Usenet Newsgroup Archive: rec.radio.amateur.policy

2002-03

These Usenet messages were preserved as a plain-text archive. This PDF was generated by Digital Library of Amateur Radio & Communications from the source text file in 2026.

Date span: 2002-03-01 through 2002-03-31

Source text: rec.radio.amateur.policy.txt

Source item: https://archive.org/details/usenet-rec

Messages included in this PDF: 3,274

Message records with no readable body available in the source text: 3

Messages are presented chronologically by archived date.

Binary or encoded payloads are not printed as blocks of encoded text; a placeholder appears where such material was detected. The original source text is unchanged.

1. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 00:00:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5mgf5atv1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35946

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7D9CFF.74FAB257@worldnet.att.net...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > >What matters is that they went through the same process to learn
> > >that fact that we all did.
> >
> > That is the precise description of a hazing ritual, Dick.
>
> "Going through a process to learn facts" is a hazing ritual? Not on planet
> Earth, maybe in NCI land

There are many totaly useless "facts". Hazing memorization
takes many forms...example - to pledge for XYZ fraternity,
the pledges might be "required" to memorize the names of all
the past presidents of the farternity/sorority.

> > >*THAT* is what will be lost by dropping all code testing.
> >
> > You do not feel that Morse code has much merit, then, if you feel
> > that people will not be attracted to use it.
>
> No, thetas what YOU are saying. I'm saying what I always have said-
> Without the code test almost no one today will be exposed to its merits.

Which is an admission on your part that you have no faith, zilch,
nada, nothing as to the true merits of code and the ability of yourself
and/or others to "sell" newcomers (or old times for that matter)
on the "joys, pleasure, value, worth" of learning and using code which
you have preached here for years.

> > Your saying that is NOT a very good
> > endorsement for the mode, Dick.
>
> That doesn't make it inaccurate.

So you truly don't believe in what you say as to the
merits of code?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 00:05:01 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5mguv$2oq$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35947

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7E47A2.F3E0417C@worldnet.att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Without the code test almost no one today will be exposed to its
merits.
> >
> > You and I can expose them to CW's merits
>
> And how do you propose to expose Carl to CW's merits? Gag and tie him,
and
> "force" him to listen to Gorden West tapes?

Well which/what is it Dick...is success in your mind ONLY
to be measured if EVERYONE (i.e. including Carl) buys the
code as to value, use, etc.?

If not, why do YOU care if
Carl, me or anyone else individually doesn't give a hoot
about code?

Is there some threshold level
of code users (i.e. 10% of all active hams...or some other value)
that would satisfy you or must it always be 100% of HF licensed
hams?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 00:07:34 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5mgrfatt1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35948

```
"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7E5C18.EFA0042D@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > Without the code test almost no one today will be exposed to its
merits.
> > >
> > > You and I can expose them to CW's merits
> >
> > And how do you propose to expose Carl to CW's merits? Gag and tie him,
and
> > "force" him to listen to Gorden West tapes?
>
> You, yourself, said Carl is a lost cause for CW, as are many new hams.
> There were many older hams who hated CW - always has been - always
> will be. What I am talking about is exposing new hams, who might like
> CW, to CW's merits. Set up field day demonstrations - stuff like that.

Actually, given the time, I'd bet there'd also be "new code users"
from the ranks of long term hams. For many people, the time
they have for ham radio is limited while working, but once retired
some of them might have sufficient dicretionary time to pursue
code use. To each his own.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK
```

4. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 00:12:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0202281612.56fc138@posting.google.com>
Source record: 35949

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c7cdcbd_1@news7.fast.net>...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020227065021.26726.00000109@mb-fm.aol.com...
> > In article <3c7c3d6f_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
> > >
> > > >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > >news:20020226160954.04655.00000108@mb-mw.aol.com...
> > > >>
> > > >> Let's see:
> > > >>
> > > >> - permanent/renewable license vs. 1 year one-time license
> > > >
> > > >[begin sarcasm mode]
> > >
> > > Wasn't meant as sarcasm, Carl. I was just listing the differences.
> > > Are any of my facts incorrect?
> >
> > Note the placement of the [begin ... end sarcasm mode] markers.
> > I was pointing out that MY new text in response to your list of
> > comparisons was sarcasm, NOT that you were being sarcastic,
> > Jim.

Ah, OK. I wasn't sure.

But why be sarcastic here? The facts are correct, are they not?

The point I was trying to make is this:

Ed keeps mentioning the "4 page study guide" story, but doesn't
mention
the vast difference in privileges granted.

Fact is, we really don't have an effective entry-level license today.
> > >
> > > >Yup ... it's a shame those "newcomers" get a license for
> > > >longer than a year ... makes it harder for the cranky olde fartz
> > > >to find time and opportunity to drive them off, right?
> > >
> > > The first QSO I ever had was with an old-timer who did not
> > > try to drive me off. Now I'm the old timer. Do you see me trying

> > to drive off newcomers? Do you see me calling anyone names
> > like "stupid", "idiot", "twit", "cranky olde fartz", "a$$hole",
> > "fossil" or some such?

Well?
> >
> > >(remember the "No lids, kids, or space kadets" guy? A real
> > >"welcome to ham radio" if I ever heard one ...}
> > >(not!)
> >
> > That was Mike, W2OY. He was on phone - 75 meter AM, actually. Not
> > CW and not in the Novice subbands. He's been dead several years now.
> >
> > Do you know what his gripe was?
>
> Does it REALLY matter in terms of the impression his
> diatribe must have made on newcomers?

Actually, YES.

For one thing, they guy is remembered because he was so unusual. He
stuck out like a sore thumb. Also had a big signal.

His gripe was that prior to 1953 it took an Advanced/Class A license,
or
an Extra, to operate 'phone on 20 or 75. Everybody else had to use
what
bits of 160 were available, or the ham bands above 25 MHz. 40 had no
phone segment and 15 wasn't a ham band yet.

Then, without an NPRM, RM or anything else, in late 1952 FCC opens all
privs to all hams except Novices and Techs. All of a sudden ol' Mike
has lotsa new
company.

> > >> - 1500 W peak output above 50 MHz vs. 75 W input
> > >
> > >[temporarily leaving sarcasm mode]
> > >
> > >I've stated that I (personally) think that 1500W PEP is way
> > >too much power for the level of technical competence that's
> > >demonstrated by the tech test.
> >
> > We know you don't like high power, Carl. Do you know of any
> > abuses of the power allowed to hams because of lack of technical
> > knowledge? If not, why do you insist on making folks jump through
> > technical test hoops just to use 1500 W?
>
> Because, without adequate technical competency, 1500W at
> VHF/UHF with unlimited antenna gain can be downright
> dangerous, not only to the person who's (mis)using it, but to
> his/her family and neighbors ...

Sure. But all that does is justify the need for RF safety questions
on the test. Nothing more.

And note that a new ham can go from no license to Extra without
answering a single RF safety question correctly. Many if not most
currently licensed hams have never been tested on RF safety.

FCC doesn't seem to be worried about it, though. They simply
provide regulations about exposure and survey and leave the
rest up to us.

> not to mention that most 1500W
> amps still use thermionic FETs (tubes) and therefore have high
> plate voltage supplies, which introduces yet another danger
> factor for the incompetent and those around him/her.

One can be just as easily killed by 120/240 VAC "house current". Yet
there is no test or licensing requirement to do most electrical work
on
one's own home. There are also all sorts of amateur electronics folks
(audiophiles, for example) who work with high voltage "hollow state"
equipment, yet they have no license nor test.

So, except for the possibility of exposing others to
higher-than-regulation
RF, there is no safety issue.
>
> Thus, a test of adequate technical competency would be a
> RELEVANT, REASONABLE requirement for such high powers,
> not just a "hazing ritual" "hoop to jump through."

Except for the RF exposure stuff, that's simply not true. Should
government be in the business of protecting hams from themselves but
not other citizens?

Fact is, most of what's on the written test is NOT needed from a pure
safety consideration, nor for the orderly operation of a "modern"
amateur station. Most what's on the writtens is only necessary to
know if a particular ham wants to build something or use a
particular mode.
>
> > >[re-entering sarcasm mode]
> > >
> > >> - All authorized modes and frequencies above 50 MHz vs.
> > >> 145-147 CW, MCW and AM only
> > >
> > >Yup ... got to restrict what the newcomers can do to to the point
> > >where it's not attractive ... otherwise, they'll over-run "our"
> bands
> > >(Not!)
> > >
> > >> - All forms of authorized frequency control vs. crystal control
> only

> > >
> > >Yup ... keep 'em rock-bound, despite the fact that rig stability
> > >isn't really an issue any more ... that'll make them easier to
> avoid
> > >and make it harder for them to work something interesting ... heck,
> > >if you let them move around at will, they might actually get
> together
> > >and teach each other a few things, and realize that they're really
> > >not an inferior species ... just a bit less experienced.
> > >(Not!)
> > >
> > >> Add the 5 wpm code test and get:
>
> > >> - 250 W peak output vs. 75 W input below 30 MHz
> > >
> > >Wow!!!! (Not!)
> >
> > We all know you hate high power.
>
> I don't "hate high power" ... I simply thing that it is misused A LOT,

How much is "a lot"? Sure, some hams never turn their amps off, but
your statement seems to be a sweeping generalization.

> that it presents potential dangers (electrical or RF exposure ... the
> latter particularly at VHF/UHF and up), and that better antennas
> and modulation and coding schemes offer FAR more "bang for the
> buck" than brute force power.

Sure. But many hams cannot put up better antennas than they already
have.

And on the subject of "better modulation and coding schemes", I'll ask
again: What mode(s) did you use to work those 70+ countries and 40+
states that you talked about here a while back?

I bring this up because it seems to me that it's a bit disingenuous to
preach to other hams about "better modulations and coding schemes" if
yourself don't use them as an amateur.

> However, if the more elegant solutions
> (antennas, modulation, coding) don't provide adequate link margin,
> then I have no problem with someone using higher, allowable powers.
> (But, according to the minimum power rule, which is probably the
> MOST violated rule in ham radio, the guys who are telling each other
> that they are all S9+40+ to everyone else in the group are MISusing
> their amps, IMHO.)

Sure - if, in fact, they are using amplifiers at all.

Oddly enough, most of the folks I work on HF are running 100 W or less
-
often far less. YMMV.

> >
> > Another thing that has changed from those days is homebrewing.
> > How many newcomers start out with homebrew equipment today?
> > It was common back in 1963.
> > My first rig was homebrew, and it has been followed by many others.
>
> Because of code testing, most newcomers today enter as techs.

I disagree. The trend to newcomers starting off as Techs goes back
way before 1991. The reason is simple: You get a LOT more privs for
just a little more study.

> The
> most versatile piece of gear they can acquire as a 1st rig is a 2m HT.

All depends what they want to do. Most start with an HT because it's
self-contained. But in many areas the HT owner is VERY limited, and
would
be better off spending the same money on a dual band rig that could be
used mobile or at home, and some decent antennas.

> How many "experienced, long-time" hams do you think are technically
> capable of building the equivalent of, for example, a Yaesu VX-5R?
> (let alone building it cost-effectively, when buying parts in small
> quantities
> at outrageous prices compared to what the OEMs pay?)

I doubt most could. But that's not the point. Most hams could not
build
the sophisticated commercial equipment of the day.

The point I was making is that the technical stuff in the tests had
more relevance at a time when many if not most hams were building
equipment, especially transmitters. Today, among newcomers,
building is not nearly so common, so there is less if any absolute
NEED for technical knowledge. Those that do build need far more
technical knowledge than the test requires.

In other words, it's a hoop for newbies to jump through.

> > >> - CW and SSB on a piece of 10 M plus slices of 80/40/15 vs CW
> only on
> > >80/40/15
> > >
> > >Wow ... let newcomers use SSB! What heresy! (Not!) BTW ... you
> forgot
> > >that data is also allowed in that sliver on 10m, not just CW (more
> heresy).
> >
> > Sounds to me like you have a prejudice against CW and cannot imagine
> that it
> > could be fun for newcomers.
>

> - From my experience, most don't find it fun ... or even interesting ...
> that's why so many refuse to do it.
> I don't find it fun ... I don't use it.

I must say that based on your many, many comments on the mode over the years, I would hardly expect you to like it or have an objective view of
the mode.

> I have NO problem with anyone
> who WANTS TO using it to their heart's content. I DO have a
> problem with it being used as an unnecessary barrier designed
> to keep people off of HF.

But not with using the written tests to do the same thing. One man's "reasonable and relevant" is another's "hoop". Why is a Tech Plus
competent to run AM on 6 meters but not 10 meters? Why is a Tech Plus competent to run 1500 W PEP on VHF/UHF but only a fraction of that on HF, even though the RF exposure hazard is less on HF/MF?

> > Do you know WHY Novices and Techs got 10 meters?
>
> Because the FCC wanted to make ham radio at least marginally
> more attractive to newcomers ("novice enhancement").

That was a minor reason. The real reason was to counter the increasing incursions of freebanders and others illegally using 10 meters.

> But I'll
> bet that the "traditional society" lobbied the FCC to make sure
> that they didn't get "real ham" privs in the other HF bands.

Nope. In fact, the "traditional society" pushed FOR the idea in the first place.
> > >
> > >Jim,
> > >
> > >Almost sounds like there's some "newcomer" prejudice
> > >showing on your part ...
> >
> > Only in your imagination, Carl. I'm simply stating facts.
>
> OK ... I believe you to be an honorable person, so I'll
> take your word on that.

Thanks. I was a newcomer once, and I remember well what it was like.
>
> However, I think in all honesty, you'd have to admit that
> a LOT of what I said in sarcasm above really DOES
> represent the feelings of quite a lot of long-time "real hams."

Not the ones I know. The ones who feel as you do are as rare as
ol' W2OY.
>
> > Ed constantly mentions the "4 page study guide of 1963"
> > so I filled in the blanks.
> >
> > > sounds like you're irritated that
> > >newcomers don't have to endure the same hardships that
> > >you had to as a novice.
> >
> > I'm simply pointing out the enormous differences 40 years has made.
>
> 40 years has made enormous differences in EVERYTHING.

Not really. Most of life is not that different.

> That's
> part of the problem ... you can't keep ham radio "like it was 40 years
> ago" and expect it to be vital, heathy, and viable for the long haul.
> EVERYTHING changes and hams need to accept change as well.

Only if the change is for the better. Many changes are NOT for the
better. The mantra that "change must be accepted" as if all change
is inevitable and good is simply bogus.
>
> > I have also suggested (with Richard Plourde) a post-S25.5 license
> structure to
> > address some of the imbalances of the current system (like 1500 W
> for
> > newcomers) and at the same time LOWER the requirements for new hams.
>
> You're right ... I remember seeing some of that, but it got a bit
> involved and I missed a lot due to business travel, then it seemed
> to be gone ...

Still in the archives. Seems odd to me that nobody but Mr. Plourde and
me want to discuss stuff like that.
>
> > One additional fact: Nobody is required to start out with a Tech
> today, just as
> > nobody was required to start with a Novice in 1963. All newcomers
> have always
> > had the option to skip over the "entry level" and go straight for
> General or
> > its historic equivalent.
>
> Yes, but I believe that the leap from nothing to General is a larger
> leap today than it was in the past, with the exception of 5 wpm vs.
> 13.

I disagree! The new General test is 35 questions from a publicly
available pool. The 5 wpm can be taken independently (CSCEs didn't
exist in 1963, either).

> There is a place for an entry-level license ... and other than the
> power and lack of HF-specific material, I think the tech is not TOO
> far off the mark for a "starter" ... I'd beef it up just a bit, get
> rid of
> code and add HF privs when the ITU Radio Regs allow it, and
> I think it would be a good replacement for the old Novice entry point.
> Much more versatile, agreed, but I think that is necessary to make
> the ARS attractive to newcomers.

I would say what is needed is a 21st century version of the Novice.
New
name, new privs, simplified test. See what we came up with - check
google.
>
> > >You might want to think it over
> > >from that perspective a bit and do some self-examination.
> >
> > Good suggestion. After careful consideration it seems to me that the
> > comparisons
> > made could be taken out of context, even though nowhere have I said
> "we should
> > go back to the way it was". In other words, some readers may project
> their own
> > biases on what I wrote.
> > >
> > >Or maybe, you're just listing some of the changes that
> > >have taken place without really complaining about them ...
> >
> > Now you've got it. In fact, think about it the other way - perhaps
> > the complaint is that the old Novice was too restrictive.
>
> I do think the old Novice was FAR too restrictive ... maybe
> when it first came out ... but technology made it reasonable
> to ease many of the restrictions ... like VFOs, 250W PEP,
> etc.

Which happened about the time you were licensed.

> You *seemed* to be (at least on the edge of) complaining
> about those liberalizing changes ... if you weren't my sarcasm
> wasn't for you ... it really was for those who actually DO feel
> the way I was expressing in sarcasm.

You inferred what wasn't implied.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 00:13:49 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5mhbjipl1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 35950

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a5k4el017b3@enews1.newsguy.com...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020227180954.23126.00000131@mb-fy.aol.com...
> > Such a program already exists, and has for years. The ARRL Code
> Proficiency
> > Program offers certificates and endorsements in 5 wpm intervals from 10
to
> > at least 40 wpm.
> >
> > This program goes back many decades.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Then FISTS, the ARRL, or any PCTA types should be pushing these
endorsements
> if they want morse code to endure. They've depended on welfare support of
> the mode via code testing, and now it's time to work for it.

Why not an annualcode recieving contest too?

Many hobby pursuits encorage "excellence" by
hosting contests that focus on desired qualities.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

6. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 00:16:09 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5mhbkipl2@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36001

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a5ln5j011a1@enews3.newsguy.com...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:a5k457$do0$2@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > This is exactly what FISTS should be doing - more agressive selling. I
> > don't
> > > see why any pro-coder would have an objection to an organization such
as
> > > FISTS having a program where you could get a 13 or 20 WPM certificate.
> > Yes,
> > > it would be worthless as far as the FCC is concerned, but they would
> then
> > > have their "real" hams to tout.
> >
> > To my knowledge, no one in NCI opposes any such
> > "voluntary", private certification idea/concept.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> I never implied otherwise.

Agree and understood. If we didn't spell it out exactly, however,
ole Dick'd be claiming our silence as an admission of quilt.

>The point I'm trying to make is that is the
> pro-coders want CW to endure, they have to do
> so without welfare support of
> the mode via mandated testing at high speeds.

I agree completely.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

7. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 00:30:01 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5mi5l$qs2$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36002

> >> >Take the WTC disaster. I've already offered that someone provide the
> >> >message that was relayed out of that disaster scene--this country's
> >worst.
> >>
> >> whoa! This country's worst disaster? By what measure?

Not sure who asked this, but by the number of people killed,
the 911 WTC is certainly one of the worst, if not the worst.
I don't know of any other "disastor" that had as many people killed...
but I'm willing to listen.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

8. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 00:37:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5mijq$6e8$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36003

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7E456C.98E2D7B3@worldnet.att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > W1RFI wrote:
> > > > In the first place, I see no reference to "investing whatever it
takes" in any
> > > > FCC regulation.
> > >
> > > There's a hell of a lot of ham radio that isn't in the FCC
regulations. You don't
> > > know that?
> >
> > How is the part of ham radio that isn't in the FCC regulations enforced?
>
> No now you're advocating that every facet of life (and ham radio) be
enforced??
> Change your mind?

He is asking you...IF "investing whatever it takes" is supposed
to be of some importance to ham radio...then why
isn't that concept codified as part of the rules/regs/testing?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

>
> > Who does the enforcement for "investing whatever it takes"?
>
> The issuance of the license obviously takes care of that. If you found it
to be
> "trivial" as you have said, well boolah - boolah for you. I know that the
vast
> majority of applicants do not.
>

9. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 00:58:14 UTC
From: toxic_waste@citizensband.com
Message-ID: <1f2adfc1.0202281658.3a16b10c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 36004
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

appaloosax4@aol.com (Appaloosa X 4) wrote in message
news:<20020227200901.17531.00000804@mb-ct.aol.com>...

> >however, she enjoyed both fashion and shopping and
> >although not my cup of tea, I was expected to accept this.
>
> OK, I'll bite. Why didn't you just head on in to the radio(s) when she was out
> fashion shopping?

Just think about it Maggie, I was forced to go shopping with her,
simply because I was the clown that paid the bill ;-)))

>
> I might be more obsessed with the radios if the police scanners were better,
> but the conversations aren't nearly as enjoyable here as they were up in rural
> Wisconsin. That was Andy Taylor / Barney Fife Land, and people kept their
> scanners on all day every day because no TV sitcom could compare for humor.
>
> And the stuff on the CB around here seems to be pretty much "honey pick up a
> loaf of bread on your way home from work" stuff or guy talk on sports. Hard to
> get obsessed 'bout that. And nobody ever wants to hear about my really neat
> Martha Stewart crepes recipe.
>
> Maggie

Regards
toxic_waste

10. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 01:00:32 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5mk3hgmp1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36005

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020228174629.16934.00001114@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
> >To be honest, the PERCEPTION of many, licensed or unlicensed,
> >is that the ARRL has controlled most of the past of the ARS from
> >a decided minority group that is NOT required to be accountable
> >to either the membership or non-members.
>
> An odd perception to have of a group of Directors that is elected by the
direct
> vote of that membership.

Ed,
Welcome to the club. NCI get's the same accusation from some
people.

> >Are there independent, disinterested witnesses to all this "openness and
> >honesty?" All I've seen over the years is what the ARRL says it
> >does. There are NO independent checks or balances; the ARRL
> >says it is honest and aboveboard and all must take them at
> >their word..
>
> Yes, we must. :-) Why would those who set ARRL policy not want to be
honest and
> above board?

Must be a grand conspiracy. :-)

> >Before the opening of the Internet a mere decade ago, the ARRL
> >acted as an intermediary for its membership (then only about a
> >quarter of all licensees as it is now) in relations with the US
> >government and especially with the FCC. That was useful since
> >government was very large and direct communications with the
> >government was difficult. The ARRL had become a de facto
> >Big Brother, a claimed ombudsman. It was very difficult for
> >individual members to verify if the ARRL actually DID what it
> >said it did.
>
> What ARRL says it does wrt the FCC is very much a matter of public record
then,
> as it is now.

Why Ed, what about all those clandistine phone calls from ARRL
to FCC? :-) :-)

> > All were expected to believe that the ARRL was
> >honest because the ARRL said they were honest. A Belief
> >existed and skeptics were scoffed at, ignored by Believers.
>
> Uh, oh, here come the Black Helicopters and Capitilizations. Must be
> Pontification time!

Yup...same old conspiracy theory silliness.

> >The Internet brought a true Revolution as well as Revelation to
> >all who had access. Governments now had databases
> >available on-line, including Comments and Replies on NPRMs.
> >No one had to travel to DC and go to the Reading Room of the
> >FCC in order to see documents nor did they have to be a
> >lifetime subscriber to the Federal Register or GPO customer.
> >Governments even accepted comments from individual
> >citizens and did not need attorneys to represent them. The
> >FCC made public over 2600 Comments on the 98-143 NPRM,
> >all available on-line around the clock.
>
> Yes, it does. How does the fact that now that all these tools are
available,
> ARRL tells hams about them, tells them how to use them, tells hams what it
has
> filed with the FCC and gives the URLs where they can read those filings
fit
> with your "we had to believe they were honest because we had no way of
proving
> they weren't" allegations?

Yep.....I spent many hours reading the actual comments filed by
people on NPRM 98-143. Before the internet, that'd be
virtually impossible and cost prohibitive.

> >The ARRL has a large website, too. Many sources of amateur
> >radio information are available for free, but nearly as many are
> >also available ONLY to members.
>
> And on what basis do you know what percentage of the website is available
only
> to members, Len? From what I see, the members-only features are probably
less
> than 20% of the whole. Most of that is related to what is printed in QST,
and
> I think we can reasonably conclude that someone who chooses not to get QST
will
> have to accept that about half of the reprinted articles from QST and QEX
on
> the ARRL website are available only to members.

As a paid member of ARRL, I'm glad that ARRL doesn't give everything
on the web free to non-members. Nice to know that membership
gets me "extra benefits".

> >That same website has continual advertisements paid for by others and for
> >ITSELF. It
> >is an ideal self-promotional medium and the ARRL never fails
> >in such self-promotion.
>
> Good for them. As a member, I appreciate that ARRL promotes the products
that
> pay for the things that are important to me.

Works for me too.

> >The ARRL membership is still not above a quarter of all US
> >amateur radio licensees, yet the ARRL still implies that it
> >"represents all amateurs."
>
> Maybe someday you will understand the meaning of representation, Len.

Kinda reminds me too of the people that complain about judging
rules at one of the car club events I have helped organize BUT they
don't join the club to be a part of the work effort.

> >The ARRL has had a record of
> >past opposition, strong opposition to change, yet has repeatedly
> >reversed opposing stances after change had been enacted.
>
> In what way? ARRL didn't purge the record of its postion wrt
restructuring
> after restructuring was enacted differently. It did accept the outcome
after
> filing its Petition for Reconsideration. To hear you talk, one would think
that
> you believe ARRL should have flouted the law. I think this is a case you
would
> damn either way ARRL did it. As a member, I believe that ARRL should not
flout
> the law.

Heaven forbid that ARRL, NCI or anyone individually ever changes their
mind on a subject.

> >Believers will selectively bring out such reversals as "proof" that
> >the ARRL was "really all for change" prior to an occurance.
>
> Can you provide an example of this nonsense?

Ed,
It makes no difference. The conspiracy theory people
will believe whatever their fantasies are.

> >Believers cannot see such tarnish but others do.
>
> Ah, the Secret Seer phenomenon. :-) We understand, Len.

Wup, wup, wup...hear them choppers approaching.

> >The ARRL has no indication of "support" for newcomers unless
> >they are teen-agers or totally ignorant of radio or of miniscule
> >experience in ANY radio communication.
>
> I can barely understand what this means? In your twisted view, what
rational
> reason can you offer that ARRl would not want to support newcomers unless
they
> didn't know anything? You can sure cook up some far-flung ideas, Len. :-)

Made no sense to me ither.

> > The (unfortunately)
> >clear implication for many years has been that all who enter
> >must be ignorant of radio and young acolytes of brainwashable
> >aptitudes.
>
> Well, if you have had to bring in allegations of brainwashing, you really
are
> scratching pretty deep, Len. I think I will let that one speak for itself.
You
> can Clay can both think "they" are out to get other people, but YOU are
too
> smart to be caught by their lies. :-)

More black helicopters approaching.

> >The ARRL knows all and sees all, they will "lead the
> >way" because they (and only they) "know what is best."
>
> I disagree, Len. I do not believe that ARRL is either all knowing, or all
> seeing. You are free to believe they are, but it is pretty odd that you
would
> believe that and say all the things you said above.

Last I checked, there is no law prohibiting anyone from
starting another "ARRL like" organization. Now I haven't
checked lately, so maybe ARRL got a special law passed
through congress while we weren't looking.

> >Of course, the ARRL tries to influence ENTRY regulations into
> >US amateur radio...by the same manner as had so many in
> >the membership under old regulations.
>
> Can you explain what you mean by this?

Assuming it true, what's the beef anyway?

> >Are these just one person's observations? No. Hardly. It is a
> >sort of synopsis of what thousands of others have seen and
> >felt over the years.
>
> I don't imagine that "thousands" have seen and felt the TRVTH as Len knows
it,

> Len.

And nothing is stopping those thousands from starting their
own "alter-ARRL" organziation.

> >There is no poll of that multitude, no proof,
> >yet it has been heard, felt, and understood. It is almost
> >tangible. The signs have just begun to appear, such as the
> >Comments on 98-143.
>
> This reminds me of the guy in rags standing on the street corner preaching
the
> end is near. :-)

Sinner repent.

> >Perhaps the ARRL leadership ought to start listening to more
> >than its own propaganda, to be more ecumenical in its Belief
> >System. It is free to hold its own Mass but that is only a
> >ceremony...the masses aren't entering the secular enclave.
>
> >There are no "black helicopters" but rather fully identifiable
> >ones. There is no paranoia about a "they." There is simply
> >an observation of what has gone on in the past and a very
> >great mass of younger skeptics not convinced. The "they"
> >are seen for who they are, what they have stated.
>
> I hope you feel better soon, Len.

Dittos from me too Len. Frankly, I'm disappointed
in the reduction to Len's commentary to such
fantasy land exhortations.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK
ARRL member, LGL
NCI member, BOD

11. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 01:06:18 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5mk9j$dv9$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36006

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7E4A31.82D694E3@worldnet.att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > The people who like CW will use it. The
> > people who don't like CW won't use it.
>
> And the people who are never required to learn it for a test will not
learn it.

Pure unadulterated bunk. Is there anyone other than
Dick that truly believes that once the code testing is ended that
"the people who are never required to learn it for a test will not learn
it."

> So they will never learn to like it. And so they will never use it. End of
story for
> CW
> Carl will be very happy, and one might hope that he finds himself stranded
on a
> desert island with only an ordinary HF SSB/CW transceiver with a defective
> microphone.

What a sorry example of a code enthusiast. If I were
a serious code user I'd sure not want Dick plying the
ranks of newcomers with his total negativism.

No cheers,
Bill K2UNK

12. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 01:15:23 UTC
From: toxic_waste@citizensband.com
Message-ID: <1f2adfc1.0202281715.7c0c45b5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 36007
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:<6mdq7uon07vbh3e5gnfr4tnba0enjr95lc@4ax.com>...
> On 27 Feb 2002 06:49:38 -0800, toxic_waste@citizensband.com (toxic
> waste) wrote:
>
> >I suppose its fair to say, a British Hams radio is his equivalent of a
> >blow up doll...
>
> And his crank-up mast is his penile extension.
>
> 73 de G3NYY

LOL, I will bow to your superior knowledge Walt ;-)))

Have a nice weekend...
Best wishes (even though I am a somewhat lapsed Cber)

toxic_waste

13. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 01:28:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C7ED931.2A0DAD52@earthlink.net>
Source record: 36008

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3C7DB2EC.C74B5AF5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> >Those who are up on the latest technology can do the same things if they
> >> >like. Their ham tickets permit any number of activities.
> >>
> >> Be consistent and aware of federal regulations. Radio amateurs
> >> are NOT AUTHORIZED to engage in deliberate transmission of
> >> RF energy outside of amateur bands through their amateur license.
> >
> >Stuff and nonsense! No such claim was intended nor would it be
> >understood as such by anyone in full command of his mental faculties.
>
> The technical regulations on spurious emissions of amateur radio
> transmissions are clearly given in Part 97, Title 47 CFR. It is the
> RESPONSIBILITY of the control operator to insure proper
> compliance of their station equipment. Anyone (even in partial
> command of mental faculties) can see that for themselves.
>
> Except for the extreme emergency situations outlined in Part 1,
> Title 47 CFR, no amateur radio licensee is AUTHORIZED to use
> his or her station for amateur radio activities outside of allocated
> amateur radio bands.

Stuff and nonsense! No such claim was intended nor would it be
understood as such by anyone in full command of his mental faculties.

> ANYONE in the USA, licensed in any radio service or not, may
> deliberately transmit RF energy within the regulations set forth
> in Parts 15 and 95, Title 47 CFR. For further definitions, see
> Part 1, Title 47 CFR.
>
> Has Heil read and understood US radio regulations as they have
> been explained to him by the FCC?

Are you taking a poll or writing a book?

> >> >You've never done anything in your life "24/7" except breathe.
> >>
> >> ...as I said before, calm rational discourse is not a quality of
> >> Heil's correspondence. :-)
> >
> >...but you made no denial.

>
> Irrelevant. To state full details of a life experience falls into the
> "CV" category which is NOT AUTHORIZED by another one-by-two
> Dill Instructor in this newsgroup.

"Irrelevant". You come off sounding like one of the coneheads. "We're
from France".

> Having pulled as long a shift as 34 hours continuously, broken only
> by meals, and been "on call" around the clock all days of the week
> both as soldier and civilian, is not relevant to any discussion of
> whether or not morse codes will live or die or the claimed superiority
> of Department of State HF communications methods or equipment
> relative to the rest of the US government.

As I previously stated, you've never done anything 24/7 in your life
except to breathe.

> --------------
>
> "Having an interest in radio" is not rigidly confined to marching in
> ranks solely to some martial music of morse or the religious
> fanaticsm exhibited in "my god-code is the only god" proselyte
> mantras.
>
> RADIO, that generic word having come to mean all forms of
> wireless communications, embraces ALL of it, ALL techniques,
> ALL methods, ALL procedures. It is a huge field of activity, long
> ago become far bigger than all of amateur radio, including all
> licensed therein whether active or inactive in amateur pursuits.
>
> To parade around extolling the "virtues" of amateurism or placing
> oneself high on a virtual pedastel of self-imposed "superiority" by
> certain achievements within amateurism is ludicrous as much as
> claiming that one must show interest in radio solely through
> entering amateur radio by acquisition of a federal license grant
> is pompous and arrogant. Such is also hypocritical to a perverse
> point, claims used solely to satisfy some imaginary "battle" of
> words that exists only in the imagination of the outraged claimant.
>
> Some work in or use radio as just another tool in their work or
> activity. That is probably the majority of all who have access to
> any sort of radio. Some find a fascination in radio itself, its
> technology, its methods, all the various modes and its uses
> for all rather than a few. Some delve deeper to become interested
> in the design and theory of the electronics required to make a
> "radio" of most any kind. Academics and engineers are generally
> in that last category for nearly all of the new developments in
> "radio" over its 106-year existance have come from them. Their
> interest and fascination led to exploration of new ideas and trials
> to see if their ideas would work. Some ideas did not work, but

> some did. Some ideas that did work were supplanted by newer,
> better ideas. Such is evolution in the entire radio world, not just
> a part of it occupied by non-professionals.
>
> Does "interest in radio" equate JUST to amateur radio? No, nor
> should it, in my opinion. Must "interest in radio" be "demonstrated"
> to a "community" by acquisition of a legal amateur license? No.
> Such is the self-imposed "requirement" of the fanatics, the ego-
> driven, the irrational credentialists who have confused a hobby
> activity done for recreation and enjoyment to some all-embracing
> lifestyle. The classes of US amateur radio licenses have changed
> from the time radio regulation first began in 1912. The whole
> purpose of a "license" is as a regulatory tool, one of many thought
> necessary by federal agencies. It is not an academic achievement
> certificate. It does not "qualify" anyone to transmit RF energy, it
> only authorizes them to do so.
>
> Some discount all of the preceding even though it is established in
> the real world, the bigger world of all radio. Those who wish to say
> otherwise live in another world of fantasy contained in their
> imaginations and quasi-religious beliefs. They are gods. Mere
> mortals may not argue with gods. They are superior.

You become more peculiar with each post. Lemme set you straight, Seymour. You are posting in an amateur radio newsgroup. Perhaps you'll forgive radio amateurs if they seem to be more concerned with amateur radio than with the rest of the radio world. Indulge us. After all, you are the outsider, the individual who is not a member of the worldwide community of radio amateurs. You are not *authorized* to communicate with radio amateurs via radio.

You aren't impressing anyone here (except perhaps yourself), Len. You only succeed in portraying yourself as a flake. I believe you stated that you were interested in becoming a radio amateur. Anyone reading the enormous volume of material you typed would be hard pressed to find any evidence of that interest expressed in your rant.

Dave K8MN

14. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 02:12:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7EE39B.A205F0E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36009

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > > It just so happens that when you "rote memorize" something, you've
> > > > learned it!
> > >
> > > But, but, but, Larry, the argument that all the doomsayers are using is
> > > that the present exams are too easy because they can be rote memorized.
> > >
> > Wrong, as usual. It's not the "exams", it's word associations that remain
> > essentially
> > meaningless (to the memorizer) but allow a passing grade and a license to
> > result.
> > For all those who actually learn the material, hooray for you.
>
> 1000 Russian words would be meaningless to you but I haven't seen any
> progress in your memorizing their definitions. Is that another example
> of do as I say, not as I do?

Hey, make it as worth my while as memorizing a ham radio exam and you might
get my attention. A megabuck might do it. Betcha I could do it.

Till then you're still just blowing trollsmoke from your posterior.

15. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 02:13:54 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7EE3F6.C1BEEF38@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36010

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > W1RFI wrote:
> > > > > In the first place, I see no reference to "investing whatever it takes" in any
> > > > > FCC regulation.
> > > >
> > > > There's a hell of a lot of ham radio that isn't in the FCC regulations. You don't
> > > > know that?
> > >
> > > How is the part of ham radio that isn't in the FCC regulations enforced?
> >
> > No now you're advocating that every facet of life (and ham radio) be enforced??
> > Change your mind?
>
> No, you were the one who brought it up. I'm asking you how you would enforce them.
> -

So you're not aware - or intelligent- enough to understand that not all of ANYTHING is enforced, nor intended to be? I thought so.

16. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 02:14:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228211410.19404.00000168@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 36011

In article <xqqf8.5250$106.332396@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "K7JEB"
<k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> writes:

>Carl R. Stevenson, WA6VSE, wrote
>
>> Yes, some will say, "You support 'jumping through the technical hoop'
>> but not 'jumping through the Morse hoop'." Correct .. I believe that
>> the "technical hoop" if one insists on calling it that, is a
>> REASONABLE one, because it relates to safety, interference, etc.,
>> whereas the Morse hoop only relates to operator mode use preference...
>
>Sadly, most of the present "technical" questions have little
>or no relevance to the interference or safety issues in station
>operation.

Or to operating or regulatory issues.
>
>Any operator licensing test MUST justify its existence as
>being necessary to protect the rights of other spectrum
>users. Anything else is just a hoop to jump through, placed
>there by someone with a favorite cause (or mode).

BINGO. Thanks, Jim!

Any question in the pools can be subjected to a simple test. Just
consider if an amateur could properly and safely operate a ham station
without the knowledge contained in the question. If so, the question
does not cover knowledge that is absolutely necessary.

For example, we must identify ourselves on the air using our callsigns,
so questions about proper ID involve "absolutely necessary" knowledge.
But one can operate without knowing the difference between a tunnel
diode and a zener diode, so that knowledge is not "absolutely necessary".
Instead, it's part of the hoop.

I would venture to say that there are more hams on the air today using
Morse/CW than there are hams using homebrew rigs. Yet a technical
knowledge test is held up as a "reasonable and relevant" requirement
for an amateur license while a basic Morse/CW skill test is not.

Kinda like saying you have to answer detailed technical questions on
how your car works in order to get a driver's license, but you don't have
to know how to drive a stick shift to get the same license.

73 de Jim, N2EY

17. Re: Bootleg Call signs - Identity theft?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 02:19:53 UTC
From: arcweb@bnnorth.net
Message-ID: <3c7ee37c.6134978@news.bright.net>
Source record: 36013

On Thu, 28 Feb 2002 16:14:15 -0500, "Leland C. Scott"
<no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:

>
>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:a4nfcn$f56$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>>
>> "Bill" <kf6wxj@cwnet.com> wrote in message
>> news:3c6ef76c$1_1@news3.cwnet.com...
>> > Ive been getting email from a couple of guys that claim to be hams. One
>> is
>> > supposed to be an extra class operator and the other claims to be an
>> > advanced operator. Neither one know any code. Is this illegal? Bill
>> > KF6WXJ
>>
>> Is it (1) illegal to impersonate a ham...or is it
>> (2) illegal for a ham to be an extra or advanced and not know
>> code?
>>
>> The answer to #1 is, no...unless they impersonate
>> "on the air".
>
>I would have thought that using a call sign, that was not yours, to identify
>oneself even off the air is a form of identity theft, which is a crime.
>People may have the same exact name but the FCC only issues unique
>callsigns, no duplicates. So, for example, would a person identifying
>themselves to an emergency organization as a Ham, by supplying a bootlegged
>callsign as proof, a crime?
>
>
>--
>Leland C. Scott
>KC8LD0
>
>Saw this on a Tee-shirt:
>
>"I am a bomb technician. If you see
> me running, try to keep up. "
>

A while back there was an instance of an individual representing
himself to schools as a representative of the AMerican Red Cross
Disaster Services, said he was going to use some school children to
run some practice evacuation drills. Fortunately the school officials
decided to contact the local chapter to find out if thi person was

indeed who he said he was.

Similar thing happened to me in NYC, when arriving at LaGuardia, I was wearing the ballcap of the local Fire Department that I am affiliated with, it also had my board member pic for the local Red Cross chapter. Remember this was a time that security was tight at ground zero, only people allowed in were fire/police, federal agents, and the Red Cross. Anyway I sat down and was talling to some fellow Red Cross volunteers who flew in on the same plane, and some fool comes by and steals my hat, obviously to try to gain entrance into restricted areas. Fortunately there was security people close by, and I made them aware of the situation, and I got my hat back, and he went to the pokey.

Personally, I feel that stealing or misappropriating a call sign could be considered identity theft. Only thing is though, the person who took the said call, would not have access to the true licensee's CORES id number.

73 de Keith

KC8TCQ
Vice President: REACT of Henry County
Executive Board Member: Henry County Chapter - American Red Cross
American Red Cross Disaster Services Logistics Specialist

18. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 02:27:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7EE73A.8BA38958@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36012

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > Jim, if you were a newcomer, would you buy into the merits of
> > > > > CW while the seller of CW was calling you a lazy, no good, whining,
> > > > > knuckledragger?
> > > > >
> > > > Carl and Brian Burke are newcomers?
> > > >
> > > Carl and I are newcomers to the Extra license. You have NOT made
> > > us feel welcome.
> > >
> > "Newcomers" and "newcomers to the Extra license" have entirely different
> > meanings, as you
> > know. Welcome to a dumbed down Extra class, one that any REAL newcomer can
> > just
> > as well easily achieve. It isns't anywhere near the accomplishment it once
> > was, and you know that, too.
>
> It is a license, not a degree, Dick. All it does is grant
> privileges. I, like you, met the requirements in order to
> obtain the privileges. That's what all new hams are doing.

Hell, that's all that is left, Might as well have one-license-fits-all.

The FCC sucks. Over thirty years ago they started something they all called
Incentive
licensing, designed to cause hams who were more than nonchalant about the hobby
to
upgrade their knowledge and skills, and when they did, then they were awarded a
few
kc of extra spectrum and a certificate to hang on your was attesting that you
had, indeed,
met all the requirements of that lofty charge. Now what little staff remaining is
too
absorbed in the mechanics of PC to bother to even concern themselves with any
such
nonsense, save an occasional barb hurled at ham radio in general decrying our
solaced

"failure to adopt advanced technology" ad naseum. All the while they embrace dolts like
Stevenson who may in fact be a digital communications designer *at work*, but hangs onto
his SSB microphone for dear life as a ham.

Disgusting is far too mild a term to waste on it all.

19. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 02:40:52 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C7EEA34.63D698CE@adelphia.net>
Source record: 36014

After having taken the tests, all under the new system, I can assure you
all that memorizing the tests are hard enough that anyone who does it
would be clever and stupid simultaneously.

clever to memorize all the answers, and stupid because they couldn't see
that it would be easier to pick up the underlying principles.

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Wrong, as usual. It's not the "exams", it's word associations that remain
> >essentially
> >meaningless (to the memorizer) but allow a passing grade and a license to
> >result.
>
> I know that you are giving this advice to those who are studying for the exams,
> but I want to tell them that you are wrong and that it is easier to learn the
> underlying principles than to try to word-associate 300 sets of questions three
> separate times.
>
> >For all those who actually learn the material, hooray for you.
>
> Now you're talking, Dick. Such a turnaround.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

20. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 02:42:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7EEAB2.FD144EC1@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36015

Jim Kelley wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > > It just so happens that when you "rote memorize" something, you've
> > > > learned it!
> > >
> > > But, but, but, Larry, the argument that all the doomsayers are using is
> > > that the present exams are too easy because they can be rote memorized.
>
> > Wrong, as usual.
>
> You're saying that Larry is wrong then, Dick. Cecil agreed with Larry
> about rote memorization. Why didn't you reply to Larry's post instead?

Lots of hams have rote memorized the question pool since 1985. In have no particular interest in how Larry did it, and you can find in the archives where I
stated unequivically that rot memorization certainly is a part of learning. The problem
lies in what is learned, radio theory and regs or just word associations to get a license.

21. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 02:46:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7EEB97.C78B241A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36016

CAM wrote:

>
> My SCS PTC2e treats CW just like any other digital mode. It generates an
> audio tone in SSB mode and keys the PTT line.

So does any soundcard software package.

> It decodes CW a lot better
> than I do.

Gee I'm sorry to hear that. How long did you say you've been working CW?
Betcha it won't in weak signal conditions where you can't get an attractive S/N
ratio.

22. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 02:47:22 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <HdCf8.29506$sH1.2033166@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 36019
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I heard something similar except in reverse.

Seems there was an American airline pilot who had just landed at large
airport outside Berlin.
He was a bit confused as to how to taxi to the ramp and asked for directions
at least 3 times,
always politely. On the 3rd request for directions, a rather terse and
thickly accented voice
answered and curtly repeated the instructions ending with a very
smart-alecky, "Hazz de
Americaner not been to Ber-leen before?" The quite senior Captain paused
and then replied,
Er, affirmative.....but it was in 1945--and we, uh, didn't stop!"

Jerry

Martin <mdwade@mobiletel.com> wrote in message
news:3C7E6D7D.546A@mobiletel.com...
> Krell wrote:
> >
> > "Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
> > news:timr7ugi4ppiu90sa1e5268kd14fo8hl40@4ax.com...
> > > On Wed, 27 Feb 2002 15:54:18 -0500, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> > > wrote:
> > >
> > > >We communicate in the same
> > > >language as you, albiet with variations, but it's still English.
> > >
> > > Oh really?
> > >
> > > "Albiet" looks more like German to me.
> > > ;-)
> > >
> > ...and just what language(s) do you think English evolved from? Look at
an
> > Indo-European chart sometime, if you know what one of those are.
>
>
> For all who do not recognize ENGLISH as the world's standard:
>
> OVERHEARD AT THE FRANKFORT RADIO TOWER ON THE AIRCRAFT FREQ:
>
> 1. Plane trying to land asking for instructions in German was
> given the reply, "You must use English to recieve instructions

> from this control tower!
>
> The plane's pilot asked why since he was in a German Plane, in
> German airspace and coming from and land on German soil, why
> must we use ENGLISH?
>
> Before the control tower could answer, a decidely British and
> American Accent both chimed in, "Because we won the war!"
>
> RULE BRITANNIA, PAX AMERICANA and the highest standards of living
> in world are to be found in ENGLISH speaking countries!
>
> In America, we have a ROYAL SOCIETY CLUB, in Canada we have the
> best hockey team and in the UK country music has a cult following,
> why you ask, because of the ENGLISH LANGUAGE!
>
> Martin N5PZJ
>
> To stay on thread, yes my spouse tolerates my hobby and I tolerate her
> hobby, ouch where did you find those knitting needles again?

23. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 02:51:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7EECD8.54378369@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36017

Krell wrote:

> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C7E5E52.D40E8253@IEEE.org...
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > W1RFI wrote:
> > >
> > > > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> > > >
> > > > > Tsk, tsk. Still couldn't pass a code test, though.
> > > >
> > > > Carl passed a code test.
> > >
> > > But not THE code test. He knows.
> >
> > He passed THE only one that matters now.
>
> This mentality is strikingly familiar to what has been dubbed "blue collar
> envy" by some.

Krell, you really aren't very bright, are you? So what did Stevenson do for
over 25 years,
instead of hang out on HF (as he clearly was desperate to do)? Huh?

Cecil's lame answer of "the only one that matters NOW" is so much fluff. NO
test matters
now.

24. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 02:53:29 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <vjCf8.29514$sH1.2034742@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 36024
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Where I am from "razz" means to tease, so I teased her about speaking so unkindly about my
radios, declaring how worthless they were, and then using the HF to keep track of me.
So, it had a "use"--even to her!!

Jerry

A Different Nick <nicholas@commcen.co.uk> wrote in message
news:hk7s7u4g2lc7oofaojf1f7p0u23s0pl4f9@4ax.com...
> "Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>
> >. It was my
> >turn to razz HER! LOL!
> >
> >73
> >
> >Jerry
> >
> Um... My imagination is probably running away, but when you say it was
> your turn to "razz" her, what exactly was that... or shouldnt I ask.
>
> I'm assuming your razz her everytime you return from a trip away :-)
>
> Nick
>

25. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 02:57:38 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7ef078_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36021

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020227221007.17584.00000161@mb-ct.aol.com...
> In article <3c7aed04_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020225063827.20570.00000050@mb-fz.aol.com...
> >> In article <3c790731_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> >> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >We provide communication service to our public service and regulatory
> >> >agencies during an emergency or disaster. Those entities do not use
CW
> >> >themselves. Why would we?
> >> >
> >> Because it works!
> >>
> >> Those agencies do not provide themselves with adequate communications
> >> facilities for all imaginable situations, either. If they did, there
would
> >be
> >> no
> >> need for amateurs to be involved at all. (They're getting better in
this
> >> regard,
> >> though). Why should we copy what they do?
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>
> >I think when a Fire Chief I am shadowing wants me to relay a message over
to
> >the other end of town that additional tank trucks are needed in about 45
> >min., along with some relief provisions for 30 men, that the Fire Chief
> >would much rather hear me say that than to wonder if I sent the right
> >message.
>
> Why would the Chief have to hear you say it, if you have established that
> hams get messages through correctly?
>

In some cases, the person you are shadowing doesn't have to hear the relays
of messages. However, how much time is it going to take if I have to
decipher and re-relay a message? In close proximity to disaster operations,
there is no need for CW. For traffic nets carrying H&W, or provisional

information even, CW is probably a great mode, although still a little
impractical at even up to 200 miles away from a scene.

> Obviously for short-range tactical communication in a situation like that,
> voice
> is probably more practical than Morse or any digital mode.
> >

Agreed, obviously.

> >I think if the Red Cross is liaisoning between an official government
entity
> >and a volunteer agency, and the message needs to be sent that volunteers
are
> >need at Area A, some relief can be made by transitioning some folks from
> >Area C over to Area A, that the Red Cross person I am shadowing wants to
> >hear or know that I sent the right message.
>
> So if PSK31 or packet or PACTOR were available, you would not use it?
> >

Actually, I've never used either so I'm not sure I would be affective at
either. Would I recommend its use? I would recommend the use of *ANY*
communication mode available and that has operator capability.

> >Don't they? I'll ask the Hunt County Emergency Management Officer and
the
> >City of Greenville Fire Chief the next time I see them what they would
> >prefer. Maybe it's different from town to town, but I think our served
> >agencies aren't going to want to wonder if what they said got relayed
> >correctly.
>
> Sounds like you don't have much confidence in the ability of hams to get a
> message through without someone looking over their shoulder, or through
> the use of nonvoice modes. Even asking the questions you ask indicates
> that you doubt the "savvy" of the hams involved, or of any nonvoice mode.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I don't ask my served agencies to trust or be confident--they are quite
aware or we wouldn't be asked to be a part of their activities. And, it
sounds to me like once again you are enjoying misunderstanding to the hilt
what I am saying.

Kim W5TIT

26. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 02:58:59 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7ef079_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36020

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020227231745.15503.00000109@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article <3C7C6C36.8AD5B928@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> I'm not dictating a damn thing, Kim -- just holding your feet to the
fire
> >> for something you've already done.
> >
> >And for that today, she is thankful. The temperature in Dallas right now
> >is 23 degrees F and falling fast.
>
> Cecil:
>
> Thank you for making that point. Who says I'm not a warm, caring
> sort of guy?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

No one has to say it. You scream it out it here.

Kim W5TIT

27. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 03:03:38 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7ef18e_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36025

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020227231746.15503.00000110@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article <3c7d86fa_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Oh good grief, Larry. The day I win respect and courtesy from the likes
of
> >you would be the day I'd hope I'd come to my senses.
>
> Kim:
>
> As it happens, that is correct!
>

I'd come to my senses and rid myself of your good graces as quickly as
possible. Because, if someone is in your good graces, I am sure they have a
very twisted sense of worth--if their looking for approval from you.

> >> >By the way, I live for me...no one else.
> >>
> >> Obviously. I, on the other hand, live in a world populated with many
> >> people other than myself, and I am always careful to treat them with
> >> the same courtesy and respect that I myself wish to receive. Of
course,
> >> here on Usenet, the white gloves come off, especially when someone
> >> like yourself -- spoiling for negative attention -- surfaces. Then, I
> >give the devil it's due.
>
> >If you are so concerned, Larry, about the affect you have on other
people,
> >you'd be a lot different kind of person. I suspect you are exactly the
same
> >in real life as you are on this newsgroup.
>
> This newsgroup is only part of my real life, Kim -- not the whole thing,
> as it may be with you. You have no way of knowing how I am in "real"
> life because you simply don't know anything about me other than that
> which I choose to expose in this forum.
>
> >> >> It shows heinous disrespect
> >> >> for herself, her husband, and anyone who is forced to be exposed to
> >> >> her callsign -- thereby being placed in the undesired position of
> >> >> being a voyeur to her imprudent and salacious conduct.
> >> >>

> >> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >> >Make that *your desire* for me to be in an undesired position, Larry,
as
> >you fail miserably to make any valid point, as usual.
>
> Any points made in this newsgroup which place you in a negative light, are
> gratuitously provided by your own self.
>

So, uh, wait a minute. You say I make points in this newsgroup which you say place me in a negative light. BUT, you make points in this newsgroup that...what? Make you look good? ROFLMAO....Hysterically I might add.

> >> Totally wasted keystrokes, Kim, as I don't have any concern for your
> >opinion regarding the validity of my "points" made here.
> >>
> >
> >Ditto from me to you, Larry.
>
> Good, since you're the last person from whom I'm seeking any kind of
> validation -- unlike yourself.
>
> (About a dozen lines of Kim's more severe inanity mercifully snipped)
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Rhetoric...your as good as any other conservative groupie. Rhetoric.

Kim W5TIT

28. Watch out Cecil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 03:04:48 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <79e47b493f5c55c202cf1d634d08abae.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 36018

Dick Carroll is hot on your tail, and Mr. Hare is no slouch either!

Top 10 Users Feb 2002

[452] CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> 13.1%
[435] Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> 12.6%
[430] W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> 12.5%
[279] W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> 8.1%
[200] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 5.8%
[154] Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> 4.5%
[128] Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> 3.7%
[114] Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> 3.3%
[112] Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> 3.2%
[110] Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> 3.2%

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

29. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 03:09:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228220958.20827.00000222@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 36022

In article <20020228182254.16930.00001083@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>Some folks look at the attendance at hamfests and radio club meetings,
>>see the preponderance of older folks and conclude that ham radio is
>>"dying".
>
>I was off at a hamfest lately, and another ham expressed his concerns that
>"only old people are here." I looked around the room and, excepting teens, I
>saw hams of all ages. I told him to look again, and he did. He had a very
>surprised look as he realized that there were hams of all ages there. Maybe
>a
>few more old timers than 20s and 30s, but hams of all ages were represented.
>
>FWIW.

Excellent point, Ed!

It's been so lomng since I attended a hamfest that my knowledge is out of date. I've been to a few club meetings, but only a few.

73 de Jim, N2EY

30. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 03:09:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228220959.20827.00000223@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 36023

In article <a5mi5l$qs2$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> >> >Take the WTC disaster. I've already offered that someone provide the
>> >> >message that was relayed out of that disaster scene--this country's
>> >worst.
>> >>
>> >> whoa! This country's worst disaster? By what measure?
>
>Not sure who asked this, but by the number of people killed,
>the 911 WTC is certainly one of the worst, if not the worst.
>I don't know of any other "disastor" that had as many people killed...
>but I'm willing to listen.

Kim called it "this country's worst" disaster, which is pretty clear. I don't
mean to trivialize or minimize it in any way, but "worst" is pretty strong
stuff.

Let's exclude acts of war, even though 9/11 was clearly an act of war against
the
USA.

Here's one that comes to mind:

In September of 1900 a major hurricane hit Galveston, Texas and killed over
5000
people. Yes, it was over 100 years ago but it sure qualifies in terms of being
a
disaster and in the USA.

73 de Jim, N2EY

31. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 03:11:52 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7ef380_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36026

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020227231749.15503.00000113@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article <3c7d8568_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >Wow, I can't imagine a day when the CW guys predominantly were friendly.
>
> Kim:
>
> Don't look now, but that would be *any* given day of the year! I've never
> heard anywhere near the number of discourteous Lids on CW as I have
> on phone. Of course, you'd have no direct experience with how CW
> operators really are, would you?
>
> >Heh heh, actually that's a terrible generalization on my part, Ed.
>

I thought you were a CW loving person, Larry. You're not the least bit
friendly.

>
> Ehyupp.
>
> >And,
> >actually folks like Larry, Little Dick, Dave Heil...whomever, are in the
> >minority.
>
> I'd hope that 3 hams are in the minority -- but with the way things are
> going, that may not be so in the future!
>

And, I suggest if you're so miserable with the ARS that you either account
for your misery and get something else to make you happy or accept it.
You're like that nidyut Vince Fiscus...running around like Dr. Smith in Lost
In Space, "Oh the pain, the pain, the misery..."

> >At least around here. Most of the CW folks are very accepting of
> >all hams, regardless of CW feelings. When the Restructuring debate
first
> >hit the air down here, we had few nidyuts who said, "we're dumbing down
the
> >bands."
> >
> >But, when those of us who are already 5wpm hams, retorted that *we* were
not

> >dumb,
>
> You should have spoken strictly for yourself.
>

Uh, I did. "Those" "us" and "*we*" along with the verb "were" are plural, Larry.

> >the quick response was, "Well, I am not talking about you."
>
> Actually, they most likely were, but were just trying to be polite.
>

You live in your own little dreamland, Larry.

> >All we
> >had to do was say, "Then who *are* you talking about?" and they pretty much
> >re-surveyed what they had just said.
>
> Naaahhh -- they were just probably dismissing you as a clueless, lazy, dumbed-
> down no-coder.
>

Time to wake up, Larry.

> (It's most of us Tech and Tech+ who,
> >at the time, would spend our entire weekends helping out those older hams
> >with antenna projects, retuning, etc.) We'd also ultimately fix problems
> >with antenna connections into tuners, computer peripherals wrongly attached
> >to TNCs, and on it goes.
>
> Interesting. Prove it. Get one of the "older" hams for whom you've personally
> provided such technical assistance to get on this newsgroup and provide
> verification. Just one. If you cannot, or will not for any reason, you are a
> liar.
>

Larry, as opposed to you and I, most of the hams and friends I have around here (some hams are nothing more than mere acquaintences) have far better things to do than get involved in this crap. Think of me however you must, Larry, if it makes you feel better. You see, when the truth is known no proof is needed.

> >In fact, for a while there we Tech/Tech+'s would
> >jokingly gloat that all this stuff would roll down our way, yet it was us
> >who was keeping things going...heh heh
> >
> >I have a feeling the folks like Little Dick and Larry and Dave would act

the
> >way they do without the ham radio forum.
>
> Oh really? Find one person with whom Dick, Dave, or myself has had an
> on-the-air QSO and "acted" like we do in this newsgroup, and get them to
> provide verification -- if you cannot, or will not for any reason, then
you
> have just gratuitously slandered Dick, Dave, and myself -- thus proving
> that you're no better than you claim we are.
>

Few of us in this newsgroup are any better than the rest, Larry. Your ego
blocks you from understanding that.

> > In fact, it is the ham radio forum
> >that gives them the only soapbox they feel they can step up to, is my
real
> >suspicion.
>
> Don't look now, Kim, but that's one of the things a Usenet forum is there
> for -- to serve as a "soapbox" for individual opinion. You use it in the
> exact same way.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Yeah, so you *do* understand we are equal.

Kim W5TIT

32. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 03:13:49 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7ef3f1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36027

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7DB365.5EDFD7F5@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > From the looks of things ham radio iteself can't surive on its own
merits. It
> > keeps being downgraded so that it will "attract more new hams".
>
> If ham radio doesn't attract new hams to replace the ones who are dropping
> like flies, there won't be a ham radio for much longer. What's the age of
> the average ham?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

I hope I'm around for this "end of ham radio" thingy. I can't wait to see
what Little Dick thinks he could weasle his way into. And, Larry? Well,
who in the world would have him?

Kim W5TIT

33. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 03:18:06 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7ef4f2_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36028

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020228064713.17463.00000995@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >> Have you been sleeping close to Cecil or what?
> >
> >Not unless his name is Bronco, the cat.
>
> I think when his best response is "you are starting to sound like Cecil"
we can
> safely assume that he didn't have a better response. I think I won the
point.
> :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

They're scairt 'cause it's the only thing they're good at...

Kim W5TIT

34. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 03:20:24 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <QICf8.29533$sH1.2042140@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 36034
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

And as just another incorrect American, I have to ask just what is a
"looser"? Is it something
that has come "loose" from its moorings? Is it "looser" than it was
yesterday? Oh! Could it
be that you meant "Loser"!

Seriously, (at least on the American side of the pond) the various
expressions of the verb "to
lose" and the noun "loser" are the most misspelled and misused words on the
internet. How come we use these words so "loosely"?

Jerry

(flame suit donned and ready)

Graham Sharp <sharpg@lineone.net> wrote in message
news:lnmq7ukg76mnp5n3vpnh6cc37od6ja3l9r@4ax.com...
> On Wed, 27 Feb 2002 15:54:18 -0500, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
> >news:apdq7us8pdeuu504be2umf66d1m2p1nsip@4ax.com...
> >> On Wed, 27 Feb 2002 18:35:16 GMT, JJ <radiojim@hotmail.com> wrote:
> >>
> >> >I have seen lots of hams and cbers so eat up with the hobby they
> >> >wound up loosing family and friends. Really sad to loose so much
> >> >over such and unimportant thing.
> >>
> >> Please re-post in English.
> >>
> >> --
> >> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com
> >
> >Why is it that there always has to be some smart-arse Brit chime in and
say
> >that Yanks really don't speak/write English? We communicate in the same
> >language as you, albiet with variations, but it's still English. Canadian
> >French is different from that spoken in France, but it's still called
> >French. Ditto Mexico and Spain. However, English is supposed to have a
> >different set of rules, according to wankers like you.
> >
>
> Looser

35. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 03:20:34 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7ef5a0_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36029

Yep, you're right Jim. Absolutely right.

Kim W5TIT

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020228081231.20570.00000140@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <3c7aee6f_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020225063828.20570.00000051@mb-fz.aol.com...
> >> >
> >> >Take the WTC disaster. I've already offered that someone provide the
> >> >message that was relayed out of that disaster scene--this country's
> >worst.
> >>
> >> whoa! This country's worst disaster? By what measure?
> >
> >Oh good grief, Jim. You are near impossible to even attempt to
communicate
> >with because everything must be black and white, just for you.
>
> I don't seem to have any problem communicating with most others on this
NG,
> Kim.
>
> > OK--TAKE ANY
>
> (expletive deleted)
>
> >DISASTER YOU WANT--BIG, LITTLE, MID-SIZED, WHATEVER!!!!!
>
> Why the screaming and cussing, Kim?
> >
> >> I'm NOT minimizing the tragedy or impact of 9/11, or the losses
suffered
> >in
> >> NYC, Washington or Pennsylvania on that day. But on what grounds do you
> >> call the WTC disaster the WORST in USA history?
> >>
> >> >I don't think you'll find one.
> >>
> >> I don't have access to any of those messages. But I can pretty much
> >guarantee
> >> that any which were relayed on NTS went at least part of the way on CW.

> >>
> >> Did any emergency messages go by HF? If you can't provide one, will you
> >say
> >> that HF is not preferred in emergencies?
> >
> >OK, JIM, I CAN'T VERIFY *ANY* MESSAGES LEFT THE WTC AREA VIA HAM
RADIO...SO
> >I GUESS I SHOULD SAY THERE WERE NONE. GOOD F#$%&@ GRIEF.
>
> What's the big problem? All I did was use YOUR logic on a similar area. Is
> that wrong?
>
> Obviously Morse/CW isn't going to be used much, if at all, when a
> disaster/emergency calls for short-range tactical communications. Like
> the WTC, Pentagon and Flight 93 attacks did. But all disaster/emergency
> situations are not like those.
>
> >> > I am not saying anything against the mode,
> >> >its users, etc.
> >>
> >> Maybe not in this post.
> >>
> >> >I am simply stating that it is my opinion that CW is not a
> >> >preferred mode in an emergency.
> >>
> >> Maybe not in the one emergency you mention. In others, the story is
> >different.
> >> Like the ice storms in New York in 1997, or the hurricane stuff KT4ST
is
> >> involved in.
>
> There - two examples of CW/Morse used by hams in an emergency/disaster
> situation. And they're not decades old. Why don't they "count" to you?
>
> You could look them up on google, y'know.
>
> >I wish there were a way to statistically show how often/much CW is used
in
> >emergencies--and *not* using H&W, because I do believe there are some
people
> >who still use CW nets on NTS---those are *not* directly from the scene,
not
> >operational messages.
>
> Why don't H&W & NTS count? Seems to me you want to limit the definition
> to only those messages that fit your preconceived notion of "emergency"
and
> exclude all others and all other possibilities.
>
> >Anyway, I am certain you are confused by my above sentence.

>
> Not at all. It's clear that you want to exclude anything that might
disprove
> your
> ideas. You haven't explained why H&W and NTS messages don't count. I
> think it's clearly because counting them would disprove your claims.
>
> btw, I have never claimed that CW/Morse testing was absolutely necessary
> because it might be needed in an emergency. The way I put it went
something
> like this:
>
> Is the possibility that a ham might have to use Morse in an emergency
> situation so high that ALL hams MUST be tested for Morse skill? The
> answer is obviously no.
>
> > I give up even trying with you, Jim.
>
> Because I won't simply knuckle under and agree with you. That's really
> what it comes down to, I think.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

36. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 03:27:26 UTC
From: Martin <mdwade@mobiletel.com>
Message-ID: <3C7EF51E.5580@mobiletel.com>
Source record: 36031
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Krell wrote:
>
> "Martin" <mdwade@mobiletel.com> wrote in message
> news:3C7E6D7D.546A@mobiletel.com...
> > OVERHEARD AT THE FRANKFORT RADIO TOWER ON THE AIRCRAFT FREQ:
> >
> > 1. Plane trying to land asking for instructions in German was
> > given the reply, "You must use English to recieve instructions
> > from this control tower!
> >
> > The plane's pilot asked why since he was in a German Plane, in
> > German airspace and coming from and land on German soil, why
> > must we use ENGLISH?
> >
> > Before the control tower could answer, a decidely British and
> > American Accent both chimed in, "Because we won the war!"
> >
> > RULE BRITANNIA, PAX AMERICANA and the highest standards of living
> > in world are to be found in ENGLISH speaking countries!
> >
> > In America, we have a ROYAL SOCIETY CLUB, in Canada we have the
> > best hockey team and in the UK country music has a cult following,
> > why you ask, because of the ENGLISH LANGUAGE!
> >
> > Martin N5PZJ
> >
> > To stay on thread, yes my spouse tolerates my hobby and I tolerate her
> > hobby, ouch where did you find those knitting needles again?
>
> I would also remind the Brits that seventy percent of English, according to
> my high school French teacher, is actually mispronounced French, thanks to
> William the Conqueror and the Normans. So all of you Brits had better quit
> butchering the French language!

Voul'zant parlez francais, mon ami? Ici, en La Etat de Louisiane
francais
vivat!

Martin N5PZJ

Brits had 3 centuries of French Lessons, how many have you had?

BTW, if you like French so much spend a month in Quebec or Paris!

Martin N5PZJ (un biphone du Louisiane)
parle francais?

37. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 03:28:39 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7ef76b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36033

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a5mi5l$qs2$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> > >> >Take the WTC disaster. I've already offered that someone provide
the
> > >> >message that was relayed out of that disaster scene--this country's
> > >worst.
> > >>
> > >> whoa! This country's worst disaster? By what measure?
>
> Not sure who asked this, but by the number of people killed,
> the 911 WTC is certainly one of the worst, if not the worst.
> I don't know of any other "disastor" that had as many people killed...
> but I'm willing to listen.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

That was Jim/N2EY asking that question. I didn't dare answer, for fear that I would forget to use the qualifiers "some" and "I believe" and "in my opinion" enough times in what I had to say.

However, the WTC is the worst disaster this country has ever faced by far more than the number of people killed:

- a war has erupted over it
- companies are going under because of it
- our entire country is still at risk from it
- our government continues to legislate and impinge upon civil liberties over it
- patriotism has become the new measure by which we accept each other (yes, that is a bad thing)

And that probably just scratches the surface. Internationally, financially, emotionally, this disaster continues to spread out like a nuclear blast.

Kim W5TIT

38. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 03:33:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7EF6A4.19D871CE@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36030

W1RFI wrote:

>if you believe that

> the issuance of a license takes car of enforcement for "whatever it takes," why
> the diatribe?

Could it be the "what it takes"? And why call an observation a diatribe? Oh,
that's
right, anything other than kid gloves is one.. Got it.

39. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 03:35:22 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c7ef8fd$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36035

So, we're just counting numbers of people killed. OK, you're right Jim, as always.

Kim W5TIT

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message news:20020228220959.20827.00000223@mb-mj.aol.com...
> In article <a5mi5l$qs2$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> >> >Take the WTC disaster. I've already offered that someone provide the
> >> >> >message that was relayed out of that disaster scene--this country's
> >> >worst.
> >> >>
> >> >> whoa! This country's worst disaster? By what measure?
> >
> >Not sure who asked this, but by the number of people killed,
> >the 911 WTC is certainly one of the worst, if not the worst.
> >I don't know of any other "disastor" that had as many people killed...
> >but I'm willing to listen.
>
> Kim called it "this country's worst" disaster, which is pretty clear. I don't
> mean to trivialize or minimize it in any way, but "worst" is pretty strong
> stuff.
>
> Let's exclude acts of war, even though 9/11 was clearly an act of war against
> the
> USA.
>
> Here's one that comes to mind:
>
> In September of 1900 a major hurricane hit Galveston, Texas and killed over
> 5000
> people. Yes, it was over 100 years ago but it sure qualifies in terms of being
> a
> disaster and in the USA.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

40. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 03:36:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7EF760.B7F888EF@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36032

N2EY wrote:

> "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<a5ln5j011a1@enews3.newsguy.com>...
>
> > The point I'm trying to make is that is the
> > pro-coders want CW to endure, they have to do so without welfare support of
> > the mode via mandated testing at high speeds.
>
> There has never been mandated testing at "high speeds", though. 20 wpm
> isn't really fast CW at all.

You can easily prove that by listening TO @wW1AW code test sessions where they start the code at 35 WPM and work down. After listening to the 35 wpm session followed by the 30 and 25wpm sessions, 20 sounds really SLOW.

But then, to one who never learned it at all, 5wpm is supersonic.

41. Re: Using Amateur Radio to Talk on FRS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 04:05:28 UTC
From: leadpipe@pittnet.com
Message-ID: <410b6521.0202282005.63dfec70@posting.google.com>
Source record: 36036

There are some instants where the addition of amateur frequencies do
not void type acceptance. I made sure to check this out legally before
I proceded. I can only have one radio in my work truck, so I have used
one of the 16 channel memory banks in a commercial radio to program
ham freqs for myself. It is the better solution, rather than mod a ham
rig and go the other way. Besides, the commercial rig is a wopping 100
watts all the time. No problem hitting those repeaters with a 5db gain
antenna. And the programming software for most of todays commmercial
radios will let you put them right in.

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020201064243.11117.00000499@mb-dd.aol.com>...
> From: "Kuay Lin" KL@junoperelec.org
>
> >> Which of course nullifies its acceptability status for FRS.
>
> > And your point is?
>
> It was an important point, Kuay. Phil wanted to make sure that those that
> modified equipment for use in the amateur bands knew that in doing so, they
> could no longer use the equipment in its original use.
>
> I can modify a CB radio to transmit on 10 meters, but I can then no longer use
> it to transmit on CB. I can modify a car for off road use, but some of those
> modifications are such that it is no longer legal to use it on the road.
>
> Why did you ask him what his point is? The point of his post was really pretty
> clear.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

42. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 04:07:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7EFE85.AB866207@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36037

Dick Carroll wrote:
> The problem
> lies in what is learned, radio theory and regs or just word associations to get
> a license.

I rote memorized word associations to gain all amateur frequency privileges
in 1952. That *IS* the purpose of the license, Dick, to gain privileges.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

43. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 04:09:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7EFF0C.E15CBCFB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36038

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > No, you were the one who brought it up. I'm asking you how you would enforce them.
>
> So you're not aware - or intelligent- enough to understand that not all of ANYTHING is
> enforced, nor intended to be? I thought so.

So if not enforcement, how do you propose to ensure the parts that
are not enforced?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

44. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 04:15:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7F0047.AD484A78@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36039

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > It is a license, not a degree, Dick. All it does is grant
> > privileges. I, like you, met the requirements in order to
> > obtain the privileges. That's what all new hams are doing.
>
> Hell, that's all that is left, Might as well have one-license-fits-all.

That's exactly what I suggested to the FCC, Dick. One license for one
brotherhood of hams with no more prima donnas.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

45. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 04:20:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7F0181.1A99F182@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36041

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > My SCS PTC2e treats CW just like any other digital mode. It generates an
> > audio tone in SSB mode and keys the PTT line.
>
> So does any soundcard software package.
^^^
Hmmmmm, the soundcard software package that came with Windows won't do it.

> > It decodes CW a lot better than I do.
>
> Gee I'm sorry to hear that. How long did you say you've been working CW?
> Betcha it won't in weak signal conditions where you can't get an attractive S/N
> ratio.

At 35wpm, it does a better job than I for any and all S/N ratios.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

46. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 04:21:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7F01C7.7A1A5F4D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36040

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > No, you were the one who brought it up. I'm asking you how you would enforce them.
> >
> > So you're not aware - or intelligent- enough to understand that not all of ANYTHING is
> > enforced, nor intended to be? I thought so.
>
> So if not enforcement, how do you propose to ensure the parts that
> are not enforced?

The FCC calls it "Selfpolicing". Hadn't you heard? Or did that get lost in your CB experience?

47. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 04:31:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228233108.25762.00000244@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 36043

In article <a5mk3hgmp1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020228174629.16934.00001114@mb-dd.aol.com...
>> From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>
>> >To be honest, the PERCEPTION of many, licensed or unlicensed,
>> >is that the ARRL has controlled most of the past of the ARS from
>> >a decided minority group that is NOT required to be accountable
>> >to either the membership or non-members.
>>
>> An odd perception to have of a group of Directors that is elected by the
>> direct vote of that membership.
>
>Ed,
>Welcome to the club. NCI get's the same accusation from some
>people.

Bill, you BIT very hard on this one, ey? :-)

Alright, together now...PROVE that either election is honestly done
without any shadow of a doubt. Simply SAYING so is not proof.
Simply saying so requires an article of faith of the membership and
a strained believability factor on the part of non-members.

>> >Are there independent, disinterested witnesses to all this "openness and
>> >honesty?" All I've seen over the years is what the ARRL says it
>> >does. There are NO independent checks or balances; the ARRL
>> >says it is honest and aboveboard and all must take them at
>> >their word..
>>
>> Yes, we must. :-) Why would those who set ARRL policy not want to be
>> honest and above board?

Control, power, self-enoblement through altruistic, noble works which
have publicity of same by their own organization..

Is that somehow so "alien" in the entire human race?!?

In my area of the USA a few million of us will take part in an election
of local and state officials and propositions. The L.A. County
Registrar will check and count those ballots, permitting selected
party officials (of many parties) to observe the entire process. That
happens in many areas of the USA, not just here. Checks and
balances at work in regards to government, a democratic process.

I am asked to BELIEVE that private organizations, NCI or ARRL are ALL "honest and above-board." I have no other evidence that they are or aren't. Where is the "check and balance," the observation of the process? Either organization SAYS they are doing honest things and all are obliged to take them at their word.

Many, many, many politicians and party workers and propaganda spinners of all the parties SAY they are all "honest and above-board" and some of them are. Unfortunately some are NOT. There is seldom any rational basis for determining that ahead of time. Everything is taken as an article of FAITH.

I will grant you government elections and polticians are not quite related to private organizations claiming altruistic motives. You will have to grant me acknowledgement that government and elected officials of government have a number of independent agencies and private organizations observing the honesty of the election processes and the officials themselves. Can either you or Ed grant to non-members the same proof of honesty of elections and officials of private organizations who do NOT have the same checks and balances? I don't think so.

All the non-membership gets when challenged about the above is peevish statements demanding that all accept them "on their word" because both are "honest" because they SAY they are honest. Sorry, but that is a non-answer, just a variation on the "you must believe us becasue we ARE honest" spin.

>Must be a grand conspiracy. :-)

My challenge on proof and altruism was not based on some "grand conspiracy" but of the PERCEPTION of many that elections and policy decisions MAY not be as honest as we are told.

A way to counter skepticsm is to misdirect or engage in ridicule. Misdirection is to dance away from a direct challenge and to point to "all the other great things" the organization is doing to "help amateur radio." Now, if NCI has one policy on certain things and the ARRL an opposite, both cannot be "right," can they? If one is "right" then the other must be "wrong." Another possibility is that both of them are "wrong." It is not possible that both of them can be "right" yet each say they are. Ridicule of skeptics is good misdirection, putting the onus on the challenger and diverting from the challenge. That does not prove "rightness." It is a smokescreen to avoid the challenge.

>Why Ed, what about all those clandistine phone calls from ARRL
>to FCC? :-) :-)

Public release of FCC announcements has occurred on the ARRL website before it was available on the FCC website.

Not many, I'll grant, and not lately. Apparently some skeptics
commentary got through to the ARRL and they are more
careful.

>> Uh, oh, here come the Black Helicopters and Capitilizations. Must be
>> Pontification time!
>
>Yup...same old conspiracy theory silliness.

...and also a sign of a commonplace syndrome of arrogance on
the part of organization officials or members. This time it is
ridicule for smug superiority reasons?

<snip>

>Kinda reminds me too of the people that complain about judging
>rules at one of the car club events I have helped organize BUT they
>don't join the club to be a part of the work effort.

Are the issues before WRC-03 on amateur radio are considered the
same as a "car club rally?!?"

The ARRL has approximately 170,000 members. The membership
in NCI is unknown. If either say you KNOW what the feelings of
either or both members are, you are very foolish indeed or think
that all can be duped. If the latter then it is a height of true con-
manship.

The ARRL has lobbied for certain amateur radio regulations in
the past which concern GETTING INTO amateur radio. Quite a
long time of lobbying and influence with the FCC. Now you are
implying that the ONLY way to work for getting INTO ham radio
is get into ham radio first and "work from the inside?"

That is not following democratic principles. That is stacking the
deck in favor of only one game with little hope for success.

>Ed, It makes no difference. The conspiracy theory people
>will believe whatever their fantasies are.

Neither of you acknowledge that perception by others is subject
to skepticsm. That is turning a blind eye away from criticsm.

Ridiculing skepticsm is not an answer to any challenge.

>Last I checked, there is no law prohibiting anyone from
>starting another "ARRL like" organization. Now I haven't
>checked lately, so maybe ARRL got a special law passed
>through congress while we weren't looking.

A monopoly can effectively tie up available market monies
for a particular activity. A major portion of ARRL operating
funds comes from product sales, much more than
membership fees. QST has had to reduce its size due to a

shrinking market for amateur radio related products.
Independent publishers of amateur radio books and
periodicals have a similar problem. The ham radio market
is finite.

To deny that the ARRL has had a major influence on amateur
radio regulations in the past is about like denying the sun
comes up each day. Other amateur radio organizations HAVE
come up challenging the ARRL. Their goals were as lofty and
altruistic as any of the ARRL but the scene was already set for
the ARRL and the play went on without them.

I'd mention "No SSB International" but that never seemed
anything but a glossy sarcastic jab at early NCI, fueled
primarily by Jim Kehler's arrogant disdain for those not loving
CW and DXing. It is no longer visible. Eric June had a more
noble goal of preservation of CW through legislation but lacked
the propaganda skills to reach any masses. It is no longer
visible. FISTS exists but apparently suffers ennui, only its
devout faithful attending, failing to attract enough newcomers.

>> >Are these just one person's observations? No. Hardly. It is a
>> >sort of synopsis of what thousands of others have seen and
>> >felt over the years.
>>
>> I don't imagine that "thousands" have seen and felt the TRVTH as Len knows
>> it, Len.
>
>And nothing is stopping those thousands from starting their
>own "alter-ARRL" organziation.

There is no quantifyable number of those who were not convinced
and walked away to pursue other recreation. They are still vocal.

Established small and big organizations do not acknowledge
their existance. They may be too busy extolling their stated
"virtue" and "honesty" without quantifying those things.

>> This reminds me of the guy in rags standing on the street corner preaching
>> the end is near. :-)
>
>Sinner repent.

Spoken like two Enron executives in 2001, chuckling after
exchanging high-fives on pulling off another "fast one" on
their investors.

>> I hope you feel better soon, Len.
>
>Dittos from me too Len. Frankly, I'm disappointed
>in the reduction to Len's commentary to such
>fantasy land exhortations.

Ah, but I LIVE in the real world. Some wish to create a fantasy
by stating everything they say is "true' and "honest" yet offering
little substance for their veracity except a necessary Belief.

I was discussing organizations, not indivuduals. Two individuals
from organizations felt obliged to take things personally and
to rebut on a personal level to a skeptical challenger. Cheap.

So, to the private organizations, where is the independent proof
that all your elections are honest?

48. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 04:31:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228233109.25762.00000245@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 36042

In article <20020228181516.16934.00001124@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>I am told that the VEC QPC will accept input on the pools from
>>all. I cannot verify this, but that would seem the proper direction
>>to argue for changes to make them better.
>
>You are correct, and such input would be valuable. You can email your
>comments to any of the participating VECs or directly to the chairman.

Sorry but, according to the dynamic duo in here, "I either know nothing about amateur radio" or I "lack the necessary moral virtues of proper attitude towards amateur radio."

I have no objection to the public question pools as they are. Anyone can read them.

Why do you seek to imply that I am objecting to the pools? I simply pointed out something that exists, a mechanism in-place for changing the questions to another's wishes.

Do you suspect nasty, evil (shudder) conspiracy plots afoot?

Ah...skepticsm is evil? Must be...

49. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 04:32:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7F045F.F5683CA0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36044

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Cecil's lame answer of "the only one that matters NOW" is so much fluff. NO
> test matters now.

All those attempts to achieve Royal Highness status within amateur radio
have gone for naught. Poor Dick.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

50. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 04:38:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7F05D7.767523EE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36045

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > So if not enforcement, how do you propose to ensure the parts that
> > are not enforced?
>
> The FCC calls it "Selfpolicing".

So why don't you just "self police" everyone into learning Morse code?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

51. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 04:46:58 UTC
From: Steve Terry <g4wwk@oinospamtesco.net>
Message-ID: <DJDf8.70268$Ah1.8887722@news2-win.server.ntlworld.com>
Source record: 36048
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"JJ" <radiojim@hotmail.net> wrote in message
news:3C7D2FA7.CC05B6F2@hotmail.net...
> Suggest you learn to read English.
<snip top post>
>
and I suggest you reply at the bottom, and trim.

Steve Terry

52. Code Is Dead

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 04:49:53 UTC
From: leadpipe@pittnet.com
Message-ID: <410b6521.0202282049.72906c94@posting.google.com>
Source record: 36046

I cannot wait till the code requirement is dropped completely from ARS so that I can follow in the footsteps of my mentors. Those "20WPM Extras" and other code pushing scum that are icons of Amateur Radio legend have given us underlings a good education on how to act on HF by putting these practices on display on 3898, and 14313 and other pompous sections of those elitist bands. I have learned much from them about radio protocall that I was able to put to immediate use on CB through the years. I as a no code tech that passed his advanced, and almost passed the extra written when I tested for my license will be looking forward to talking with all my dear friends on HF while I use fowl language, discuss the intricacies of trailer trash, tell cat killing stories, and work the actions of my firearms, as I have heard all of you fine examples do for years. I salute you in your pursuit of Amateur Radio excellence, and hope to join you soon in your unholy endeavors. Even now I am laying my evil plans, and it will give me another use for the best CB I ever owned. A Yaesu FT-100! Two meters, 440, 6 meters, and CB at 100 watts all in one box. Life is good!

53. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 04:50:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020228235043.08443.00000284@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 36047

In article <20020228220959.20827.00000223@mb-mj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>In September of 1900 a major hurricane hit Galveston, Texas and killed over
>5000
>people. Yes, it was over 100 years ago but it sure qualifies in terms of being
>a disaster and in the USA.

IN CONTEXT, radio was 4 years old in 1900. The Radio Club of America would not be formed for another 9 years. How would RADIO have helped, aided the Galveston victims still alive?

Now where are the specifics of a CW BY RADIO message to aid disaster victims where the dead victims totals are greater than 3300? Specific, no generalities.

54. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 05:08:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C7F0CB2.7042518F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 36049

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <a5mk3hgmp1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020228174629.16934.00001114@mb-dd.aol.com...
> >> From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

> >> This reminds me of the guy in rags standing on the street corner preaching
> >> the end is near. :-)
> >
> >Sinner repent.
>
> Spoken like two Enron executives in 2001, chuckling after
> exchanging high-fives on pulling off another "fast one" on
> their investors.
>
> >> I hope you feel better soon, Len.
> >
> >Dittos from me too Len. Frankly, I'm disappointed
> >in the reduction to Len's commentary to such
> >fantasy land exhortations.
>
> Ah, but I LIVE in the real world.

...as you know it.

> Some wish to create a fantasy
> by stating everything they say is "true' and "honest" yet offering
> little substance for their veracity except a necessary Belief.

Come to think of it, how do we know that everything YOU say is true and
honest?
>
> I was discussing organizations, not indivuduals. Two individuals
> from organizations felt obliged to take things personally and
> to rebut on a personal level to a skeptical challenger. Cheap.

I don't know about cheap, Len. It certainly was funny. I don't think
there was a really serious manner in which to respond to your sudden,
lengthy and really strange barrage. Give my regards to Harold Pransky.

Dave K8MN

55. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 05:17:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7F0F15.868FA5A1@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36050

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > It is a license, not a degree, Dick. All it does is grant
> > > privileges. I, like you, met the requirements in order to
> > > obtain the privileges. That's what all new hams are doing.
> >
> > Hell, that's all that is left, Might as well have one-license-fits-all.
>
> That's exactly what I suggested to the FCC, Dick. One license for one
> brotherhood of hams with no more prima donnas.

Ah, yes YOU will be the prima donna in your new and improved brotherhood.
Gotta redo
it all since you couldn't cut the mustard in the old one, eh?

Yep, let's just make it one big wall to wall CB. We're headed in that very
direction, and are
well down the road to getting there.

When the FCC opens the next inquiry I intend to recommend that the ARS be
fundamentally
reconstructed OFFICIALLY to reflect the reality of today- that it is no longer
a fundamentally technical service or even a technical passtime, and is really
so little different from Class D CB
that they might as well go ahead and combine the two services officially,
instead of perpetuating the farce. NO technical exam is needed, after all
virtually everyone buys all their
gear these days. If it breaks, off it goes to the factory service center. Why
should mere users
be required to pass a test on their Maytag when the repairman stays so idle?
Where's
the difference?

And might as well give REACT the frequency and equipment capabilities they
need to do
their "public service" hobby. After all, there are a lot more of them than
us. Jim Haney
should be pleased.

Just look at all the benefits- no more amplifier restrictions, we won't need
to worry about
the ten meter incursions, all our Good Buddies can now talk directly TO us
instead of about

us, Carl will have a plethora of newbies to tutor on all the grate snazzy new digimodes he
claims to be working on while he chews his HF microphone, and surely there's a ream of
others that I haven't thought up yet. I'll get to work on that. Why not just go ahead and
complete the New Age Ham Radio transition and do away with all the chaff and balderdash?

56. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 05:24:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7F1096.3005FF0E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36051

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > That's exactly what I suggested to the FCC, Dick. One license for one
> > brotherhood of hams with no more prima donnas.
>
> Ah, yes YOU will be the prima donna in your new and improved brotherhood.
> Gotta redo it all since you couldn't cut the mustard in the old one, eh?

If all hams had the same license, I couldn't possibly be a prima donna,
Dick, no one could - that would be minimize the animosity among hams.

> When the FCC opens the next inquiry I intend to recommend that the ARS be
> fundamentally
> reconstructed OFFICIALLY to reflect the reality of today- that it is no longer
> a fundamentally technical service or even a technical passtime, and is really
> so little different from Class D CB
> that they might as well go ahead and combine the two services officially,
> instead of perpetuating the farce.

"Sink me the ship, master gunner, sink 'er, blow 'er to heck.
Fall into the hands of God, and not into the hands of the techs."

Can't have it your way so you want to blow it to bits - nice guy.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

57. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 05:46:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7F15D3.3FCBC315@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36052

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > That's exactly what I suggested to the FCC, Dick. One license for one
> > > brotherhood of hams with no more prima donnas.
> >
> > Ah, yes YOU will be the prima donna in your new and improved brotherhood.
> > Gotta redo it all since you couldn't cut the mustard in the old one, eh?
>
> If all hams had the same license, I couldn't possibly be a prima donna,
> Dick, no one could - that would be minimize the animosity among hams.
>
> > When the FCC opens the next inquiry I intend to recommend that the ARS be
> > fundamentally
> > reconstructed OFFICIALLY to reflect the reality of today- that it is no longer
> > a fundamentally technical service or even a technical passtime, and is really
> > so little different from Class D CB
> > that they might as well go ahead and combine the two services officially,
> > instead of perpetuating the farce.
>
> "Sink me the ship, master gunner, sink 'er, blow 'er to heck.
> Fall into the hands of God, and not into the hands of the techs."
>
> Can't have it your way so you want to blow it to bits - nice guy.

That's total nonsense. The charge was set long ago and now the fuse is lit. The
rest
is inevitable.

58. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 06:05:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7F1A48.A92DB65C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36053

N2EY wrote:

> In article <a5mi5l$qs2$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> >> >Take the WTC disaster. I've already offered that someone provide the
> >> >> >message that was relayed out of that disaster scene--this country's
> >> >worst.
> >> >>
> >> >> whoa! This country's worst disaster? By what measure?
> >>
> >Not sure who asked this, but by the number of people killed,
> >the 911 WTC is certainly one of the worst, if not the worst.
> >I don't know of any other "disastor" that had as many people killed...
> >but I'm willing to listen.
>
> Kim called it "this country's worst" disaster, which is pretty clear. I don't
> mean to trivialize or minimize it in any way, but "worst" is pretty strong
> stuff.
>
> Let's exclude acts of war, even though 9/11 was clearly an act of war against
> the
> USA.
>
> Here's one that comes to mind:
>
> In September of 1900 a major hurricane hit Galveston, Texas and killed over
> 5000
> people. Yes, it was over 100 years ago but it sure qualifies in terms of being
> a
> disaster and in the USA.

Then shortly after WW2 a pair of shiploads of fertilizer exploded in the harbor
at Texas City
pretty well leveling the whole place. I don't recall how many people it killed,
but it was a lot, and it sure qualified as a major disaster.

59. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 09:53:59 UTC
From: Walt Davidson <walt99@tiscali.co.uk>
Message-ID: <briu7uojfkh50i34c2262qckajhq0bd9cq@4ax.com>
Source record: 36054
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 28 Feb 2002 21:27:26 -0600, Martin <mdwade@mobiletel.com>
wrote:

>Voul'zant parlez francais, mon ami? Ici, en La Etat de Louisiane
>francais vivat!

That must be Cajun French! :-)

Voyez le brick gï¿½ant que j'examine prï¿½s du wharf.

Soixante-treize de G3NYY

--
Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

60. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 10:30:29 UTC
From: Radio Ham <no.spam@no.spam>
Message-ID: <3c7f5a3e_3@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>
Source record: 36057
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

WRONG!

William The Conqueror and the Normans
were of Viking descent and not from the Francs.

"Gallia est omnes divises in partes tres", etc.

Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a5m7vr01htf@enews2.newsguy.com...
> I would also remind the Brits that seventy percent of English, according
to
> my high school French teacher, is actually mispronounced French, thanks to
> William the Conqueror and the Normans. So all of you Brits had better quit
> butchering the French language!

61. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 10:34:38 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020301053438.26465.00001132@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36055

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

What he said:

>>You are correct, and such input would be valuable. You can email your
>>comments to any of the participating VECs or directly to the chairman.

What he heard:

>Why do you seek to imply that I am objecting to the pools?

No wonder conversation here can be so difficult.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

62. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 10:36:17 UTC
From: Radio Ham <no.spam@no.spam>
Message-ID: <3c7f5a40_3@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>
Source record: 36058
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Top posting is one Internet convention, and makes sense
if you have been following a thread, for you get to the
latest contribution immediately, and then only need
to refer to the previous stuff if your memory is poor.

Bottom posting is another convention which results
in postings being ignored because the new comment is off
the screen, and when you've got of the order of
2000 postings per day in different newsgroups, you ain't got
time to page down.

Steve Terry <g4wwk@oinospamtesco.net> wrote in message
news:DJDf8.70268$Ah1.8887722@news2-win.server.ntlworld.com...
> "JJ" <radiojim@hotmail.net> wrote in message
> news:3C7D2FA7.CC05B6F2@hotmail.net...
> > Suggest you learn to read English.
> <snip top post>
> >
> and I suggest you reply at the bottom, and trim.
>
> Steve Terry
>
>
>
>
>
```

63. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 10:38:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020301053818.26465.00001133@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36056

From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net

>They're scairt 'cause it's the only thing they're good at...

Do you really believe that Morse code is the only amateur skill that Dick and Larry are good at? Even a casual read of the things they have said here indicate otherwise... and I know that you give Larry more than a casual read.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

64. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 10:40:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020301054059.26465.00001134@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36059

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>NO
>test matters
>now.

Has your opinion of Morse code really come to this?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

65. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 10:43:54 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020301054354.26465.00001135@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36060

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Gee I'm sorry to hear that. How long did you say you've been working CW?
>Betcha it won't in weak signal conditions where you can't get an attractive
>S/N
>ratio.

Let's put the best of each method of decoding -- human vs machine -- to the test. Do you think you can copy the CW signal that was about 30 dB below the noise in 100 Hz that was used for some EME experiments as well as the DSP-10 software did?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

66. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 10:50:12 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020301055012.26465.00001136@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36061

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>Pure unadulterated bunk. Is there anyone other than
>Dick that truly believes that once the code testing is ended that
>"the people who are never required to learn it for a test will not learn
>it."

I believe that fewer will learn it sans code testing than will learn it with code testing. I think that the number of hams that will go on to use it will be slightly smaller without a code test will be only slightly smaller than the number that would learn it for the code test then discover magically that they really don't hate it after all.

I believe that the broad numbers I estimated above are smaller than they would otherwise be because of the things that some of the PCTAs are saying about the mode and their perception of the unworthiness of people who are passing today's tests.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

67. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 10:54:18 UTC
From: gareth@lightfox.demon.co.uk
Message-ID: <20020301.105418.49@lightfox.demon.co.uk>
Source record: 36064
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <fvat7u87piuuusm6lnum0n7j07lcf614m9@4ax.com>,
snowbat@geocities.com (Snowbat) wrote:

> The German controllers at Frankfurt Airport were a short tempered lot ...

There's also the one about the BA plane that expected to be the next
in the queue to line up and depart, when the controllers gave priority
to a Lufthansa jet.

When the BA pilot queried the change with the tower, the Lufthansa pilot
is alleged to have interjected:

"We had our towel on the runway first !"

73, G.

--
http://www.rat.org.uk/

68. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 10:54:39 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020301055439.26465.00001137@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36062

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>As a paid member of ARRL, I'm glad that ARRL doesn't give everything
>on the web free to non-members. Nice to know that membership
>gets me "extra benefits".

The general convention I use in making the decisions on the www.arrl.org/tis pages is that information that is for the overall benefit of amateur radio or help for newcomers is made public. That which helps an individual ham with his or her hamming is a membership benefit.

I think that those that choose not to receive QST have little cause for complaint if some of the QST articles are not available to them.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

69. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 10:57:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020301055707.26465.00001138@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36063

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> > > How is the part of ham radio that isn't in the FCC regulations
>enforced?

>> > No now you're advocating that every facet of life (and ham radio) be
>enforced??
>> > Change your mind?

>> No, you were the one who brought it up. I'm asking you how you would
>enforce them.

> So you're not aware - or intelligent- enough to understand that not all of
>ANYTHING is
>enforced, nor intended to be? I thought so.

I think he was asking you to explain how any of the things that hams do that
are not in the FCC rules will be enforced. "Any" and "all" have different
meanings to most people.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

70. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 11:04:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020301060425.26465.00001139@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36065

>From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net

>So, we're just counting numbers of people killed. OK, you're right Jim, as
>always.

Maybe not. At first I was going to agree with Jim, but I think that if we look at the impact of both disasters on our nation as a whole, 9/11 is the worst hands down. We did not see the nationwide financial impact, nationwide changes to our transportation system or nationwide changes to our sense of security after any of the hurricanes. Perhaps one could argue that our being involved in World War II was a worst disaster, or that the attack on Pearl Harbor had a greater impact on our nation.

"Worst" can mean a lot of things to a lot of people.

71. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 11:10:34 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020301061034.26465.00001140@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36066

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Can't have it your way so you want to blow it to bits - nice guy.

Kinda' like the kid that pees in the sandbox if the other kids won't play
exactly the game he wants them to play?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

72. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 11:13:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020301061305.26465.00001141@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36067

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Can't have it your way so you want to blow it to bits - nice guy.
>
> That's total nonsense. The charge was set long ago and now the fuse is lit.
>The rest is inevitable.

He wants someone else to blow it to bits. :-)

Every prophet of doom in the amateur radio service since its inception has been
wrong.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

73. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 11:18:42 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020301061842.26465.00001142@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36068

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>Ed keeps mentioning the "4 page study guide" story, but doesn't
>mention
>the vast difference in privileges granted.

I have not stressed that fact because the contexts I respond to are usually related to the number of young hams, and the relative un-ease of getting started today is, IMHO, a significant reason that we see plenty of 30 year old newcomers but few 15 year old newcomers.

The other context is related to "dumming down." It is clear that the exams of today are more comprehensive than the exams I took -- completely so at the entry level, and with the exception of the code test at the "all priveleges" level, so the premise that amateur radio is dumbed down is, IMHO, a flawed one.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

74. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 11:20:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020301062017.26465.00001143@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36069

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>There are many totaly useless "facts". Hazing memorization
>takes many forms...example - to pledge for XYZ fraternity,
>the pledges might be "required" to memorize the names of all
>the past presidents of the farternity/sorority.

Isn't the number of past presidents and the number of Morse characters required
for the test approximately the same? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

75. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 11:21:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020301062128.26465.00001144@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36070

From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net

> And, Larry? Well,
>who in the world would have him?

I don't know, Kim; you and Larry do seem intensely interested in each other on this forum...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

76. Re: Bootleg Call signs - Identity theft?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 11:35:04 UTC
From: Technomage <proudhawk@uswestmail.net>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.03.01.04.35.03.836.19687@uswestmail.net>
Source record: 36071

interesting point there OM.
I have had my run-ins with the same problem here in phoenix quite some time ago. However, I was not the only one. there was a particularly nasty case back around 1994 that really had the phoenix area buzzing for a couple of years. I feel sorry for that ham. he had no end of trouble with his call being hijacked and used on everything from police frequencies to harrassing autopatch phone calls.

from what I hear, he pretty much went off the air (though I did hear indications that his call was being used on 2 machines locally last night).

still fun in the sun in phoenix arizona.

Technomage
(My call is my own business and those that know me also know my call and won't transmit it here).

In article <uixf8.4832$gK2.374025@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

> Interesting question. We had a knucklehead around here a few years back
> that just loved to chase ambulances. He was impersonating EMT
> personnel. He did not pass go ... he did not collect $200 ...
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim
> ps - key here is not to mess with emergency organizations - police,
> fire, medical ... etc.
>
>
> "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote in message
> news:a5m5cd$6vq$1@news.bignet.net...
>>
>> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> news:a4nfcn$f56$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>> >
>> > "Bill" <kf6wxj@cwnet.com> wrote in message
>> > news:3c6ef76c$1_1@news3.cwnet.com...
>> > > Ive been getting email from a couple of guys that claim to be hams.
> One
>> > is
>> > > supposed to be an extra class operator and the other claims to be
>> > > an advanced operator. Neither one know any code. Is this illegal?
>> > > Bill KF6WXJ
>> >

>> > Is it (1) illegal to impersonate a ham...or is it (2) illegal for a
>> > ham to be an extra or advanced and not know code?
>> >
>> > The answer to #1 is, no...unless they impersonate "on the air".
>>
>> I would have thought that using a call sign, that was not yours, to
> identify
>> oneself even off the air is a form of identity theft, which is a crime.
>> People may have the same exact name but the FCC only issues unique
>> callsigns, no duplicates. So, for example, would a person identifying
>> themselves to an emergency organization as a Ham, by supplying a
> bootlegged
>> callsign as proof, a crime?
>>
>>
>> --
>> Leland C. Scott
>> KC8LD0
>>
>> Saw this on a Tee-shirt:
>>
>> "I am a bomb technician. If you see
>> me running, try to keep up. "
>>
>>
>>
>>

--
I will not be pushed, filed, stamped, indexed, briefed, debriefed, or numbered!
My life is my own - No. 6

77. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 12:25:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020301072520.21422.00000240@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 36072

In article <3c7ef078_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

>> >I think when a Fire Chief I am shadowing wants me to relay a message over
>to
>> >the other end of town that additional tank trucks are needed in about 45
>> >min., along with some relief provisions for 30 men, that the Fire Chief
>> >would much rather hear me say that than to wonder if I sent the right
>> >message.
>>
>> Why would the Chief have to hear you say it, if you have established that
>> hams get messages through correctly?
>
>In some cases, the person you are shadowing doesn't have to hear the relays
>of messages.

Why would that person ever have to hear the message sent unless there was
doubt as to the ham's ability to send the message correctly?

>However, how much time is it going to take if I have to
>decipher and re-relay a message?

I think you mean "receive" a message. Obviously voice is faster if it's a
simple message that doesn't get written down. "Company 6 needs 5 more
air packs right away", for example. But for messages that get written down,
the transcription speed often becomes the limiting factor.

>In close proximity to disaster operations,
>there is no need for CW.

All depends on the situation. In most cases VHF/UHF voice is the mode of
choice.

>For traffic nets carrying H&W, or provisional
>information even, CW is probably a great mode, although still a little
>impractical at even up to 200 miles away from a scene.

No "probably" about it. Nor impractical. I don't see where the 200 mile
distance comes from.
>
>> Obviously for short-range tactical communication in a situation like that,
>> voice
>> is probably more practical than Morse or any digital mode
>
>Agreed, obviously.
>
>> >I think if the Red Cross is liaisoning between an official government

>entity
>> >and a volunteer agency, and the message needs to be sent that volunteers
>are
>> >need at Area A, some relief can be made by transitioning some folks from
>> >Area C over to Area A, that the Red Cross person I am shadowing wants to
>> >hear or know that I sent the right message.
>>
>> So if PSK31 or packet or PACTOR were available, you would not use it?
>
>Actually, I've never used either so I'm not sure I would be affective at
>either. Would I recommend its use? I would recommend the use of *ANY*
>communication mode available and that has operator capability.

More tools in the toolbox is a good thing.
>
>> >Don't they? I'll ask the Hunt County Emergency Management Officer and
>the
>> >City of Greenville Fire Chief the next time I see them what they would
>> >prefer. Maybe it's different from town to town, but I think our served
>> >agencies aren't going to want to wonder if what they said got relayed
>> >correctly.
>>
>> Sounds like you don't have much confidence in the ability of hams to get a
>> message through without someone looking over their shoulder, or through
>> the use of nonvoice modes. Even asking the questions you ask indicates
>> that you doubt the "savvy" of the hams involved, or of any nonvoice mode.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>I don't ask my served agencies to trust or be confident--they are quite
>aware or we wouldn't be asked to be a part of their activities.

Yet you think they want/need to hear the message being sent.

>And, it
>sounds to me like once again you are enjoying misunderstanding to the hilt
>what I am saying.
>
You infer what isn't there. All I have to go on is what you actually write,
Kim.
One thing I have learned here on rrap is not to assume things from rrap
posts.

If you are seriously interested in the recent use of CW in disasters by
amateurs, go to google and look up a post by KT4ST that started a thread
called "Hurricanes and Emergencies". Post date is October 10, 1999, and it
describes the efforts involving an evacuation connected with Hurricane Floyd.

73 de Jim, N2EY

>
>

>
>
>

78. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 13:09:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020301080953.21826.00000180@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 36073

In article <20020301060425.26465.00001139@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>From: "Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>
>>So, we're just counting numbers of people killed. OK, you're right Jim, as
>>always.
>
>Maybe not. At first I was going to agree with Jim, but I think that if we
>look
>at the impact of both disasters on our nation as a whole, 9/11 is the worst
>hands down.

Worse than the Galveston hurricane of 1900 in total impact? I agree!

What I was asking about was the criteria for "worst", which is an absolute. In terms of lives lost, Galveston was worse - that was my only point. Your criteria may vary.

>We did not see the nationwide financial impact, nationwide
>changes
>to our transportation system or nationwide changes to our sense of security
>after any of the hurricanes.

True.

>Perhaps one could argue that our being involved
>in World War II was a worst disaster, or that the attack on Pearl Harbor had
>a
>greater impact on our nation.

I'd agree with that - so far. There may be more attacks.

>"Worst" can mean a lot of things to a lot of people.

Which means the criteria have to be defined. I don't know about financial devastation, but the Enron mess looks really bad.

In looking at this, it seems to me that the 9-11 attacks should not be compared to
natural disasters like hurricanes. Hurricanes are not deliberate acts of war. Human beings have developed the capacity to be far more destructive to each other than Mother Nature.

--

So I'll ask this question: What fundamental changes are Americans willing to make in their lives in order to prevent more terrorist attacks?

73 de Jim, N2EY

79. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 13:36:06 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5o07fpoi1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36074

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7EFE85.AB866207@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > The problem
> > lies in what is learned, radio theory and regs or just word associations
to get
> > a license.
>
> I rote memorized word associations to gain all amateur frequency
privileges
> in 1952. That *IS* the purpose of the license, Dick, to gain privileges.

Ditto for me in 1957 (novice) and then Tech in '58 (General theory).

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

80. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 14:08:09 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <dXLf8.179$gc.144503@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 36075

> The answer should be so obvious that it isn't even needed, at all.
> As you well know, this isn't about me. It's about all those future hams
> who will NOT be learning to use radio's most basic mode.
>

Using radio's most basic mode.... (since you didn't state amateur radio's most basic mode) So how come 911 dispatchers, firefighters, law enforcement, ambulance jockeys, and many other services who very well may come up with an alternate means of communicating when conventional modes fail aren't required to learn it? If there is definitely a case where the need for a message to get through is more important than most we will ever do, publice service frequency occupants would have to be a prime example?

If morse code is so important, why aren't they required?

I know you will take this as an attack or an insult, but it isn't.

Ryan

"ALL-CODE INTL. (If we have to do it, so does everyone else!)"

81. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 14:08:11 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <fXLf8.180$gc.144243@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 36076

From the looks of things, ham radio won't survive on it's own merits because of:

1. Lack of promotion (a good offense) by our largest psuedo-representative. (ARRL)

2. Lack of promotion on a local level. Some clubs and groups may be doing a great job
with that, but most aren't. There is so much that could be done.

3. NEGATIVITY. Now I understand that the older a person gets, the grumpier they get
and that in and of itself must be justification for that. Would you want to involve yourself
in something where you are constantly told you are a bad or lesser person, even before
you put a signal on the air? I don't think so. About the only case where this actually may
be true is the Christian church. We need to show ourselves in a professional and positive
exterior appearance.

4. Education/Elmerism is just not there as well as it should be. From a local standpoint
our local clubs could be doing a hell of alot more promotion in the educational arena.
With over 200 schools from elementary to colleges in our Tri County area, one person
could make a full time job out of going to these schools and doing presentations, assisting
with school ham clubs, and training and testing. Sure, a person needs to learn this stuff
on their own, but with reading and reading of the material may not make sense until a
person either sees the material in action or explained in a manner by an Elmer who can
teach. A person can practice the code tapes etc all they want, but they need to have
someone teach the intial characters to them. Also, the training methods of the 50's may
not be as effective as other methods depending on the person. Some people are more
visual learners, some are auditory etc. As long as a effective elmer can help with different
ways of training, not only the theory but also morse code, we could have

many more
licensees. As long as the person learns the required material to pass
the sufficent tests,
thats all that matters. As long as a person gets from Point A to Point B
thats all that
matters. (Point B means a sucessfull test session) Any complaining of
"things aren't the
way they used to be needs to be directed at the F.C.C.'s and the mafioso
groups that
control them.

5. The "If you build it, they will come" syndrome. I guess this one
ties into the promotion idea. I have seen clubs and VE groups that offer
test sessions and only get a few testees. (as well as other functions) Just
because we exist does not mean that people automatically come to us.
Constant promotion in a positive way is needed to get people to these
events. Some of these events are ONLY listed with ham circles, (ARRL site,
club web sites etc.) so how does the general public get to know about all
the wonderful things we have access to as hams? One local club I am aware of
does absolutely nothing to promote their testing sessions except for within
circles of EXISTING hams. How do they expect to grow?

There are many other points that could be brought up but I will save those
for a different post. With everything we have to combat for dollars and
time, (internet, cellphones and so on) we need to work harder at putting
ourselves in a positive light. These points can either be taken from a local
or national standpoint.

I have personally worked hard to try to change some of the things listed
above and constantly run against opposition. I am almost to the point of
where I should just sit back, and not care at all, and moan all the time
like the "Grumpier Old Men-Ham Radio Sequel" as that would be a hell of a
lot easier. For some reason I know I won't.

Ryan

> From the looks of things ham radio iteself can't surive on its own merits.
It
> keeps
> being downgraded so that it will "attract more new hams".
>
>

82. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 14:08:12 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <gXLf8.181$gc.144395@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 36077

I believe in the 40's or 50's but I could be wrong. At least locally it is 56 years old around here where I live. I am the youngest in our club at going on 32 years of age. The next oldest is 36-38 yrs old. Majority are in 50-60 and 70's age brackets.

Dropping the code test requirement in and of itself won't do a damned bit of difference unless the attitudes and practices by existing (living) hams doesn't change as stated in part in a separate post here. We need to promote in positive way. I.E. selling the hobby, to qualified sales leads. People with aptitude, interest and character as to make a beneficial addition to the hobby. The code test is meaningless regardless of rate of words per minute if the people do not know about the hobby in the first place. Competition is already rough as it is for peoples time and money (their investments into hobbies that is) and the lethargy in this hobby will do more damage that raising/lowering/dropping a morse code test regardless of its relevancy to the present time.

Some people are of the idea that the movie "Frequency" was a boost, where I think it was a detriment in some regards. "Nobody uses those things anymore" as stated in the movie bothered me. I thought that if someone within the whole production of the movie who may have been a ham could have injected a little more into the movie as to trigger more interest that would have been great. Yes, I know it was only a movie, but movies do have impact on people. Look at the movie "Contact." Great at the begginning, but I wish they would have some how incorporated more into it..

Ryan

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7DB365.5EDFD7F5@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > From the looks of things ham radio iteself can't surive on its own
merits. It
> > keeps being downgraded so that it will "attract more new hams".
>
> If ham radio doesn't attract new hams to replace the ones who are dropping
> like flies, there won't be a ham radio for much longer. What's the age of
> the average ham?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

83. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 14:08:13 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <hXLf8.182$gc.144330@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 36078

That brings up a question.... Is there somewhere where it is written about how soon a person MUST upgrade? Since I have seen a select few in here that it seems to be a major point of interest to, I was wondering if there was some type of listing as to when a person MUST upgrade that I may have missed. (sarcasm mode off)

Personally, I believe a person should grow within this hobby at a pace that makes them comfortable. If a person does not want to "scoot" all the way up to extra until later on in their life and not within the various levels of testing requirement changes, that is just fine. I can see that if a person, say for instance, is in the middle of raising kids or some other point in their life that is time consuming, there is nothing wrong with taking a longer time to upgrade. After all, this is a hobby and not a career. It is stated in the Amateur's Code (or somewhere...) that Amateur Radio is supposed to be a PART of our lives, not our WHOLE lives.

Ryan

> Yup. In fact, some folks say that one of the FCC's driving forces in pushing
> "incentive licensing"
> was Sputnik fever. The FCC first started asking questions about how to get more
> hams to
> upgrade beyond General in 1958.

84. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 14:08:14 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <iXLf8.183$gc.144475@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 36079

> The ARRL membership is still not above a quarter of all US
> amateur radio licensees, yet the ARRL still implies that it
> "represents all amateurs."

The ARRL is only concerned with its membership and is only obligated to them. All other non-member hams are of no concern. Case in point, I tried to get a membership form by calling the 1-800 number. Besides being insulted for not having a credit card, I have been told they have no obligation to send me a membership form since I am not a member. Sounds like a Catch-22 sort of eh?

85. ARRL Newsgroup?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 14:08:15 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <jXLf8.184$gc.144458@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 36080

I was thinking about this the other day, but I wonder if there would be any interest in a rec.radio.amateur.arrl newsgroup or maybe even something like rec.radio.amateur.arrl.discussion?

Whaddaya think?

I am not aware of how someone gets a newsgroup started but willing to learn. I would also love to see a alt. or rec.6meter or something similar as well as other bands.

Ryan KC8PMX

86. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 14:28:23 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5o39t$ol9$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36081

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020228233108.25762.00000244@mb-mg.aol.com...
> In article <a5mk3hgmp1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020228174629.16934.00001114@mb-dd.aol.com...
> >> From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >>
> >> >To be honest, the PERCEPTION of many, licensed or unlicensed,
> >> >is that the ARRL has controlled most of the past of the ARS from
> >> >a decided minority group that is NOT required to be accountable
> >> >to either the membership or non-members.
> >>
> >> An odd perception to have of a group of Directors that is elected by
the
> >> direct vote of that membership.
> >
> >Ed,
> >Welcome to the club. NCI get's the same accusation from some
> >people.
>
> Bill, you BIT very hard on this one, ey? :-)
>
> Alright, together now...PROVE that either election is honestly done
> without any shadow of a doubt. Simply SAYING so is not proof.
> Simply saying so requires an article of faith of the membership and
> a strained believability factor on the part of non-members.

Len,
Neither ARRL nor NCI (nor any other "private" organization
has to prove anything. The answer to anyone that either disagrees,
wants more "proof" or doesn't like the internal
policies/process/voting procedures is to simply NOT join
or to quit if already a member. Voluntary association...simple
concept in my book.

> >> >Are there independent, disinterested witnesses to all this "openness
and
> >> >honesty?" All I've seen over the years is what the ARRL says it
> >> >does. There are NO independent checks or balances; the ARRL
> >> >says it is honest and aboveboard and all must take them at
> >> >their word..
> >>
> >> Yes, we must. :-) Why would those who set ARRL policy not want to be

> >> honest and above board?
>
> Control, power, self-enoblement through altruistic, noble works which
> have publicity of same by their own organization..
>
> Is that somehow so "alien" in the entire human race?!?
>
> In my area of the USA a few million of us will take part in an election
> of local and state officials and propositions. The L.A. County
> Registrar will check and count those ballots, permitting selected
> party officials (of many parties) to observe the entire process. That
> happens in many areas of the USA, not just here. Checks and
> balances at work in regards to government, a democratic process.

Government vs private organization. Government exists by
decree of the people and the "checks & balances" are there
because the "people" want them. Private organizations exist at
the will of the memberships of each private organization.

> I am asked to BELIEVE that private organizations, NCI or ARRL
> are ALL "honest and above-board." I have no other evidence
> that they are or aren't. Where is the "check and balance," the
> observation of the process? Either organization SAYS they are
> doing honest things and all are obliged to take them at their
> word.

Len, I don't care if you do or don't believe that ARRL and/or NCI
are honest and above board. What difference would it make as to
what you believe in either case?

> Many, many, many politicians and party workers and propaganda
> spinners of all the parties SAY they are all "honest and above-
> board" and some of them are. Unfortunately some are NOT.
> There is seldom any rational basis for determining that ahead of
> time. Everything is taken as an article of FAITH.

Works for me. I learned a long time ago there will
always be nay sayers to anything I say. The old
axiom covers that... You can't please all the people
all the time.

> I will grant you government elections and polticians are not quite
> related to private organizations claiming altruistic motives. You
> will have to grant me acknowledgement that government and
> elected officials of government have a number of independent
> agencies and private organizations observing the honesty of the
> election processes and the officials themselves. Can either you
> or Ed grant to non-members the same proof of honesty of
> elections and officials of private organizations who do NOT have
> the same checks and balances? I don't think so.

More to the point...WHY does ARRL or NCI owe you
any such "proof" in the first place?

> All the non-membership gets when challenged about the above
> is peevish statements demanding that all accept them "on their
> word" because both are "honest" because they SAY they are
> honest. Sorry, but that is a non-answer, just a variation on the
> "you must believe us becasue we ARE honest" spin.

Sorry, but that IS the only answer you'd get from me.

> >Must be a grand conspiracy. :-)
>
> My challenge on proof and altruism was not based on some
> "grand conspiracy" but of the PERCEPTION of many that
> elections and policy decisions MAY not be as honest as we
> are told.

Perceptions and about a $1 will get you a cup of coffee. If
ARRL, NCI and many other organizations had to worry about
everyone's "perceptions" we'd never get to focus on our
goals.

> A way to counter skepticsm is to misdirect or engage in
> ridicule. Misdirection is to dance away from a direct challenge
> and to point to "all the other great things" the organization is
> doing to "help amateur radio." Now, if NCI has one policy on
> certain things and the ARRL an opposite, both cannot be "right,"
> can they? If one is "right" then the other must be "wrong."
> Another possibility is that both of them are "wrong." It is not
> possible that both of them can be "right" yet each say they
> are. Ridicule of skeptics is good misdirection, putting the
> onus on the challenger and diverting from the challenge. That
> does not prove "rightness." It is a smokescreen to avoid
> the challenge.

I don't have a clue as to what that all is supposed to mean
with regard to elections held by NCI and/or ARRL.

> >Why Ed, what about all those clandistine phone calls from ARRL
> >to FCC? :-) :-)
>
> Public release of FCC announcements has occurred on the
> ARRL website before it was available on the FCC website.
> Not many, I'll grant, and not lately. Apparently some skeptics
> commentary got through to the ARRL and they are more
> careful.

Do you believe that EVERY phone call, discussion, conversation,
etc between an ARRL person and an FCC person MUST be
reported somewhere?

> >> Uh, oh, here come the Black Helicopters and Capitilizations. Must be
> >> Pontification time!

> >
> >Yup...same old conspiracy theory silliness.
>
> ...and also a sign of a commonplace syndrome of arrogance on
> the part of organization officials or members. This time it is
> ridicule for smug superiority reasons?

There comes a point where, having failed to convince or
where the critic just keeps pushing for their way that every
organization ultimately has to simply say: You don't like,
that's tough...don't join, quit or whatever.

> <snip>
>
> >Kinda reminds me too of the people that complain about judging
> >rules at one of the car club events I have helped organize BUT they
> >don't join the club to be a part of the work effort.
>
> Are the issues before WRC-03 on amateur radio are considered the
> same as a "car club rally?!?"

Are the WRC issues the "exclusive" domain of ARRL, NCI?
Pursue whatever legal process is available to you. No one is
saying you or anyone else shouldn't do so.

> The ARRL has approximately 170,000 members. The membership
> in NCI is unknown. If either say you KNOW what the feelings of
> either or both members are, you are very foolish indeed or think
> that all can be duped. If the latter then it is a height of true con-
> manship.

I suspect the FCC is quite able to understand that comments from
either organization represents their repective memberships regardless
of what either may say. Interesting too, that from a historic perspective,
the ARRL probably does represent a significant proportion of ACTIVE
hams.

> The ARRL has lobbied for certain amateur radio regulations in
> the past which concern GETTING INTO amateur radio. Quite a
> long time of lobbying and influence with the FCC. Now you are
> implying that the ONLY way to work for getting INTO ham radio
> is get into ham radio first and "work from the inside?"

No one, neither ARRL, NCI, Ed Hare, Carl S or myself has
ever said that the ONLY partipation in such FCC rule
setting should be via those organziations, already licensed
hams or ourselves.

> That is not following democratic principles. That is stacking the
> deck in favor of only one game with little hope for success.

NCI and ARRL both avail themselves of the public and well
established processes for input, comment, etc. YOU are

free to do so on your own. Neither NCI nor ARRL owes anyone
a special forum within their own organization to accomodate YOU or
anone else.

> >Ed, It makes no difference. The conspiracy theory people
> >will believe whatever their fantasies are.
>
> Neither of you acknowledge that perception by others is subject
> to skepticsm. That is turning a blind eye away from criticsm.

Whatever perceptions exist, they don't worry me or in
any way cause me concern.

> Ridiculing skepticsm is not an answer to any challenge.

The "challenge" requires nothing on my part to begin
with. That I state the claim is bogus or of minimal
concern as to not warrant any change in organization and/or
a reply of suffient depth to satisy you my right, it
is NCI's right, it is ARRL's right.

> >Last I checked, there is no law prohibiting anyone from
> >starting another "ARRL like" organization. Now I haven't
> >checked lately, so maybe ARRL got a special law passed
> >through congress while we weren't looking.
>
> A monopoly can effectively tie up available market monies
> for a particular activity. A major portion of ARRL operating
> funds comes from product sales, much more than
> membership fees.

So have the feds file an anti-trust suit against the
aleged ARRL monopoly. Given the availability of
alternative sources of products from other than ARRL,
I suspect the "monopoly" is unproveable.

> QST has had to reduce its size due to a
> shrinking market for amateur radio related products.
> Independent publishers of amateur radio books and
> periodicals have a similar problem. The ham radio market
> is finite.

Economic reality...so what. Neither ARRL, CQ Publishing,
or any other entity owns that total
marketshare anyway.. No monopoly exists, nor has
it ever been so.

> To deny that the ARRL has had a major influence on amateur
> radio regulations in the past is about like denying the sun
> comes up each day.

Who ever suggested the ARRL has NOT been a major
influence in amateur rules/regs. That IS one reason ARRL exists.

It is also why NCI exists.

> Other amateur radio organizations HAVE
> come up challenging the ARRL. Their goals were as lofty and
> altruistic as any of the ARRL but the scene was already set for
> the ARRL and the play went on without them.

So what? No one is guaranteed any success inife.
Have those new organizations been unfairly, illegally
or unethically undermined by actions of ARRL.

> I'd mention "No SSB International" but that never seemed
> anything but a glossy sarcastic jab at early NCI, fueled
> primarily by Jim Kehler's arrogant disdain for those not loving
> CW and DXing. It is no longer visible.

So what....does ARRL or NCI owe that organization
any special accomodation, any support to insure it's
success?

> Eric June had a more
> noble goal of preservation of CW through legislation but lacked
> the propaganda skills to reach any masses. It is no longer
> visible.

So what....does ARRL or NCI owe that organization
any special accomodation, any support to insure it's
success?

> FISTS exists but apparently suffers ennui, only its
> devout faithful attending, failing to attract enough newcomers.

So what....does ARRL or NCI owe that organization
any special accomodation, any support to insure it's
success?

> >> >Are these just one person's observations? No. Hardly. It is a
> >> >sort of synopsis of what thousands of others have seen and
> >> >felt over the years.
> >>
> >> I don't imagine that "thousands" have seen and felt the TRVTH as Len
knows
> >> it, Len.
> >
> >And nothing is stopping those thousands from starting their
> >own "alter-ARRL" organziation.
>
> There is no quantifyable number of those who were not convinced
> and walked away to pursue other recreation. They are still vocal.

They must be vocal in the woods right next to the falling
tree that may or may not make a sound
if no one is there to hear it. Bottom line, again, neither

ARRL or NCI owes any individual answers or replies. IF, as you claim,
enough members or prospective members are unhappy with any
organization, then that organization will eventually fail...so
far both ARRL and NCI seem to be satisfying enough of their
repective memberships that the viability of either organization is not
in question.

> Established small and big organizations do not acknowledge
> their existance. They may be too busy extolling their stated
> "virtue" and "honesty" without quantifying those things.

I don't have a clue what that is supposed to mean.

> >> This reminds me of the guy in rags standing on the street corner
preaching
> >> the end is near. :-)
> >
> >Sinner repent.
>
> Spoken like two Enron executives in 2001, chuckling after
> exchanging high-fives on pulling off another "fast one" on
> their investors.

Your anology is pathetic. The fiscal irrisponsibility of Enron
execs is in no way comparable to the actions, policies or
processes of ARRL or NCI.

> >> I hope you feel better soon, Len.
> >
> >Dittos from me too Len. Frankly, I'm disappointed
> >in the reduction to Len's commentary to such
> >fantasy land exhortations.
>
> Ah, but I LIVE in the real world. Some wish to create a fantasy
> by stating everything they say is "true' and "honest" yet offering
> little substance for their veracity except a necessary Belief.

I repeat...neither ARRL or NCI owes YOU anything. You are not
a member of either organization.

> I was discussing organizations, not indivuduals. Two individuals
> from organizations felt obliged to take things personally and
> to rebut on a personal level to a skeptical challenger. Cheap.

Cheap, only because YOU don't like the answer.

> So, to the private organizations, where is the independent proof
> that all your elections are honest?

You don't like our word on it, then don't join.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

87. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 14:32:50 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5o3mk$ps5$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36082

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020301055012.26465.00001136@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>
> >Pure unadulterated bunk. Is there anyone other than
> >Dick that truly believes that once the code testing is ended that
> >"the people who are never required to learn it for a test will not learn
> >it."
>
> I believe that fewer will learn it sans code testing than will learn it
with
> code testing.

I agree.

> I think that the number of hams that will go on to use it will be
> slightly smaller without a code test will be only slightly smaller than
the
> number that would learn it for the code test then discover magically that
they
> really don't hate it after all.
>
> I believe that the broad numbers I estimated above are smaller than they
would
> otherwise be because of the things that some of the PCTAs are saying about
the
> mode and their perception of the unworthiness of people who are passing
> today's tests.

Agree also.

Bill K2UNK

88. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 14:41:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7F9310.85D3D879@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36083

Dick Carroll wrote:
> That's total nonsense. The charge was set long ago and now the fuse is lit. The
> rest is inevitable.

Only if hams like you help it along.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

89. Re: ARRL Newsgroup?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 14:47:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020301094711.16967.00001171@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36084

>Subject: ARRL Newsgroup?
>From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net
>Date: 3/1/2002 8:08 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <jXLf8.184$gc.144458@monger.newsread.com>

>
>I was thinking about this the other day, but I wonder if there would be any
>interest in a rec.radio.amateur.arrl newsgroup or maybe even something like
>rec.radio.amateur.arrl.discussion?
>
>Whaddaya think?

I think it would be a neat idea, except for the fact that it would probably wind up being another "Morse Code" flaming group as are most other Amateur Radio spots.

Besides, what would they discuss "there" that's not done here?

73

Steve, K4YZ

90. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 15:13:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020301101324.16967.00001177@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36085

>Subject: Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/28/2002 3:10 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020228161044.17627.00000228@mb-mo.aol.com>

>ANYONE in the USA, licensed in any radio service or not, may
>deliberately transmit RF energy within the regulations set forth
>in Parts 15 and 95, Title 47 CFR. For further definitions, see
>Part 1, Title 47 CFR.

Not completely true, Your Detailmissingness. Can't remember? Not
"everyone" in the USA may use Part 95.

(Jeopardy 60 second jungle playing...)

>Irrelevant. To state full details of a life experience falls into the
>"CV" category which is NOT AUTHORIZED by another one-by-two
>Dill Instructor in this newsgroup.

You go right ahead, Your Selfworshipness. Don't use ME as an excuse to
not answer any questions put to you...LEAST of all one's that you can't answer
truthfully! You COULD, but we'd never expect it!

>To parade around extolling the "virtues" of amateurism...(SNIP)

AmateurISH is what rants and railings like this are, Your Uneducatedness.

>Such is also hypocritical to a perverse
>point, claims used solely to satisfy some imaginary "battle" of
>words that exists only in the imagination of the outraged claimant.

If such is "imaginary", then who are you fighting against, and WHY are you
fighting against them if it's not real?

Those voices in your head are a bit loud, are they?

>Does "interest in radio" equate JUST to amateur radio? No, nor
>should it, in my opinion. Must "interest in radio" be "demonstrated"
>to a "community" by acquisition of a legal amateur license? No.

No, you don't "have" to get a license, Lennie.

You HAVE lied to us though, on several occassion, and said you were. You
have not. We are not surprised at your inability to get one, however.

Furthermore, one cannot make an INFORMED decision without some experience
base upon which to make it. It has been conceeded by almost all here that you
are "smarts" about the inside of the box. However THAT is where your frame of
reference stops.

>Such is the self-imposed "requirement" of the fanatics, the ego-
>driven, the irrational credentialists who have confused a hobby
>activity done for recreation and enjoyment to some all-embracing
>lifestyle.

For some, it IS a lifestyle, and I think that's one of the things that galls you. Friends, picnics, hamfests, contests, and on occassion, even some "lernin' an a smartin'" happens.

All without 14 years of night school to do it.

>Some discount all of the preceding even though it is established in
>the real world, the bigger world of all radio. Those who wish to say
>otherwise live in another world of fantasy contained in their
>imaginations and quasi-religious beliefs.

Oh, there's some "discounting" going on here...Mostly by a deranged little old man in Southern California that stalks Amateur Radio operator newsgroups and insists he knows more about Amateur Radio than licensed operators do. He sit's behind his keyboard, dying and decrepit, lashing out at those who he would have called "friends" save for his own reticence and cowardness. What a waste.

>They are gods. Mere
>mortals may not argue with gods. They are superior.

Only when you are used as the milestone, Lennie. Only when gauged against you.......

91. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 15:26:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020301102636.16967.00001178@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36086

>Subject: Re: The tests that Real Hams took
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/28/2002 10:31 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020228233109.25762.00000245@mb-mg.aol.com>

>Sorry but, according to the dynamic duo in here, "I either know
>nothing about amateur radio" or I "lack the necessary moral virtues
>of proper attitude towards amateur radio."

If I am one of the Dynamic Duo you refer to, this is not true. I HAVE stated that you do not have an experience base from which to draw an INFORMED opinion about AMATEUR Radio matters.

This is not untrue. You are not licensed...You do not, by your own admission, participate in any organized Amateur Radio organization or program, including the ARRL, and refuse to do so at ANY level.

I have never seen anyone so proactive in his own ignorance as you, Lennie.

92. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 15:33:51 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0203010733.4e06c8da@posting.google.com>
Source record: 36087

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020301060425.26465.00001139@mb-fx.aol.com>...
>
> "Worst" can mean a lot of things to a lot of people.

Consider the influenza epidemic of 1918. It killed 850,000 Americans
and 25 million people worldwide in one year. Some estimates range as
high as 37 million. Here in Philadelphia, 158 out of every 1000 people
died.

DNA evidence shows that the so-called "Spanish flu" was a mutated swine
virus.

73 de Jim, N2EY

93. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 15:47:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020301104725.16967.00001184@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36088

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>Date: 2/28/2002 9:28 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3c7ef76b_1@newsa.ev1.net>

>- our government continues to legislate and impinge upon civil liberties
>over it

Which one's, Kim?

Were you unable to vote today?

Did anyone refuse to hire you because of your gender or predisposition to
an "alternative" lifestyle?

Did a police officer not inform you of your right to legal representation
after he (since we no longer allow women officers) arresetd you?

>- patriotism has become the new measure by which we accept each other (yes,
>that is a bad thing)

I don't believe you really mean this. You can BE a patriot and still
disagree with "the system". And I DO consider someone based upon THIER frame
of reference to what thier views on America are.

>And that probably just scratches the surface. Internationally, financially,
>emotionally, this disaster continues to spread out like a nuclear blast.

And unfortunately there are a great number of people who made comments to
the like of "it will take an act of war or grand act of terrorism to get them
to wake up..."

They were right. Unfortunately, what we consider as "rights" are NOT
really "rights". They are what society THINKS are "rights" at any given moment
and are subject to change by vote or convention.

Even more unfortunate is that had we been "riding herd" on some of these
groups a long time ago, WTC 9/11 would have never occured. Yes, some
individuals may have gotten thier individual toes stepped on in the process and
that is unfortunate. But look at what FAILING to invest in our security did to
us.

You are right, Kim. The dust hasn't settled yet. The financial fallout
will be years in settling. Families have been torn apart and billions of
dollars wasted that could have been invested in our future and wellbeing.

Can you honestly say that all that was lost is worth it since, along the
way, someone didn't get hassled by a federal investigator trying to make sure

this could never happen?

Our "security" and our "rights" are fluid concepts. Only the Bible has rules in it that are supposedly unvioable, and those are the one's we seem to break most often. What makes anyone think anything written by the hand of man is so sacrosanct?

73

Steve, K4YZ

94. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 15:50:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C7FA344.30605@ieee.org>
Source record: 36089

Dick Carroll wrote:

> CAM wrote:
>>1000 Russian words would be meaningless to you but I haven't seen any
>>progress in your memorizing their definitions. Is that another example
>>of do as I say, not as I do?
>
> Hey, make it as worth my while as memorizing a ham radio exam and you might
> get my attention. A megabuck might do it. Betcha I could do it.

So you want a million bucks for doing what you say is a trivial
task for new hams? Do you think what new hams are doing is worth
a million dollars? If it is as trivial as you say, why is it worth
a million dollars? Let's settle on an actual amount to see what
new hams are doing is really worth. What is the minimum number of
dollars you would take to memorize 1000 Russian words?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

95. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 16:31:05 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0203010831.9219da8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 36090

Friend of mine (or as Waylon wrote, a friend of a friend of mine ...)
wrote a CW song called "A love hate relationship."

"We have a love-hate relationship. I love her and she hates me," goes
the lyric.
--Carl

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020301062128.26465.00001144@mb-fx.aol.com>...
> From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>
> > And, Larry? Well,
> >who in the world would have him?
>
> I don't know, Kim; you and Larry do seem intensely interested in each other on
> this forum...
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

96. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 17:01:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C7FB404.DBFDF419@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36091

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Wrong, as usual. It's not the "exams", it's word associations that remain
> >essentially
> >meaningless (to the memorizer) but allow a passing grade and a license to
> >result.
>
> I know that you are giving this advice to those who are studying for the exams,
> but I want to tell them that you are wrong and that it is easier to learn the
> underlying principles than to try to word-associate 300 sets of questions three
> separate times.
>

But you *really* don't know, do you? You've never approached the question pools
from
a perspective of not knowing anything about the material, yet faced with
determining the
best way to get the license. From that perspective, for most of the pool questions,
learning
the material is NOT easiest path. Non-licensed applicants soon learn that, and
proceed
accordingly, as some have stated clearly here. (wonder why you ignored that?) Those

who have a technical background do indeed find it lots easier to learn the
technical
principles behind most of the questions in the pool. But for some reason, you and
some others
insist there is no other way to do it. Strange. But maybe not so strange, it took
awhile as a VE
for me to learn about it.
I realize you'd like me to try to keep under the table so that newcomers won't
know, and
will be *forced* to to through all the hoop-jumping to learn the background
material. Sorry.
It's not up to me. I learned about it from them. They already know.

> >For all those who actually learn the material, hooray for you.
>
> Now you're talking, Dick. Such a turnaround.

NO turnaround whatever, I've always applauded those who learn. Why can't you
get used to that fact? Because I explain the method that most non-technical people
use to get a ham license doesn't mean I advocate it, in fact quite the contrary, I
decry the

fact that it is possible.

97. Re: ARS Licensing in the USA Since WW2

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 17:13:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203010913.55e4f78@posting.google.com>
Source record: 36092

A Brief History Of Amateur Radio Licensing In The USA Since WW2 (1946-2002)

by N2EY – Part 2 of 4

Growth and Evolution (1957 - 1963)

By the mid '50s several trends in ham radio were clear. There was continued rapid growth in the number of amateurs. The popularity of SSB, RTTY and VHF continued to increase. New modes and operating methods such as SSTV, ATV, moonbounce, and amateur radio satellites appeared. The trend towards manufactured and kit equipment continued.

In the late '50s the first manufactured HF SSB transceivers aimed at the amateur radio market appeared. While the idea of a complete integrated station in one box with shared circuitry not new, and homebrew transceivers had been built by a few skilled hams, the new HF SSB/CW transceiver caused many more changes than were first apparent. Most importantly, they paved the way for SSB to displace AM as the premier voice mode. For a little more money than a good receiver, a ham could have a transceiver with the effective power output of a much larger and more expensive AM rig. Transceivers were also small enough, and attractive enough, to find their way out of the basement or attic and into the den or living room of many amateurs. Though simple to use, their electrical and mechanical complexity meant that only a few advanced homebrewers would even attempt to build them. SSB transceivers were soon followed by separate receiver/transmitter pairs designed to work together, and able to transceive or work separately. Transistors began to appear in amateur gear. The first amateur satellite was launched in 1961, and the first 2 way amateur moonbounce QSO occurred that same year.

In 1958 the FCC announced the creation of the Class D Citizens Band (CB) service. Class A and B CB had existed since 1948, using frequencies in the 465 MHz region, but had not attained much popularity. The 11 meter band was withdrawn from amateurs and reassigned to this new service. This change was opposed by many hams, but the FCC saw the need for a new service, and rejected all opposition. 11 meters was never an exclusive amateur band by treaty - US hams had it on a secondary shared basis.

From 1957 to 1962 there existed a set of regulations commonly referred to by hams as "Conelrad". Hams were required to monitor a local broadcast station at intervals of 10 minutes or less whenever they were operating, and if the broadcast station went off the air due to an emergency, hams had to leave the air as well.

During this time the number of hams in some districts became so great that new prefixes were needed, and six-character permanent callsigns of the form "WB2LGJ"

began to be issued in those districts.

The licensing structure remained basically unchanged through this time period, as did the bands available to hams. Technicians gained access to 2 meters in this time period. The number of US hams exceeded 250,000 by 1963, about three times the total of just 15 years earlier. This figures out to an annual growth rate of about 7%. Most amateurs had General or Conditional class licenses. There were about 40,000 Advanceds, all of whom had obtained their licenses before December 31, 1952, when the FCC stopped issuing new Advanceds. Novices and Technicians numbered about 10,000 each, but only a few (less than 4,000) hams had Extras.

Incentive Licensing (1964 - 1969)

In 1958 the FCC began to rethink its late-1952 decision granting all privileges to General class amateurs. They noted that homebrewing and experimenting were decreasing, phone operation was increasing, and the technical knowledge and operating skills of many amateurs seemed mediocre at best. It's also possible that the unexpected launch of Sputnik by the Soviet Union in 1957, and the Soviets' early space triumphs, led the FCC to think that American amateur radio needed some kind of change in the licensing area.

At that time, many new hams followed a fairly straightforward path. First, a new ham got a Novice license, and set up a simple station, often with homebrew, secondhand, or converted surplus gear. The Novice year was marked by rapid learning and improvement of skills - it had to be, because if the new ham did not upgrade before the license term ended, he/she would be off the air until a higher level license could be earned. Most new hams upgraded to General or Conditional, but some went to Technician. However, once the General or Conditional license was passed, many hams bought new manufactured gear and lost interest in increasing their skills or technical knowledge. The FCC thought this was a problem, and began to inquire about ways to change what they saw as an undesirable trend.

The ARRL responded in 1963 with a simple proposal: Reopen the Advanced to new applicants, and restrict the 75, 40, and 20 meter phone bands to Advanced and Extra licensees. The idea was to add one more step on the ladder from beginner to full privileges, and thus extend the learning time and raise the level of knowledge required for an all amateur privileges license. The concept became known as "Incentive Licensing".

The FCC responded with a general call for ideas, and was deluged with responses. No less than 10 proposals were given RM numbers by the FCC. The FCC combined features from many of these proposals and came up with a complex plan.

The HF bands would be divided into segments, or subbands, with some segments reserved for Extras, some for Advanceds and Extras, and some for all classes General and above. 6 meters was also slightly involved. Novices would be unaffected by these changes, and Techs were only affected by the change to 6 meters.

One particularly unpopular feature of the FCC plan was the replacement of the Advanced license with a new "Amateur First Class" license, with a new

16 wpm code test and a new written test. FCC proposed to demote holders of the Advanced to General. This idea was finally dropped due to stiff opposition from the amateur community, including the ARRL.

Several proposals and counterproposals went back and forth, each with different features, all hotly debated. Finally in 1967 a final plan was announced. Enacted in two phases, much of the HF spectrum available to holders of General and Advanced class licenses would be withdrawn from their use. The plan as conceived by the FCC is shown below. Only the affected bands are shown.

Phase 1 Incentive Licensing plan - effective Nov. 22, 1968

Extra Class Only: (all frequencies in MHz):
3.5-3.525 CW 3.8-3.825 Phone 7-7.025 CW 14-14.025 CW 21-21.025 CW 21.250-21.275 Phone

Extra and Advanced Classes Only:
3.825-3.85 Phone 7.2-7.225 Phone 14.2-14.235 Phone 21.275-21.3 Phone 50-50.1 CW

Phase 2 Incentive Licensing plan - effective Nov. 22, 1969:

Extra Class Only: (all frequencies in MHz):
3.5-3.525 CW 3.8-3.825 Phone 7-7.025 CW 14-14.025 CW 21-21.025 CW 21.250-21.275 Phone

Extra and Advanced Classes Only:
3.825-3.9 Phone 7.2-7.25 Phone 14.2-14.275 Phone 21.275-21.35 Phone 50-50.1 CW

In addition, anyone with 25 years as a ham and an Extra class license could get a 1X2 call.

Opinion on this change was deeply divided. A very slight majority favored the plan, but many opponents felt cheated and had bitter resentment towards the FCC, ARRL, or both. There was a feeling among some that they had the "right" to all amateur privileges. Some left ham radio, but most grumbled but set about getting a higher class license, to get back the lost privileges.

The trends in amateur radio did not change, however. More and more hams bought, rather than built, their stations. HF SSB voice operation continued to increase in popularity, while AM declined and CW stayed about the same. RTTY and SSTV continued to progress, but the expense and complexity of those modes, and the lack of commercially available gear limited their appeal. VHF operation became more popular as compact transceivers for 6 and 2 meter AM were produced by several manufacturers. There were also a growing number of VHF/UHF stations on the air using more advanced equipment, usually homemade.

In 1964, the FCC imposed fees for amateur licenses (except the Novice). A new or renewed license, or any exam except Novice, cost $4, a modification cost $2, and the very limited "vanity call" program cost $20. Fees were charged whether or not the applicant passed the test. While these fees may seem nominal today, in the early '60s they represented a significant amount of money.

This time period also saw changes to the procedures for exams by mail. The distance requirement for a Conditional license was extended from 75 to 175 miles, and more exam points included. The procedure for Novice and Technician licenses became longer and more complicated.

First, you found a volunteer examiner to give you the test, as before. The volunteer examiner gave you the code test, and when you passed, sent the proper forms to the FCC certifying that you had passed the code and requesting the written exam. There was typically a six to eight week wait for the written exam to arrive from the FCC. The written exam was sent in a sealed envelope, and the volunteer examiner acted as a proctor only - he/she wasn't supposed to even look at the exam. The exam was sent back to the FCC for marking, and you had another six to eight week wait to find out the results. If you passed, your new license came in the mail, and you could go on the air as soon as it arrived. If you failed, you had to do the whole thing all over again. The process typically took about three months to complete if all tests were passed the first time.

In addition, the Advanced and Extra were available by mail, but only to those with a physical disablity that prevented them from appearing at an FCC office.

In 1967 the Novice license term was extended to two years. This came about due to concern about too many newcomers dropping out because a year was too short a period in which to learn all that was needed to upgrade. Novices lost 2 meter voice privileges, but retained CW privileges on 2. In 1969 the FCC revised the "one time" provision of the Novice so that anyone who had been unlicensed for at least a year could get a Novice. Also, simultaneous holding of Novice and Technician licenses was prohibited.

After more than a decade and a half of rapid growth, the number of US hams stabilized at about 250,000 in 1964 and stayed at about that level for several years. By 1970 there were about 270,000 US hams.

In 1968, amateur access to 160 meters was increased significantly. US hams got access to 1800 to 2000 kHz - but still subject to complex geographical and power limitations.

In this time period the use of transistors and integrated circuits became increasingly common in amateur equipment. Digital logic began to be used for a variety of purposes, from CW keyers to frequency counters. This period also saw the appearance of Japanese amateur gear in significant numbers.

73 de Jim, N2EY

98. Re: Bootleg Call signs - Identity theft?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 17:28:04 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <ESOf8.8135$106.510294@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36093

"Technomage" <proudhawk@uswestmail.net> wrote in message
news:pan.2002.03.01.04.35.03.836.19687@uswestmail.net...
> interesting point there OM.
> I have had my run-ins with the same problem here in phoenix quite some
> time ago. However, I was not the only one. there was a particularly
nasty
> case back around 1994 that really had the phoenix area buzzing for a
> couple of years. I feel sorry for that ham. he had no end of trouble
with
> his call being hijacked and used on everything from police frequencies
to
> harrassing autopatch phone calls.
>
> from what I hear, he pretty much went off the air (though I did hear
> indications that his call was being used on 2 machines locally last
> night).
>
> still fun in the sun in phoenix arizona.
>
> Technomage
> (My call is my own business and those that know me also know my call and
> won't transmit it here).
>

As you like with appropriate discounting of credibility. I must admit the
first time I saw it, I read 'Technomange'. While I have known a few
glueheads whom it might fit, I never saw anyone admit it.

Dick N�BK

99. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 18:43:45 UTC
From: Martin <mdwade@mobiletel.com>
Message-ID: <3C7FCBE1.163A@mobiletel.com>
Source record: 36094
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Radio Ham wrote:
>
> WRONG!
>
> William The Conqueror and the Normans
> were of Viking descent and not from the Francs.
>
Very True!

> "Gallia est omnes divises in partes tres", etc.
>
The opening statement from Juluis Ceaser's Commentary
on the Gaullic Wars.

Gaul is divided (only) in three parts.

Martin N5PZJ HOMME de LETTRES
> Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:a5m7vr01htf@enews2.newsguy.com...
> > I would also remind the Brits that seventy percent of English, according
> to
> > my high school French teacher, is actually mispronounced French, thanks to
> > William the Conqueror and the Normans. So all of you Brits had better quit
> > butchering the French language!

100. Re: Bootleg Call signs - Identity theft?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 19:00:57 UTC
From: Technomage <proudhawk@uswestmail.net>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.03.01.12.00.57.816.24638@uswestmail.net>
Source record: 36095

Dick,
define what you mean by "gluehead" (unless you are implying that I am either a user, or abuser of glue products that contain <among other things> tolulene, etc.).

also, what issue of credibility are we talking about here?

I simply pointed out a case or 2 that happened here roughly 8 years or so ago and the problems (albeit abreviated) that such caused.

/RANT on

as a side note, have you ever considered the kind of problems that can be caused when ones Identity is "hijacked"? taking anothers callsign may appear to be "small potatos" to you (and a few others here) but its just the first step. with that call, one can find out other info from the FCC database (such as date of birth, SSN# and full name). with *THAT* information, one can then access credit reports, drivers lic. info and a myriad of other important information (thus effectively hijacking a persons life). There are cases where this has actually happened (bank accounts go missing, new credit cards issued, old ones cancled, etc.).

In a small number of cases of this type of identity theft, the victims are "killed off" when the identity ceases to be of use (thus causing the victim even more trouble as he/she attempts to prove they are still alive, etc.).

Believe me, you don't want to be the end-recipient of such an action (believe me, I have seen the results of such and it is not pretty).

if you think "that will never happen to me", then you might be right. However, just remember how easy it is to gain information via todays computer networks (let alone what some well meaning civil servant will provide with just the right prodding <its called "social engineering">).

/RANT off

now that I am done with my soapbox, what is your point, really?

Technomage

In article <ESOf8.8135$106.510294@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

>> As you like with appropriate discounting of credibility. I must admit
> the first time I saw it, I read 'Technomange'. While I have known a few
> glueheads whom it might fit, I never saw anyone admit it.
>

> Dick Nï¿½BK

--
I will not be pushed, filed, stamped, indexed, briefed, debriefed, or numbered!
My life is my own - No. 6

101. Re: Code Is Dead

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 19:13:21 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <lpQf8.6741$gK2.509390@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36096

"Leadpipe" <leadpipe@pittnet.com> wrote in message
news:410b6521.0202282049.72906c94@posting.google.com...
> I cannot wait till the code requirement is dropped completely from ARS
> so that I can follow in the footsteps of my mentors. Those "20WPM
> Extras" and other code pushing scum that are icons of Amateur Radio
> legend have given us underlings a good education on how to act on HF
> by putting these practices on display on 3898, and 14313 and other
> pompous sections of those elitist bands.
<<SNIP>>

Nice try. Both 3898 and 14313 are available to general and higher classes of tickets. Although I do not believe in the necessity of Morse, I'm beginning to realize I might have to use CW on HF just to avoid both unlicensed individuals, folks such as you mention, and you as well. For what it is worth, in 1993 I had no license either. One sitting - that was it. The 20 words per minute wasn't fun, but then I had no license, no practice, and no CW since 1969. Since you seem to believe that 14313 and 3898 are extra portions of the band, one tends to question how well you did on your exams you have already passed (but, of course, you don't need all of 'em right).

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA
(and enjoying 440 FM more and more!)

102. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 19:17:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203011117.ad3e750@posting.google.com>
Source record: 36097

Here are some numbers to think about. These are the number of unexpired
FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of February 28, 2002:

Novice - 39,507 (decrease of 9,822)
Tech - 236,643 (increase of 31,299)
Tech Plus - 82,985 (decrease of 45,875)
General - 138,824 (increase of 26,147)
Advanced - 86,171 (decrease of 13,581)
Extra - 98,891 (increase of 20,141)
Total - 683,021 (increase of 8,229)

73 de Jim, N2EY

103. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 20:07:03 UTC
From: RVMJ <RVMJ@Safety-&-Arming.Clara.co.uk>
Message-ID: <c3mv7u4sa1origesbmf2cl14fgu9c2ij1t@4ax.com>
Source record: 36098
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The Anus wrote:

>Top posting is one Internet convention.....
>
>Bottom posting is another convention.....

But the most useful convention is to trim the posting to the points
you wish to answer, and interleave your replies accordingly. In this
way the ng suffers neither of disadvantages of the other.

I would have thought that someone who claims six or more years in
usenet just might have become aware of the third option before now.

--
from
RVMJ
Remove Safety-&-Arming before e-mailing

104. Re: Code Is Dead

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 20:20:39 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C7FE297.61AB7527@uci.edu>
Source record: 36099

Nice troll.

I wonder what it rates on Hans' ol' trollometer?

Leadpipe wrote:

> I have learned much from them
> about radio protocall that I was able to put to immediate use on CB
> through the years.

105. Re: Bootleg Call signs - Identity theft?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 20:34:42 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <CBRf8.8421$106.529160@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36100

"Technomage" <proudhawk@uswestmail.net> wrote in message
news:pan.2002.03.01.12.00.57.816.24638@uswestmail.net...
> Dick,
> define what you mean by "gluehead" (unless you are implying that I am
> either a user, or abuser of glue products that contain <among other
> things> tolulene, etc.).
>
> also, what issue of credibility are we talking about here?
>
> I simply pointed out a case or 2 that happened here roughly 8 years or
so
> ago and the problems (albeit abreviated) that such caused.
>
> /RANT on
>
> as a side note, have you ever considered the kind of problems that can
be
> caused when ones Identity is "hijacked"? taking anothers callsign may
> appear to be "small potatos" to you (and a few others here) but its just
> the first step. with that call, one can find out other info from the FCC
> database (such as date of birth, SSN# and full name). with *THAT*
> information, one can then access credit reports, drivers lic. info and a
> myriad of other important information (thus effectively hijacking a
> persons life). There are cases where this has actually happened (bank
> accounts go missing, new credit cards issued, old ones cancled, etc.).
>
> In a small number of cases of this type of identity theft, the victims
> are "killed off" when the identity ceases to be of use (thus causing the
> victim even more trouble as he/she attempts to prove they are still
> alive, etc.).
>
> Believe me, you don't want to be the end-recipient of such an action
> (believe me, I have seen the results of such and it is not pretty).
>
> if you think "that will never happen to me", then you might be right.
> However, just remember how easy it is to gain information via todays
> computer networks (let alone what some well meaning civil servant will
> provide with just the right prodding <its called "social engineering">).
>
> /RANT off
>
> now that I am done with my soapbox, what is your point, really?
>

> Technomage
>
> In article <ESOf8.8135$106.510294@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
>
> >> As you like with appropriate discounting of credibility. I must
admit
> > the first time I saw it, I read 'Technomange'. While I have known a
few
> > glueheads whom it might fit, I never saw anyone admit it.
> >
> > Dick N�BK
>
>

I was referring to mange; if the shoe fits, by all means wear it.

You don't seriously expect unidentified opinion to be given full weight.
Shirley you jest.

106. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 20:51:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C7FE9B5.6090001@ieee.org>
Source record: 36101

N2EY wrote:

> Tech Plus - 82,985 (decrease of 45,875)
> General - 138,824 (increase of 26,147)
> Advanced - 86,171 (decrease of 13,581)
> Extra - 98,891 (increase of 20,141)

Looks like there may be a good many Tech+'s upgrading
to Extra like Carl did. Think so?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

107. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 21:28:14 UTC
From: Snowbat <snowbat@geocities.com>
Message-ID: <utrv7usj425mv665lhgq278nqth3hdgrv7@4ax.com>
Source record: 36102
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Radio Ham wrote in message
<3c7f5a40_3@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>:

>Steve Terry <g4wwk@oinospamtesco.net> wrote in message
>news:DJDf8.70268$Ah1.8887722@news2-win.server.ntlworld.com...
>> and I suggest you reply at the bottom, and trim.

>Top posting is one Internet convention, and makes sense
>if you have been following a thread, for you get to the
>latest contribution immediately, and then only need
>to refer to the previous stuff if your memory is poor.

Top posting is a recent trend brought about by a design oversight in a
widely distributed email/usenet client coupled with lazy users who
don't understand the concept of trimming quotes in their replies.

Bottom posting is and always was the Usenet convention.

108. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 21:33:50 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020301163350.26498.00001067@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36103

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>Non-licensed applicants soon learn that, and
>proceed
>accordingly, as some have stated clearly here. (wonder why you ignored that?)
>

Why do you ignore the much greater number that have posted here they they
believe that they used the easiest method by learning the underlying material?
I chose to ignore what I believe to be the minority.

73, Ed Hare, W1RFI

109. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 21:36:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020301163602.26498.00001069@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36104

From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net

>The ARRL is only concerned with its membership and is only obligated to
>them. All other non-member hams are of no concern. Case in point, I tried to
>get a membership form by calling the 1-800 number. Besides being insulted
>for not having a credit card, I have been told they have no obligation to
>send me a membership form since I am not a member. Sounds like a Catch-22
>sort of eh?

You said this the last time, and everyone I talked to in Circulations cannot
imagine what you described. They send out paper applications on a daily basis.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

110. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 21:37:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020301163725.26498.00001070@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36105

kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net

>Since I have seen a select few in here that
>it seems to be a major point of interest to, I was wondering if there was
>some type of listing as to when a person MUST upgrade that I may have
>missed.

Dick is in charge of enforcing those things about ham radio that are not
covered in the FCC rules.

Dick, can you tell him how long he is allowed to be a ham before he must
upgrade and what penalty will be imposed on him if he doesn't?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

111. Re: I Am An Outlaw CB Genius!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 22:07:45 UTC
From: Brian Gray <kd4fun@cox.net>
Message-ID: <RYSf8.21085$s03.702495@news2.east.cox.net>
Source record: 36106
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

The frequencies are reserved for the U.S. Goverment you bunch of free band
Morons. You have the technical skill of a dead turtle. You give RTiley
Hollingsworth plenty of job security!
"ZX11D" <w9jcm@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:3c58b8b0_2@corp.newsgroups.com...
> 2 meter hams???????????? LOL thats funny. That show how much you know pal.
> Boy there is allot of 2M dx.!!
> "Twistedhed" <twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com> wrote in message
> news:e9de0154.0112201650.5423f9f0@posting.google.com...
> > "Hammies and dog-pound refugees (dogie,nad,pipeboy) would do well to
> > read my scintillating prose and learned insights on the fine art of
> > freebanding. A pet peeve of mine is that hammies (certain ones) put
> > down radio hobbyists like myself just because they are CBers and just
> > because they use gear that's advanced. I have logged more DX on the
> > freeband than most 2 meter hams have in a lifetime. Why shouldn't I be
> > treated with respect? All I am asking is that the issue of legality be
> > put aside and my acheivements be recognized for what they are"
> >
> > http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html
> >
> > "If you take the time to read this you will see that we on freeband
> > have problems with troublemakers too. They don't abide by our rules.
> > They don't care what others think. They jam and make noises on 27.555.
> > Read about it in my article. They are wrecking my freeband and they
> > should be stopped"
> >
> > http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html
> >
> > "I admit I get all upset when hammies tell me I am breaking rules. I
> > don't care about rules. I don't care what others think. If I want to
> > operate freeband it is my responsibility and I don't like to hear
> > anyone putting me down for it. Read about how we have created our own
> > little illegal alternative to ham radio on the freeband. You hammies
> > can be jealous"
> >
> > http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html
> >
> > "Hammies try to say that there are goverment users on 27.555 and
> > above. I have never heard any myself so that proves there are none.
> > Because of course what I say is true and everyone else is a liar.
> > Read my wonderful prose and see for yourself"
> >
> > http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html

> >
> > "Geniuses like me don't need to obey laws since we are above the
> > masses. Take that, you pussy-footed hams"
>
>
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> ------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

112. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 22:17:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7FFDF6.CB471362@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36108

W1RFI wrote:
> The other context is related to "dumming down." It is clear that the exams of
> today are more comprehensive than the exams I took -- completely so at the
> entry level, and with the exception of the code test at the "all priveleges"
> level, so the premise that amateur radio is dumbed down is, IMHO, a flawed one.

If a 5wpm exam dumbs a person down, can you imagine what my 13wpm exam did to me? And what the 20wpm exam did to Dick and Larry? Dumbed down four times as much as a 5wpm ham? :-) Ed, you must have had some kind of antidote for the dumbing-down syndrome that Morse code causes.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

113. Re: I Am An Outlaw CB Genius!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 22:17:31 UTC
From: Darkhorse <Darkhorse_50@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <a5ouls$7u9$1@newsg4.svr.pol.co.uk>
Source record: 36107
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

"Brian Gray" <kd4fun@cox.net> wrote in message
news:RYSf8.21085$s03.702495@news2.east.cox.net...
> The frequencies are reserved for the U.S. Goverment you bunch of free band
> Morons.

Then why isn't everyone getting busted left, right and centre?

114. Re: ARRL Newsgroup?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 22:19:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C7FFE6E.ECC63608@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36109

KC8PMX wrote:
> I was thinking about this the other day, but I wonder if there would be any
> interest in a rec.radio.amateur.arrl newsgroup or maybe even something like
> rec.radio.amateur.arrl.discussion?
>
> Whaddaya think?

I think what would be a better idea is for the ARRL server to have chat rooms
like some of the other servers. Whaddaya think, Ed?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

115. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 22:41:08 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <8sTf8.7361$gK2.531291@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36110

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org> wrote in message
news:3C7FE9B5.6090001@ieee.org...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > Tech Plus - 82,985 (decrease of 45,875)
> > General - 138,824 (increase of 26,147)
> > Advanced - 86,171 (decrease of 13,581)
> > Extra - 98,891 (increase of 20,141)
>
>
> Looks like there may be a good many Tech+'s upgrading
> to Extra like Carl did. Think so?
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

Certainly one explanation but remember that Pluses are renewed as Techs so they come to expiration and fall off the edge of the Earth.

116. Re: I Am An Outlaw CB Genius!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 22:47:23 UTC
From: Tom Bridge - Doc <t.bridge@verizon.net>
Message-ID: <%xTf8.2383$fl6.1014@nwrddc01.gnilink.net>
Source record: 36111
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Do you really think they use these freqs. lets be real about this with
tecknogly at its best these are discarded and they have the pick of anything
this is just another way for the gov. to make money off of us!!
--
Best Regards!
- Doc -
http://hr2510.homeip.net:2510/

"Brian Gray" <kd4fun@cox.net> wrote in message
news:RYSf8.21085$s03.702495@news2.east.cox.net...
> The frequencies are reserved for the U.S. Goverment you bunch of free band
> Morons. You have the technical skill of a dead turtle. You give RTiley
> Hollingsworth plenty of job security!
> "ZX11D" <w9jcm@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:3c58b8b0_2@corp.newsgroups.com...
> > 2 meter hams???????????? LOL thats funny. That show how much you know
pal.
> > Boy there is allot of 2M dx.!!
> > "Twistedhed" <twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com> wrote in message
> > news:e9de0154.0112201650.5423f9f0@posting.google.com...
> > > "Hammies and dog-pound refugees (dogie,nad,pipeboy) would do well to
> > > read my scintillating prose and learned insights on the fine art of
> > > freebanding. A pet peeve of mine is that hammies (certain ones) put
> > > down radio hobbyists like myself just because they are CBers and just
> > > because they use gear that's advanced. I have logged more DX on the
> > > freeband than most 2 meter hams have in a lifetime. Why shouldn't I be
> > > treated with respect? All I am asking is that the issue of legality be
> > > put aside and my acheivements be recognized for what they are"
> > >
> > > http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html
> > >
> > > "If you take the time to read this you will see that we on freeband
> > > have problems with troublemakers too. They don't abide by our rules.
> > > They don't care what others think. They jam and make noises on 27.555.
> > > Read about it in my article. They are wrecking my freeband and they
> > > should be stopped"
> > >
> > > http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html
> > >
> > > "I admit I get all upset when hammies tell me I am breaking rules. I
> > > don't care about rules. I don't care what others think. If I want to
> > > operate freeband it is my responsibility and I don't like to hear
> > > anyone putting me down for it. Read about how we have created our own

> > > little illegal alternative to ham radio on the freeband. You hammies
> > > can be jealous"
> > >
> > > http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html
> > >
> > > "Hammies try to say that there are goverment users on 27.555 and
> > > above. I have never heard any myself so that proves there are none.
> > > Because of course what I say is true and everyone else is a liar.
> > > Read my wonderful prose and see for yourself"
> > >
> > > http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html
> > >
> > > "Geniuses like me don't need to obey laws since we are above the
> > > masses. Take that, you pussy-footed hams"
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> > http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> > -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----
>
>

117. Re: I Am An Outlaw CB Genius!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 22:57:05 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <5HTf8.7398$gK2.533973@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36112
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Who resurrected this old piece of crap and why is it crossposted to everywhere??????????

"Tom Bridge - Doc" <t.bridge@verizon.net> wrote in message news:%xTf8.2383$fI6.1014@nwrddc01.gnilink.net...
> Do you really think they use these freqs. lets be real about this with
> tecknogly at its best these are discarded and they have the pick of anything
> this is just another way for the gov. to make money off of us!!
> --
> Best Regards!
> - Doc -
> http://hr2510.homeip.net:2510/
>
> "Brian Gray" <kd4fun@cox.net> wrote in message
> news:RYSf8.21085$s03.702495@news2.east.cox.net...
> > The frequencies are reserved for the U.S. Goverment you bunch of free band
> > Morons. You have the technical skill of a dead turtle. You give RTiley
> > Hollingsworth plenty of job security!
> > "ZX11D" <w9jcm@arrl.net> wrote in message
> > news:3c58b8b0_2@corp.newsgroups.com...
> > > 2 meter hams???????????? LOL thats funny. That show how much you know
> pal.
> > > Boy there is allot of 2M dx.!!
> > > "Twistedhed" <twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com> wrote in message
> > > news:e9de0154.0112201650.5423f9f0@posting.google.com...
> > > > "Hammies and dog-pound refugees (dogie,nad,pipeboy) would do well to
> > > > read my scintillating prose and learned insights on the fine art of
> > > > freebanding. A pet peeve of mine is that hammies (certain ones) put
> > > > down radio hobbyists like myself just because they are CBers and just
> > > > because they use gear that's advanced. I have logged more DX on the
> > > > freeband than most 2 meter hams have in a lifetime. Why shouldn't I be
> > > > treated with respect? All I am asking is that the issue of legality be

> > > > put aside and my acheivements be recognized for what they are"
> > > >
> > > > http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html
> > > >
> > > > "If you take the time to read this you will see that we on
freeband
> > > > have problems with troublemakers too. They don't abide by our
rules.
> > > > They don't care what others think. They jam and make noises on
27.555.
> > > > Read about it in my article. They are wrecking my freeband and
they
> > > > should be stopped"
> > > >
> > > > http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html
> > > >
> > > > "I admit I get all upset when hammies tell me I am breaking rules.
I
> > > > don't care about rules. I don't care what others think. If I want
to
> > > > operate freeband it is my responsibility and I don't like to hear
> > > > anyone putting me down for it. Read about how we have created our
own
> > > > little illegal alternative to ham radio on the freeband. You
hammies
> > > > can be jealous"
> > > >
> > > > http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html
> > > >
> > > > "Hammies try to say that there are goverment users on 27.555 and
> > > > above. I have never heard any myself so that proves there are
none.
> > > > Because of course what I say is true and everyone else is a liar.
> > > > Read my wonderful prose and see for yourself"
> > > >
> > > > http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html
> > > >
> > > > "Geniuses like me don't need to obey laws since we are above the
> > > > masses. Take that, you pussy-footed hams"
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> > > http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> > > -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----
> >
> >
>
>

118. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 23:01:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C800870.D57DF384@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36113

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >Non-licensed applicants soon learn that, and
> >proceed
> >accordingly, as some have stated clearly here. (wonder why you ignored that?)
> >
>
> Why do you ignore the much greater number that have posted here they they
> believe that they used the easiest method by learning the underlying material?
> I chose to ignore what I believe to be the minority.

Of those posting here, I certainly agree. I would note, however, that those posting here
are but a minuscule portion of licensed hams, and few posting here are of the W5TIT
variety in that few of the informationless memorizers like her (her description, not mine)
are represented. Thus it would follow that the large majority of posters here did NOT
do only the word associations as do so many who have no technical background whatever
but want a quick ham radio license. In our day we we, who had no background in radio
technology, found it necessary to start at the beginning, which for most of us that would have
been Novice, do the necessary learning required to advance as the years passed, and
we wound up at least somewhat learned, to varying degrees, in radio technology.
Today, what the are required to do is download the question pool and start making the
necessary word associations, and the license is theirs, after a relatively short but intense period
of memory work. It's fact. Unpopular in certain circles, but true.

119. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 23:03:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8008D8.CD6FF58D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36114

W1RFI wrote:

> kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net
>
> >Since I have seen a select few in here that
> >it seems to be a major point of interest to, I was wondering if there was
> >some type of listing as to when a person MUST upgrade that I may have
> >missed.
>
> Dick is in charge of enforcing those things about ham radio that are not
> covered in the FCC rules.
>
> Dick, can you tell him how long he is allowed to be a ham before he must
> upgrade and what penalty will be imposed on him if he doesn't?
>

Are you vying with Cecil for the position of Trollmeister of RRAP?

120. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 23:14:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C800B53.5358524D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36116

Dick Carroll wrote:
> It's fact. Unpopular in certain circles, but true.

Speaking of which, Dick, I sent in a FISTS application and they said
they were reissuing numbers of people who failed to renew their subscription.
By some strange coincidence, I was reissued FISTS number 3939. That must make
us blood brothers.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

121. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 23:16:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C800BB8.FA4F026B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36117

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > Dick, can you tell him how long he is allowed to be a ham before he must
> > upgrade and what penalty will be imposed on him if he doesn't?
>
> Are you vying with Cecil for the position of Trollmeister of RRAP?

It's a fair question, Dick, given the grief you have tried to heap upon
me for delaying my upgrade to Extra.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

122. Re: Bootleg Call signs - Identity theft?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 23:16:16 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gsb8w06.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 36115

On 28 Feb 2002 22:25:01 GMT, W1RFI wrote:

>Not necessarily so. I believe under the convention used for aircraft
>identification, some of the combinations can duplicate amateur assignments.

I went around with Gettysburg, Washington, and the FAA on that
about 10 years ago at the request of California DMV who was holding a
request for "personalized" auto plates based on an FAA tail number
that was identical to an amateur call which the applicant did not
hold.

What it comes down to is that the FAA issues "tail numbers" for
aircraft identification, starting with the letter "N" followed by a
numeric or numeric+alpha string. This is not a radio license or
call sign. The pilot of said aircraft can use that tail number
INSTEAD of an FCC-issued call sign for radio identification, the
same way that a pilot of an air carrier aircraft can use the name
and flight number of the operator (airline).

If one presses the FCC to issue a call sign to an aircraft one gets
a five-letter call sign where the last two letters are not FM, TV, DT,
CA or LP (those combos are used for broadcast station call letters).

>> So, for example, would a person identifying
>>themselves to an emergency organization as a Ham, by supplying a bootlegged
>>callsign as proof, a crime?
>
>I will leave that for the lawyers to unravel -- or ravel! :-)

In most jurisdictions knowingly making a false statement in an
official matter is a crime, and the defendant upon conviction can ve
fined, imprisoned, or sentenved to do "community service".

In local or state courts, "community service" usually consists of
spending the weekends in an orange vest and hard hat along the
freeway building up a good suntan and muscles while appearing to
pick up trash. In Federal cases, though, "community service"
usually consists of cleaning bedpans in the Veterans Hospital - a
much more meaningful occupation for those who make false statements.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

123. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 23:17:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C800BFA.51819CA0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36118

Richard McCollum wrote:
> Certainly one explanation but remember that Pluses are renewed as Techs so
> they come to expiration and fall off the edge of the Earth.

Egads, I hope they are furnished space suits in the process.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

124. Re: I Am An Outlaw CB Genius!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 23:19:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C800C86.865A0316@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36119
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Richard McCollum wrote:
> Who resurrected this old piece of crap and why is it crossposted to
> everywhere??????????

Egads, Dick, why is r.r.cb, r.r.a.p, and r.r.a.swap considered "everywhere"?
Maybe you should get out more?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

125. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 23:34:23 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5p31l05i7@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 36122

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a5mhbjipl1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net...
> > Then FISTS, the ARRL, or any PCTA types should be pushing these
> endorsements
> > if they want morse code to endure. They've depended on welfare support
of
> > the mode via code testing, and now it's time to work for it.
>
> Why not an annualcode recieving contest too?
>
> Many hobby pursuits encorage "excellence" by
> hosting contests that focus on desired qualities.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Larry, Dick, etc., would rather sit back and complain about how lazy
everyone is, instead of taking a proactive position.

126. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 23:41:41 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5p3eb06s5@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 36124

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7EECD8.54378369@worldnet.att.net...
> Krell, you really aren't very bright, are you? So what did Stevenson do
for
> over 25 years,
> instead of hang out on HF (as he clearly was desperate to do)? Huh?

From the looks of his website, a helluva lot more than you've done.

127. Re: Code Is Dead

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 23:42:00 UTC
From: leadpipe@pittnet.com
Message-ID: <410b6521.0203011541.8f044ab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 36120

Too late. I get up in your area several times a year, and I seem to
rember that callsign. You didn't seem to mind talking to me.
73's until next time.
>
> I might have to use CW on HF just to avoid both unlicensed individuals, folks such as you mention, and you as well.

128. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 23:48:31 UTC
From: Graham Sharp <sharpg@lineone.net>
Message-ID: <07408uklbqe5uo4mol0k26jn0ammccjdr7@4ax.com>
Source record: 36121
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Fri, 01 Mar 2002 21:28:14 GMT, Snowbat <snowbat@geocities.com>
wrote:

>Top posting is a recent trend brought about by a design oversight in a
>widely distributed email/usenet client coupled with lazy users who
>don't understand the concept of trimming quotes in their replies.
>
>Bottom posting is and always was the Usenet convention.

Agreed, but I believe that 'top posting' is also brought about due to
it being the norm for email. Thus for many email users, unused to
newsnet, it seems strange and inconsistent to bottom post.

73 de Graham

129. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 23:52:12 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5p42208ek@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 36125
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Martin" <mdwade@mobiletel.com> wrote in message
news:3C7EF51E.5580@mobiletel.com...
> Brits had 3 centuries of French Lessons, how many have you had?

You'd better go back and take some more. According to the French, you still
can't speak it properly.

> BTW, if you like French so much spend a month in Quebec or Paris!

Personally, I'll take Toronto over Quebec, Paris, or London.

130. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-01 23:54:57 UTC
From: Graham Sharp <sharpg@lineone.net>
Message-ID: <tv408uoats1fp2m96hgfok017eonpu1dcr@4ax.com>
Source record: 36123
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 28 Feb 2002 22:20:24 -0500, "Jerry Oxendine"
<joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote:

>And as just another incorrect American, I have to ask just what is a
>"looser"? Is it something
>that has come "loose" from its moorings? Is it "looser" than it was
>yesterday? Oh! Could it
>be that you meant "Loser"!

More like: just another American with no irony receptors. <sigh>

73 de Graham

131. Re: Code Is Dead

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 00:24:35 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <7ZUf8.8809$106.565884@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36126

Oh, I don't mind for casual conversation - I'm just curious. I just heard the rain report ... seems some ARRL VECs were caught allowing folks to cheat. Ok, so someone doesn't want to know code yet wants a license; at what point would you consider someone 'not qualified' to hold a license? Should they be required to spell their name correctly? I assume they should provide their street address, hopefully without error. Or, perhaps as someone in the rec.radio.cb group suggested, 50% should be passing. So if you can spell your name, you pass; if not, getting your street address should allow you to pass? I admit that the purpose of the amateur license should be to encourage folks to experiment in electronics and communications, but I also have to assume that they should be a potential help to the community. This (at least to me) would require some basic knowlege of electronics, the ability to put up some kind of a makeshift antenna that can radiate, and at least enough knowlege to keep themselves out of trouble when working on higher power devices (or the 110 mains). Believe me, I am NOT of the mentality you assume on the part of the extras; however, I will ask you this - just what kind of knowlege do you think one should have before being issued a ticket? I am serious about this.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Leadpipe" <leadpipe@pittnet.com> wrote in message
news:410b6521.0203011541.8f044ab@posting.google.com...
> Too late. I get up in your area several times a year, and I seem to
> rember that callsign. You didn't seem to mind talking to me.
> 73's until next time.
> >
> > I might have to use CW on HF just to avoid both unlicensed individuals,
folks such as you mention, and you as well.

132. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 00:42:40 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C802000.73CCC908@uci.edu>
Source record: 36127

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > It's fact. Unpopular in certain circles, but true.
>
> Speaking of which, Dick, I sent in a FISTS application and they said
> they were reissuing numbers of people who failed to renew their subscription.
> By some strange coincidence, I was reissued FISTS number 3939. That must make
> us blood brothers.

Geez, Cecil. That's evil. Guess you made YOUR point. chrise.

133. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 01:29:09 UTC
From: Martin <mdwade@mobiletel.com>
Message-ID: <3C802AE5.4FFB@mobiletel.com>
Source record: 36128
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Krell wrote:
>
> "Martin" <mdwade@mobiletel.com> wrote in message
> news:3C7EF51E.5580@mobiletel.com...
> > Brits had 3 centuries of French Lessons, how many have you had?
>
> You'd better go back and take some more. According to the French, you still
> can't speak it properly.
>
> > BTW, if you like French so much spend a month in Quebec or Paris!
>
> Personally, I'll take Toronto over Quebec, Paris, or London.
EXCELLENT CHOICE, (Kinda prejuidice here, Ontario is/was a home!

134. Re: ARRL again affirms eQSL Cards -OK- for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 01:58:49 UTC
From: Ronald Oberloh <wa0kds@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3C8031D8.F66E004A@yahoo.com>
Source record: 36129
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

Think you are wrong on this one but that is your choose.

Jim Higgins wrote:

> On Wed, 27 Feb 2002 16:37:04 -0700, in
> <3C7D6D9F.41F65113@yahoo.com>, Ronald Oberloh <wa0kds@yahoo.com>
> wrote:
>
> >Jim Higgins wrote:
> >>
> >> On Sat, 23 Feb 2002 14:46:18 -0700, in
> >> <3c780dab$1@news.bnb-lp.com>, "Charles Johnston"
> >> <ctj92@cableone.net> wrote:
> >>
> >>>The ARRL has recently reaffirmed just one week after the
> >>>original historic announcement (08-Feb-2002) that eQSL
> >>>Cards - ARE - accepted for DXCC.... this remark from the
> >>>eQSL Webmaster found at this URL:
> >>> http://www.eqsl.cc/qslcard/comments.cfm
> >>>"ARRL reaffirmed today that it will accept eQSLs that are
> >>>mailed. AG or not" (Webmaster) 15-Feb-2002
> >>
> >> Charles,
> >>
> >> The eQSL Webmaster is incorrect. His statement is based on a
> >> misunderstanding of the response received from ARRL.
> >>
> >> The ARRL response, available at the eQSL site if you look for it
> >> follows:
> >>
> >> ==== Begin ARRL Email ====
> >>
> >> From: Moore, Bill, NC1L [mailto:bmoore@arrl.org]
> >> Sent: Friday, February 08, 2002 12:31 PM
> >> To: 'Richard B. Drake'
> >> Cc: DXCC
> >> Subject: RE: Professionally Printed and mailed eQSL's
> >>
> >> Hi Rich: Something does not sound right here. You are saying that
> >> Dave is physically mailing out QSL cards by the US postal system?
> >> This is news to me.
> >>
> >> If you are my QSL manager and I send you my logs by e-mail, I am

> >> sending them direct from point A to point B. Just as if I was
> >> sending them to you by regular mail. This is OK. I remember
> >> somewhere several years ago that some people used to get their
> >> logs over the air on RTTY and another digital mode (AMTOR I
> >> think). Not a problem.
> >>
> >> However, if as the result of a log being sent to E-QSL, someone
> >> goes in and receives a card electronically and uses it for DXCC,
> >> that e-QSL cannot be accepted for DXCC credit under rule 2. I
> >> spent a bit of time with a simple shareware program to prove the
> >> unreliability of that method.
> >>
> >> However, if Dave, acting as QSL manager with station logs
> >> completes a card (even one from his printer) and sends it by mail
> >> to you, this is an acceptable exchange and we have see this often
> >> for several years now. (assuming he phyiscally checks the log).
> >> Many people use self-made cards from their printer. Each one is
> >> evaluated on a case by case basis, and many times under Section
> >> IV rule 4(b) we have conducted an audit to insure the vaildity of
> >> a card like this.
> >>
> >> In cases like this it would be REAL nice if they used a stamp or
> >> placed their initials or signature on it, but this is not
> >> required by the rules. However, this issue has been discussed and
> >> has been given some consideration.
> >>
> >> To clarify, if Dave is sending out cards through the US Postal
> >> System as the result of the log(s) he receives, this is OK.
> >> (This would basically be operating as QSL manager).
> >>
> >> Regards, Bill Moore NC1L
> >> DXCC Manager
> >>
> >> Note: Use of this message is authorized in discussions as long as
> >> it is used in its entirity and as long as parts are not edited
> >> out.
> >>
> >> ==== End ARRL Email ====
> >>
> >> The key to understanding what this means, which eQSL clearly does
> >> not, is found in the words "acting as QSL manager with station
> >> logs."
> >>
> >> A QSL manager receives a log from the managed station and waits
> >> for QSLs (or in the case of an operation like eQSL they would
> >> wait for individual or bulk uploaded contact information) to
> >> arrive requesting a QSL from the station he manages. He then
> >> checks the received card (contact info) vs the managed station's
> >> log to see that the contact is valid; i.e., call sign, signal
> >> report, band, mode, date and time (within a reasonable clock

> >> setting/drift error) match. If it is a valid QSO, he issues a
> >> card. If it isn't he should trash that QSL, not pass it along to
> >> the station he manages. It's an invalid QSO.
> >>
> >> eQSL does not do this. eQSL receives a log and immediately makes
> >> cards available to all stations in that log without checking the
> >> information the other station has in his log or on his QSL. This
> >> is not acting as a QSL Manager; this is just plain presumptive
> >> QSLing. It is not adequate that the receiving station look at
> >> the QSL and confirm it. How many do you think will refuse a QSL
> >> from a really rare one who put the wrong call in his log so the
> >> eQSL went to the wrong person, or if the signal reports don't
> >> match, etc? There is no independent check here, thus eQSL is not
> >> performing the duties of a QSL manager, thus the eQSLs are not
> >> accepted by ARRL.
> >>
> >> The ARRL has not changed their policy as regards acceptance of
> >> eQSLs for DXCC credit.
> >>
> >> Now, I can't speak for the ARRL, but it seems to me that some
> >> software changes by eQSL could probably overcome the objections I
> >> see.
> >>
> >> Let everyone who wants to QSL via eQSL upload their logs and let
> >> the software do the cross checking a QSL manager does. Do not
> >> show anyone any information (except what he posted himself) in
> >> any form, especially not as a QSL ready for download, until that
> >> cross check has been completed, then display cards only for QSOs
> >> that match. Now *THAT* seems to stand a chance of passing muster
> >> for acceptance for DXCC credit. Whether or not eQSL would need
> >> to print and mail a QSL at that point vs just present the card
> >> for download/printing I don't know, but eQSL is too far from that
> >> point to worry about that right now. The mechanism is already in
> >> place to print and mail if required, so that isn't a hurdle
> >> anyhow.
> >>
> >> So, as I see it, eQSL need to put the rest of the requirements
> >> met by authorized QSL managers in place. In the meantime they
> >> apparently are accepting $1 per card printed and mailed for cards
> >> that will *NOT* be accepted for DXCC credit.
>
> >Kind of confused by this one (the following). I have received many QSL's
> >from DX that I did not originate (I did not send them a card first) so what
> >makes receiving a card from a eQSL log any different than a paper one ??
>
> >>"eQSL does not do this. eQSL receives a log and immediately makes
> >>cards available to all stations in that log without checking the
> >>information the other station has in his log or on his QSL. This
> >>is not acting as a QSL Manager; this is just plain presumptive
> >>QSLing. It is not adequate that the receiving station look at

> >>the QSL and confirm it. How many do you think will refuse a QSL
> >>from a really rare one who put the wrong call in his log so the
> >>eQSL went to the wrong person, or if the signal reports don't
> >>match, etc? There is no independent check here, thus eQSL is not
> >>performing the duties of a QSL manager, thus the eQSLs are not
> >>accepted by ARRL."
>
> Can eQSL absolutely assure the identity of every station that
> uploads a log? The answer is NO! An authorized QSL manager
> KNOWS the log he gets from the station he manages comes from that
> station. There's one very major difference.
>
> >Come on people eQSL are the way it has to be done going forward
> >into the 21st Century.
>
> But not the way eQSL is doing it. The DXCC program was been
> plagued with too many cheats in years gone by - everything from
> forged cards to bought cards to DXpeditions that weren't where
> they said they were. I'm glad to see ARRL holding the line.
>
> If you want to say "Come on people," say it to eQSL. They need
> to verify all uploaders (or at least those who want to count for
> DXCC credit), then if they want to play QSL manager, they need to
> do the sort of verification that QSL managers do. Software can
> do the latter.
>
> I think too many see a cheap and easy way to get QSLs without the
> 1-year wait resulting from going via "burro" and don't look any
> farther. The eQSL model as it now exists is potentially a
> cheater's paradise, requiring time consuming double checking with
> the source of the cards as the only way to catch the cheats. I
> prefer to shift the burden to those who seem set up to profit
> from it - namely eQSL at $1 per card.
>
> Bottom line - I just explained the ARRL reasoning and clarified
> that eQSLs are NOT being accepted. I didn't make the policy.
> You and many others who read this should probably be glad that
> now you won't go out and aggressively collect eQSLs only to find
> out they really don't count for DXCC credit. If you want to be
> pissed, be pissed at those who keep saying ARRL accepts them when
> they really don't.
>
> --
> Jim Higgins, quasimodo AT yahoo DOT com
> icbm: 33.55.34N, 80.24.21W

135. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 02:08:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C80341A.567B59D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36130

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > It's fact. Unpopular in certain circles, but true.
> >
> > Speaking of which, Dick, I sent in a FISTS application and they said
> > they were reissuing numbers of people who failed to renew their subscription.
> > By some strange coincidence, I was reissued FISTS number 3939. That must make
> > us blood brothers.
>
> Geez, Cecil. That's evil. Guess you made YOUR point. chrise.

The devil made me do it. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

136. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 02:10:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8034AC.921BB9B3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36131

Krell wrote:
> Larry, Dick, etc., would rather sit back and complain about how lazy
> everyone is, instead of taking a proactive position.

Larry and Dick are extremely proactive in calling everyone dirty
names who doesn't agree with them.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

137. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 02:17:49 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16e9d56034df8eab9896a2@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36132

In article <dXLf8.179$gc.144503@monger.newsread.com>,
kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net says...

> Using radio's most basic mode.... (since you didn't state amateur radio's
> most basic mode) So how come 911 dispatchers, firefighters, law enforcement,
> ambulance jockeys, and many other services who very well may come up with an
> alternate means of communicating when conventional modes fail aren't
> required to learn it? If there is definitely a case where the need for a
> message to get through is more important than most we will ever do, publice
> service frequency occupants would have to be a prime example?
>
> If morse code is so important, why aren't they required?

Simply because that for the job that they do, CW isn't required. You're
talking about local communications on VHF frequencies. It's hard to see
any kind of advantage that CW would have over voice in those situations.
However, it's not hard to see the potential advantage of CW in emergency
communications between stations at large distances.

joshua houk
ac7ri (ex-kd7pos)

138. Re: Bootleg Call signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 02:32:50 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <5be1855ae04df78bafec5b174e4560ba.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 36133

"Bill" <kf6wxj@cwnet.com> wrote in message
news:3c6ef76c$1_1@news3.cwnet.com...

> Ive been getting email from a couple of guys that claim to be hams. One is
> supposed to be an extra class operator and the other claims to be an
> advanced operator. Neither one know any code. Is this illegal? Bill
> KF6WXJ

Trollin', trollin', trolling' down the ri-i-i-i-ver.

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

139. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 02:59:01 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020301215901.21807.00000501@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 36134

In article <3c7e3701_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>> I'd hope that 3 hams are in the minority -- but with the way things are
>> going, that may not be so in the future!
>
>Larry ... it's nice to see you admit what I've known for a long
>time ... that you, Dick, and other fanatical Morse test "insisters"
>ARE in the minority ... :-)

Carl:

Hey, my brain may be sorta fried from all that beeping, but at least
I can still count!

>> Naaahhh -- they were just probably dismissing you as a clueless, lazy,
>dumbed-down no-coder.
>
>I love it, Larry ... the anti-anyone-who-doesn't-love-code-and-willingly-
>bow-down-to-your-"superiority" rhetoric that you, Dick, and others
>like you spew is arguably one of the most effective arguments in favor
>of the NCTA.

Thang Kew.

>Please don't stop ... we really appreciate your help! :-)
>
>Carl - wa6vse
>
>p.s. Please don't listen to Ed when he tries to tell you that you're
>your own worst enemies, either :-)

Don't worry, Carl -- I don't take Ed any more seriously than I do you!
I love you guys like my own brothers, but I know we'll never see
eye-to-eye. I guess we all get to go on living.

73 de Larry, K3LT

140. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 02:59:01 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020301215901.21807.00000502@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 36135

In article <3C7DB0DA.F2347E63@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> It just so happens that when you "rote memorize" something, you've
>> learned it!
>
>But, but, but, Larry, the argument that all the doomsayers are using is
>that the present exams are too easy because they can be rote memorized.

Cecil:

I can rote-memorize the complete study manual for the FAA written
exams to be a pilot. Does that mean that the exams are too easy?
Keep in mind, there is a lot more at stake when flying an airplane
than there is when kerchunking a repeater. I am not one of the
aforementioned doomsayers. I'm the doomsayer who wants to keep
the code test.

73 de Larry, K3LT

141. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 02:59:02 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020301215902.21807.00000503@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 36136

In article <3C7E4650.902ABD3E@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>
>> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> > It just so happens that when you "rote memorize" something, you've
>> > learned it!
>>
>> But, but, but, Larry, the argument that all the doomsayers are using is
>> that the present exams are too easy because they can be rote memorized.
>
> Wrong, as usual. It's not the "exams", it's word associations that remain
>essentially meaningless (to the memorizer) but allow a passing grade and
>a license to result. For all those who actually learn the material, hooray
for
>you.

Dick:

Memorization is an important part in the learning process. Just *how*
important will vary from individual to individual -- we all have differences
in long-/short-term memory capacity. Four semesters of college German
showed me very clearly that the only to get a working knowledge of
all those nouns and verbs is to just drill a hole in your head and pour
them in! To aid in the learning process, we also reinforce our memory
with mental exercises involving the material just learned, thus creating
even more neural connections leading to the correct drive, directory,
and binary file. However, it all starts with memory, and you've either
got RAM, or you don't.

I've never signed on to the notion that rote memorization of Q&A's
is in any invalid as a learning process for ham radio licensing, or
anything else. If you don't believe me, go ask John and Martha King.

73 de Larry, K3LT

142. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 03:10:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020301221008.26726.00000196@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 36137

In article <a5mhbjipl1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Why not an annualcode recieving contest too?

GREAT IDEA! They used to have them - they were called
"copying bees". Various stations would transmit long messages
at various speeds, and the goal was to copy them correctly. They
would occasionally toss in a misspelled word or ungrammatical
sentence just for fun. Score was by minimum number of errors.

Today we do something similar, only they're called DX test, SS, Field Day, etc.
;-)
>
>Many hobby pursuits encorage "excellence" by
>hosting contests that focus on desired qualities.

Yup. Even though some folks might disparage such efforts, calling
them "electronic paintball wars" and such.

Reviving the "copying bee" is a GREAT idea, Bill! Thanks!

73 de Jim, N2EY

143. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 03:48:55 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c804dc1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36138

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C7F1A48.A92DB65C@worldnet.att.net...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > In article <a5mi5l$qs2$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> > <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >
> > >> >> >Take the WTC disaster. I've already offered that someone provide
the
> > >> >> >message that was relayed out of that disaster scene--this
country's
> > >> >worst.
> > >> >>
> > >> >> whoa! This country's worst disaster? By what measure?
> > >
> > >Not sure who asked this, but by the number of people killed,
> > >the 911 WTC is certainly one of the worst, if not the worst.
> > >I don't know of any other "disastor" that had as many people killed...
> > >but I'm willing to listen.
> >
> > Kim called it "this country's worst" disaster, which is pretty clear. I
don't
> > mean to trivialize or minimize it in any way, but "worst" is pretty
strong
> > stuff.
> >
> > Let's exclude acts of war, even though 9/11 was clearly an act of war
against
> > the
> > USA.
> >
> > Here's one that comes to mind:
> >
> > In September of 1900 a major hurricane hit Galveston, Texas and killed
over
> > 5000
> > people. Yes, it was over 100 years ago but it sure qualifies in terms of
being
> > a
> > disaster and in the USA.
>
> Then shortly after WW2 a pair of shiploads of fertilizer exploded in the
harbor
> at Texas City

> pretty well leveling the whole place. I don't recall how many people it killed,
> but it was a lot, and it sure qualified as a major disaster.
>

Dick would disagree just for the sake of disagreeing. I think the WTC is the worst disaster this country has ever seen...other than the drug war.

Kim W5TIT

144. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 03:51:34 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c804e5d$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36140

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020301053818.26465.00001133@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>
> >They're scairt 'cause it's the only thing they're good at...
>
> Do you really believe that Morse code is the only amateur skill that Dick
and
> Larry are good at? Even a casual read of the things they have said here
> indicate otherwise... and I know that you give Larry more than a casual
read.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

I would have to believe them both to be trustworthy in order for me to believe what they say about themselves. I believe neither. Oh, and ham radio *is* what I am talking about--not just CW. Ham radio is probably all they're both good at...although I even have my doubts about that.

Kim W5TIT

145. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 03:54:07 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c804f0d$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36141

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020301060425.26465.00001139@mb-fx.aol.com...
> >From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>
> >So, we're just counting numbers of people killed. OK, you're right Jim,
as
> >always.
>
> Maybe not. At first I was going to agree with Jim, but I think that if we
look
> at the impact of both disasters on our nation as a whole, 9/11 is the
worst
> hands down. We did not see the nationwide financial impact, nationwide
changes
> to our transportation system or nationwide changes to our sense of
security
> after any of the hurricanes. Perhaps one could argue that our being
involved
> in World War II was a worst disaster, or that the attack on Pearl Harbor
had a
> greater impact on our nation.
>
> "Worst" can mean a lot of things to a lot of people.
>
>

Yeah. It's the character judgements that really suck...

Kim W5TIT

146. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 03:55:23 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c804f42$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36142

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020301061305.26465.00001141@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> Can't have it your way so you want to blow it to bits - nice guy.
> > >
> > > That's total nonsense. The charge was set long ago and now the fuse is
lit.
> > >The rest is inevitable.
>
> He wants someone else to blow it to bits. :-)
>
> Every prophet of doom in the amateur radio service since its inception has
been
> wrong.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

For some people, being miserable is so much easier, eh? ;)

Kim W5TIT

147. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 03:58:19 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c804ff2$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36143

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020301062128.26465.00001144@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>
> > And, Larry? Well,
> >who in the world would have him?
>
> I don't know, Kim; you and Larry do seem intensely interested in each
other on
> this forum...
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Larry does kinda invoke the same curiosity that I might have in a lab rat...

Kim W5TIT

148. Re: ARRL Newsgroup?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 04:00:53 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gsbf1q8.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 36139

On Fri, 01 Mar 2002 16:19:26 -0600, CAM wrote:

>I think what would be a better idea is for the ARRL server to have
>chat rooms like some of the other servers. Whaddaya think, Ed? -

I for one vote for either a mail group or a "reflector" type list a
la Yahoo -- something that I can automatically download and
read off-line with my text-based reader, not with a browser.

My greatest fear is that it will turn into a "The League is for
S**T" forum.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

149. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 04:15:06 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c8053e4_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36144

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020301104725.16967.00001184@mb-dd.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> >From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
> >Date: 2/28/2002 9:28 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3c7ef76b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
>
> >- our government continues to legislate and impinge upon civil liberties
> >over it
>
> Which one's, Kim?
>

Just for a start, because you'd have to read the whole Act to find
everything uncomfortable about it, how about the ability of the government
to now "scan" our discourses on the interent; listen in on phone
conversations; hold people in custody for much longer a period of time than
is even reasonable...

>
> Were you unable to vote today?
>
> Did anyone refuse to hire you because of your gender or
predisposition to
> an "alternative" lifestyle?
>

That happens every day to people. Nothing new about that at all.

>
> Did a police officer not inform you of your right to legal
representation
> after he (since we no longer allow women officers) arresetd you?
>

Women officers? They're all over Dallas. And, Miranda was suspended before
the WTC, so I don't think that could be included as a result of the
disaster.

> >
> >- patriotism has become the new measure by which we accept each other
(yes,
> >that is a bad thing)
>
> I don't believe you really mean this. You can BE a patriot and still
> disagree with "the system". And I DO consider someone based upon THIER

frame
> of reference to what thier views on America are.
>

I *do* mean that. It's almost like if one does not have flag glued to their vehicle in some manner, or hanging from their home, their patriotism comes into question. That is beginning to die down a little here.

> >
> >And that probably just scratches the surface. Internationally, financially,
> >emotionally, this disaster continues to spread out like a nuclear blast.
>
> And unfortunately there are a great number of people who made comments to
> the like of "it will take an act of war or grand act of terrorism to get them
> to wake up..."
>
> They were right. Unfortunately, what we consider as "rights" are NOT
> really "rights". They are what society THINKS are "rights" at any given moment
> and are subject to change by vote or convention.
>

Well, I consider them freedoms. Your mileage may vary.

>
> Even more unfortunate is that had we been "riding herd" on some of these
> groups a long time ago, WTC 9/11 would have never occured. Yes, some
> individuals may have gotten thier individual toes stepped on in the process and
> that is unfortunate. But look at what FAILING to invest in our security did to
> us.
>

Hmmmm, we always seem to feel so safe and warm. For how long has the "Made in China" tag been around; Japan; etc. In my opinion, we've been "asleep at the wheel" while America's been taken over silently. Never a shot fired...

>
> You are right, Kim. The dust hasn't settled yet. The financial fallout
> will be years in settling. Families have been torn apart and billions of
> dollars wasted that could have been invested in our future and wellbeing.
>

Yeah, I love these companies who are suddenly doing so awful. There's those that are legitimate. There's also those that are playing this to the hilt and taking every opportunity they will.

>
> Can you honestly say that all that was lost is worth it since, along
the
> way, someone didn't get hassled by a federal investigator trying to make
sure
> this could never happen?
>

I can't quite get that question, Steve...maybe I need a shot ;)

>
> Our "security" and our "rights" are fluid concepts. Only the Bible
has
> rules in it that are supposedly unvioable, and those are the one's we seem
to
> break most often. What makes anyone think anything written by the hand of
man
> is so sacrosanct?
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

When there's a entity in power out there that begins making decisions on what I say--whether intended as a joke or perfectly serious--and is given leeway to begin scanning what I say, I get real nervous. I don't think any entity in power should have that latitude. Maybe if I'd always grown up and lived under dictatorial type governments the concept wouldn't bother me so much.

Kim W5TIT

150. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 04:23:11 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c8055c8_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36145

And, I continue to learn what I need to in ham radio. I was
informationless, as Dick puts it, coming into the hobby. I have more
information now, a few years later. I did exactly what was required of me
to obtain a license.

Kim W5TIT

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C800870.D57DF384@worldnet.att.net...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > >Non-licensed applicants soon learn that, and
> > >proceed
> > >accordingly, as some have stated clearly here. (wonder why you ignored
that?)
> > >
> >
> > Why do you ignore the much greater number that have posted here they
they
> > believe that they used the easiest method by learning the underlying
material?
> > I chose to ignore what I believe to be the minority.
>
> Of those posting here, I certainly agree. I would note, however, that
those
> posting here
> are but a minuscule portion of licensed hams, and few posting here are of
the
> W5TIT
> variety in that few of the informationless memorizers like her (her
description,
> not mine)
> are represented. Thus it would follow that the large majority of posters
here did
> NOT
> do only the word associations as do so many who have no technical
background
> whatever
> but want a quick ham radio license. In our day we we, who had no
background in
> radio
> technology, found it necessary to start at the beginning, which for most
of us

> that would have
> been Novice, do the necessary learning required to advance as the years
passed,
> and
> we wound up at least somewhat learned, to varying degrees, in radio
technology.
> Today, what the are required to do is download the question pool and start
making
> the
> necessary word associations, and the license is theirs, after a relatively
short
> but intense period
> of memory work. It's fact. Unpopular in certain circles, but true.
>

151. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 04:26:26 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c805689$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36146

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020301215901.21807.00000501@mb-mq.aol.com...
>
>
> Don't worry, Carl -- I don't take Ed any more seriously than I do you!
> I love you guys like my own brothers, but I know we'll never see
> eye-to-eye. I guess we all get to go on living.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

First, envious of my tits. Then, he's telling men he loves them...

Kim W5TIT

152. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 04:28:27 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c805703_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36147

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C8034AC.921BB9B3@IEEE.org...
> Krell wrote:
> > Larry, Dick, etc., would rather sit back and complain about how lazy
> > everyone is, instead of taking a proactive position.
>
> Larry and Dick are extremely proactive in calling everyone dirty
> names who doesn't agree with them.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

I forget where I read this: sometimes the traits we so vehemently despise in others are the very traits we see most in ourselves. Larry and Dick are probably just looking at an awfully lot of reflections.

Kim W5TIT

153. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 04:29:39 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c80574b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36148

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a5p3eb06s5@enews1.newsguy.com...
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C7EECD8.54378369@worldnet.att.net...
> > Krell, you really aren't very bright, are you? So what did Stevenson do
> for
> > over 25 years,
> > instead of hang out on HF (as he clearly was desperate to do)? Huh?
>
> From the looks of his website, a helluva lot more than you've done.
>
>

It's that reflection thingy gettin' in his way...LOL

Kim W5TIT

154. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 04:55:25 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020301235525.21807.00000513@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 36149

In article <3c7ef76b_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>- patriotism has become the new measure by which we accept each other (yes,
>that is a bad thing)

Kim:

Yes, my dear, you are exactly right -- I do NOT accept American
citizens who aren't patriotic, loyal, and supportive of this country and
the precious freedom and liberty we enjoy here.

If you think American patriotism is a bad thing, then I cordially invite
you to renounce your American citizenship and go live somewhere
else.

73 de Larry, K3LT

155. Re: Code Is Dead

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 04:55:25 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020301235525.21807.00000514@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 36151

In article <3C7FE297.61AB7527@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>Nice troll.
>
>I wonder what it rates on Hans' ol' trollometer?
>
>Leadpipe wrote:
>
>> I have learned much from them
>> about radio protocall that I was able to put to immediate use on CB
>> through the years.

Jim:

Well, since he landed on his ass more than once, I'm sure the
French judge gave him at least a 5.9.

73 de Larry, K3LT

156. Re: Code Is Dead

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 04:55:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020301235526.21807.00000515@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 36153

In article <410b6521.0202282049.72906c94@posting.google.com>,
leadpipe@pittnet.com (Leadpipe) writes:

>
>I cannot wait till the code requirement is dropped completely from ARS
>so that I can follow in the footsteps of my mentors. Those "20WPM
>Extras" and other code pushing scum that are icons of Amateur Radio
>legend have given us underlings a good education on how to act on HF
>by putting these practices on display on 3898, and 14313 and other
>pompous sections of those elitist bands. I have learned much from them
>about radio protocall that I was able to put to immediate use on CB
>through the years. I as a no code tech that passed his advanced, and
>almost passed the extra written when I tested for my license will be
>looking forward to talking with all my dear friends on HF while I use
>fowl language, discuss the intricacies of trailer trash, tell cat
>killing stories, and work the actions of my firearms, as I have heard
>all of you fine examples do for years. I salute you in your pursuit of
>Amateur Radio excellence, and hope to join you soon in your unholy
>endeavors. Even now I am laying my evil plans, and it will give me
>another use for the best CB I ever owned. A Yaesu FT-100! Two meters,
>440, 6 meters, and CB at 100 watts all in one box. Life is good!

There you have it, folks! A perfect example of the value of the code
testing requirements as a "LID filter." In his own poor attempt at a
troll, Leadpipe has proven the value of the PCTA philosophy by having
been "filtered out" of HF by one of the best secondary attributes of
code testing! And when he does finally get his codeless HF privileges,
I hope you enjoy his on-the-air antics, for I'm sure that was the one
part of his message about which he was totally serious!

73 de Larry, K3LT

157. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 04:55:27 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020301235527.21807.00000516@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 36152

In article <3c7ef18e_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> >Oh good grief, Larry. The day I win respect and courtesy from the likes
>of you would be the day I'd hope I'd come to my senses.
>>
>> Kim:
>>
>> As it happens, that is correct!

>I'd come to my senses and rid myself of your good graces as quickly as
>possible. Because, if someone is in your good graces, I am sure they have a
>very twisted sense of worth--if their looking for approval from you.

Kim:

Unlike yourself, I hold no delusions that the world is seeking *my*
approval. If I disapprove of something, I will state that fact, but I don't
have any expectation of anyone actually proactively changing their
behavior merely to please me -- although I have known it to happen.
I am a person who prefers to gain legitimate acceptance and approval,
rather than merely sucking up to someone for the purpose of getting
on their good side. I'll leave that to you.

>> >> >By the way, I live for me...no one else.
>> >>
>> >> Obviously. I, on the other hand, live in a world populated with many
>> >> people other than myself, and I am always careful to treat them with
>> >> the same courtesy and respect that I myself wish to receive. Of
>course,
>> >> here on Usenet, the white gloves come off, especially when someone
>> >> like yourself -- spoiling for negative attention -- surfaces. Then, I
>> >give the devil it's due.
>>
>> >If you are so concerned, Larry, about the affect you have on other
>people, you'd be a lot different kind of person. I suspect you are exactly
the
>same in real life as you are on this newsgroup.

There are similarities between my newsgroup persona and my real-life
dealings with people. I'm known as a person who doesn't suffer fools
gladly -- and the proliferation of fools in this world gives me a lot of
people with which to practice this philosophy. You, naturally, are just
one of many.

>> This newsgroup is only part of my real life, Kim -- not the whole thing,
>> as it may be with you. You have no way of knowing how I am in "real"
>> life because you simply don't know anything about me other than that
>> which I choose to expose in this forum.
>>
>> >> >> It shows heinous disrespect
>> >> >> for herself, her husband, and anyone who is forced to be exposed to
>> >> >> her callsign -- thereby being placed in the undesired position of
>> >> >> being a voyeur to her imprudent and salacious conduct.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>> >>
>> >> >Make that *your desire* for me to be in an undesired position, Larry,
>as you fail miserably to make any valid point, as usual.

Not quite, Kim, since *you* were the one who chose to make a fool of
herself with an embarrassingly churlish Vanity call sign.

>> Any points made in this newsgroup which place you in a negative light, are
>> gratuitously provided by your own self.

>So, uh, wait a minute. You say I make points in this newsgroup which you
>say place me in a negative light. BUT, you make points in this newsgroup
>that...what? Make you look good? ROFLMAO....Hysterically I might add.

How I "look" in this newsgroup will always depend on the point-of-view of
the reader. Unlike yourself, I'm mature enough to understand and accept this
fact of life, and accept the reactions I receive, positive or negative, in a
manner
which helps me reflect on how I have presented myself, and make whatever
adjustments are necessary to create a more positive image. You don't seem
to be doing that. In fact, you tend to go out of your way to make a fool of
yourself -- and retaining that stupid call sign is only a small part of it.

>> >> Totally wasted keystrokes, Kim, as I don't have any concern for your
>> >opinion regarding the validity of my "points" made here.

>> >Ditto from me to you, Larry.

I shall not lose one moment's sleep over that, Kim dear.

>> Good, since you're the last person from whom I'm seeking any kind of
>> validation -- unlike yourself.
>>
>> (About a dozen lines of Kim's more severe inanity mercifully snipped)

>Rhetoric...your as good as any other conservative groupie. Rhetoric.

And you're as absurdly inane as any other liberal groupie. Keep taking
the low road, Kim -- it seems to take you where you want to go.

73 de Larry, K3LT

158. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 04:55:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020301235529.21807.00000517@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 36154

In article <3c7ef380_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> (It's most of us Tech and Tech+ who,
>> >at the time, would spend our entire weekends helping out those older hams
>> >with antenna projects, retuning, etc.) We'd also ultimately fix problems
>> >with antenna connections into tuners, computer peripherals wrongly
>attached
>> >to TNCs, and on it goes.
>>
>> Interesting. Prove it. Get one of the "older" hams for whom you've
>personally
>> provided such technical assistance to get on this newsgroup and provide
>> verification. Just one. If you cannot, or will not for any reason, you
>are a
>> liar.
>>
>
>Larry, as opposed to you and I, most of the hams and friends I have around
>here (some hams are nothing more than mere acquaintences) have far better
>things to do than get involved in this crap. Think of me however you must,
>Larry, if it makes you feel better. You see, when the truth is known no
>proof is needed.

Kim:

Uh hunh. Just as I suspected…you *were* lying!

>> >In fact, for a while there we Tech/Tech+'s would
>> >jokingly gloat that all this stuff would roll down our way, yet it was us
>> >who was keeping things going...heh heh
>> >
>> >I have a feeling the folks like Little Dick and Larry and Dave would act
>the
>> >way they do without the ham radio forum.
>>
>> Oh really? Find one person with whom Dick, Dave, or myself has had an
>> on-the-air QSO and "acted" like we do in this newsgroup, and get them to
>> provide verification -- if you cannot, or will not for any reason, then
>you
>> have just gratuitously slandered Dick, Dave, and myself -- thus proving
>> that you're no better than you claim we are.
>>
>
>Few of us in this newsgroup are any better than the rest, Larry. Your ego

>blocks you from understanding that.

Again, a request for verification goes unrequited, thus proving you to have gratuitously slandered Dick, Dave, and myself. Nothing new here.

>> > In fact, it is the ham radio forum
>> >that gives them the only soapbox they feel they can step up to, is my
>real
>> >suspicion.
>>
>> Don't look now, Kim, but that's one of the things a Usenet forum is there
>> for -- to serve as a "soapbox" for individual opinion. You use it in the
>> exact same way.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>Yeah, so you *do* understand we are equal.

We are "equal" only in our status as newsgroup posters, but in no other way I can think of as radio amateurs.

73 de Larry, K3LT

159. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 04:55:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020301235530.21807.00000518@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 36150

In article <3C7FFDF6.CB471362@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>W1RFI wrote:
>> The other context is related to "dumming down." It is clear that the exams
>of
>> today are more comprehensive than the exams I took -- completely so at the
>> entry level, and with the exception of the code test at the "all
>priveleges"
>> level, so the premise that amateur radio is dumbed down is, IMHO, a flawed
>one.
>
>If a 5wpm exam dumbs a person down, can you imagine what my 13wpm exam did to
>me? And what the 20wpm exam did to Dick and Larry? Dumbed down four times as
>much as a 5wpm ham? :-) Ed, you must have had some kind of antidote for the
>dumbing-down syndrome that Morse code causes.

Cecil:

It looks as though you've finally stumbled on something with which I
can agree. When it comes to technical knowledge and skill, I'm at
least four times "dumber" than Ed -- and I'll be the first to admit it!

73 de Larry, K3LT

160. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 05:00:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C805C71.8BD3140E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36155

Krell wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C7E4EB2.E32AA759@worldnet.att.net...
> > The answer should be so obvious that it isn't even needed, at all.
> > As you well know, this isn't about me. It's about all those future hams
> > who will NOT be learning to use radio's most basic mode.
>
> Walking and bicycling are basic modes of transportation, yet skill in
> neither is required for a driver's license. This just shows were some hams
> are technologically, and where they're likely to stay.

So good luck when all the high tech transportation modes breaks down and
you
find yourself barefoot. Just shows where some people have no idea what's out
there waiting for you.
If you really believe the old Stevenson/NCI saw about CW hams being
technogolically
backward it merely shows you're as stupid as he is. HE's the jerk with the
microphone
stuck in his face.(you too?) I'm off doing HF soundcard digital modes.

161. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 05:08:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C805E64.ECDBC9C0@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36156

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > It's fact. Unpopular in certain circles, but true.
>
> Speaking of which, Dick, I sent in a FISTS application and they said
> they were reissuing numbers of people who failed to renew their subscription.
> By some strange coincidence, I was reissued FISTS number 3939. That must make
> us blood brothers.
>

Does anyone here believe this liar? You don't think he's a liar?

For your info, Old Troll, I emailed the custodian of the lists after your troll of last week,(I'd directly quote his reply except it's on my old laptop and I'm tying this on a new one, and am not about to go to the trouble of copying it off to run on this one). He reaffirmed exactly what I said here. My FISTS number, (3939) is issued for life, and the listings they publish include only those listed as "active", meaning those currently paying dues. As I said, only the dues paying members receive the monthly newsletter,and after a couple years of newsletters I decided I could do without them, and so stopped paying dues. He stated in no uncertain terms that my FISTS number is valid and indeed mine to keep. So Cecil has,again,been caught red-handed in a deliberate lie. This was not a mistake, he flatly lied. He no more received

any such communications from FISTS than he is a 300,000 foot tall female alien.

162. Re: I Am An Outlaw CB Genius!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 05:10:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C805ED9.10991A7D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36157
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

CAM wrote:

> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > Who resurrected this old piece of crap and why is it crossposted to
> > everywhere??????????
>
> Egads, Dick, why is r.r.cb, r.r.a.p, and r.r.a.swap considered "everywhere"?
> Maybe you should get out more?

Right, Dick, after all when FCC incorporates CB into the ARS we will have to consolidate all the newsgroups, also. Cecil has a point.

163. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 05:12:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C805F36.EC49F02C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36158

Krell wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C7EECD8.54378369@worldnet.att.net...
> > Krell, you really aren't very bright, are you? So what did Stevenson do
> for
> > over 25 years,
> > instead of hang out on HF (as he clearly was desperate to do)? Huh?
>
> From the looks of his website, a helluva lot more than you've done.

So he toots his own horn, and loudly. That's news???

164. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 05:24:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C80622B.7B2062B2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36159

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <3C7E4650.902ABD3E@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
> <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >
> >> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> > It just so happens that when you "rote memorize" something, you've
> >> > learned it!
> >>
> >> But, but, but, Larry, the argument that all the doomsayers are using is
> >> that the present exams are too easy because they can be rote memorized.
> >
> > Wrong, as usual. It's not the "exams", it's word associations that remain
> >essentially meaningless (to the memorizer) but allow a passing grade and
> >a license to result. For all those who actually learn the material, hooray
> for
> >you.
>
> Dick:
>
> Memorization is an important part in the learning process.

Indeed it is, and I have so noted. Did you not see that?

> Just *how*
> important will vary from individual to individual -- we all have differences
> in long-/short-term memory capacity.

In the case of those who want a ham radio license but have no technical
knowledge from
which to draw upon nor to build up by studying the material, there exists a
method by
which they can indeed pass the exams, one at a time. It consists of rote
memorizing
word associations so that they can recognize which choice goes with what
question
based on the fact that they have seen them before in pairs and are reminded of
those
associations. No knowledge of subject matter whatever is needed nor any such
need
implied. Now, some months ago Ed Hare posted a few questions from the pool which

had been reconstructed so that it would be very difficult to make those word
association
but those few questions are not enough to foreclose this as a viable method of

obtaining
a ham radio license with little or no knowledge gained from study for that
license.

165. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 05:40:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8065D1.6567183D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36160

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <3c7ef380_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
>
> >
> >Yeah, so you *do* understand we are equal.
>
> We are "equal" only in our status as newsgroup posters, but in no
> other way I can think of as radio amateurs.

Get used to it, Larry. W5TiTs=KIM=CB=Ham radio. Before we know, it, FCC
will formalize it all, one license for all in "ham radio" that will be so much a
done deal in advance that not even the lowest knuckledragging CBer can, should,
nor will be able to resist.
Ed Hare says that we drive off newcomers by calling them Knuckledraggers. I
guess,
rather I would hope, he's right, some of them really NEED to be driven off. If
Kim
fits that category in your opinion, well, so shall it be.

Ham radio, RIP. Oh, it'll be around, all right, in name. ARRL will still be
called ARRL
and it will still be chasing the cash and membership rolls increases, regardless
of source..
But facts are facts::: When it has been flooded with the illicit offspring of 27
mcs
it will be ham radio in name only. The beef will be long gone. Much of it already
is gone,
the rest is going fast.

Again; Alas, poor Ham Radio, RIP. We hardly knew ye.

166. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 05:54:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302005440.10663.00000215@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 36162

In article <fXLf8.180$gc.144243@monger.newsread.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>From the looks of things, ham radio won't survive on it's own merits because
>of:

Hi Ryan,

Some good debating points but you've just sealed your fate (so to speak)
in this newsgroup. ;-) As a "happy old man" skeptic of the established
quasi-religion of radio amateurism, I'll comment and draw some of the
fire away from you.

[I can almost guarantee some of the responses you will get since
they've been repeated and repeated and repeated for a quarter
century by the faithful.]

>1. Lack of promotion (a good offense) by our largest psuedo-representative.
>(ARRL)

Saying such a thing is heresy of the highest order, an automatic cause
for ostracism and possible burning at the stake. :-)

The number one excuse for this is "lack of funds and time" and "it is
very difficult to get the media to listen." Other equal-size or smaller
recreation organizations manage to do so.

>2. Lack of promotion on a local level. Some clubs and groups may be doing a
> great job with that, but most aren't. There is so much that could be
done.

The usual response I'd expect there is an angry remark about "MY
club is doing GREAT, we have a BIG turnout, etc.,etc." as if one
local organization represents 50 states and 650+ thousand licensed
US radio amateurs. I can only quantify my own region as a part of
Greater Los Angeles and the San Fernando Valley of that with a
population of 1.5+ million (L.A. County has over 8 million population).
This small place has been a large part of the aerospace and
electronics industry with a goodly percentage of radio amateurs per
grid. About the only way to find out who is who and where on clubs
is to visit the local HRO store branch and hope that someone has
put out some free flyers. The San Fernando Valley has exactly
one HRO. Two other electronics stores sell amateur radio gear as
a sideline, are not in business to promote ham radio. There are, by
mail spam count, four community schools and at least eight other
community organizations...none of them offer any news of amateur
radio organizations. The Los Angeles TIMES, circulation 1.5 million,

might offer a single item of interest of ham interest a year, a freebie notice tucked away and competing for attention with maybe four dozen other groups listed twice every week. The only "easy" way to get information is to know a ham who is active in some local group.

>3. NEGATIVITY. Now I understand that the older a person gets, the grumpier
> they get
> and that in and of itself must be justification for that. Would you
> want to involve yourself
> in something where you are constantly told you are a bad or lesser
> person, even before
> you put a signal on the air? I don't think so.

Heh heh heh heh...having to coexist with lots of grumpy old men for a long time, I can understand your feelings. :-) I don't like them either.

Cheer up, there are many happy old men out there...also avoiding those gumpy old men. They feel the same way you do.

>4. Education/Elmerism is just not there as well as it should be. From a

It's my opinion that much of the "elmerism" is more fish story than actuality. Yes, I believe that there have been one-on-one tutoring situations but more likely the recipient was an impressionable teen-ager and the "elmer" was a family member. Such recountings may be exaggerations due to their nostalgia of a quarter century back. :-)

Finding a volunteer teacher who can actually teach something, anything, reasonably effectively would be a rare treasure find. That's an acquired skill and depends on their experience with different age groups. Different age groups need different techniques. Based on insider information and suggestions I have, it would be a better bet to ask a professional teacher to help tutor a knowledgeable ham in the rudiments of teaching techniques...and to review his/her presentation. Actual teaching is NOT the same as giving a one-hour presentation.

> 5. The "If you build it, they will come" syndrome. I guess this one
>ties into the promotion idea. I have seen clubs and VE groups that offer
>test sessions and only get a few testees. (as well as other functions) Just
>because we exist does not mean that people automatically come to us.

From what I've seen for a few decades the general feelings within the club are simply as fraternal orders and their events are for themselves. I don't find that strange at all.

>Constant promotion in a positive way is needed to get people to these
>events. Some of these events are ONLY listed with ham circles, (ARRL site,
>club web sites etc.) so how does the general public get to know about all
>the wonderful things we have access to as hams?

National events such as Field Day could be promoted far more than it is; it's a perfect propaganda byte opportunity for TV, open-air, mysterious morse code beeping sound over-lay on video, strange radio equipment, etc., etc. I don't think that ever happened here in the L.A. area during the years Roy Neal, K6DUE, was a journalist with KNBC-TV, channel 4.

167. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 05:54:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302005443.10663.00000216@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 36161

In article <a5o39t$ol9$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020228233108.25762.00000244@mb-mg.aol.com...
>> In article <a5mk3hgmp1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20020228174629.16934.00001114@mb-dd.aol.com...
>> >> From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >>
>> >> >To be honest, the PERCEPTION of many, licensed or unlicensed,
>> >> >is that the ARRL has controlled most of the past of the ARS from
>> >> >a decided minority group that is NOT required to be accountable
>> >> >to either the membership or non-members.
>> >>
>> >> An odd perception to have of a group of Directors that is elected by
>the
>> >> direct vote of that membership.
>> >
>> >Ed,
>> >Welcome to the club. NCI get's the same accusation from some
>> >people.
>>
>> Bill, you BIT very hard on this one, ey? :-)
>>
>> Alright, together now...PROVE that either election is honestly done
>> without any shadow of a doubt. Simply SAYING so is not proof.
>> Simply saying so requires an article of faith of the membership and
>> a strained believability factor on the part of non-members.
>
>Len,
>Neither ARRL nor NCI (nor any other "private" organization
>has to prove anything. The answer to anyone that either disagrees,
>wants more "proof" or doesn't like the internal
>policies/process/voting procedures is to simply NOT join
>or to quit if already a member. Voluntary association...simple
>concept in my book.

Bill, you and Ed have been "had" by my recent message. :-)

It was simply a case of "putting on another hat" and "thinking
out of the box" to try seeing what the "other side sees." It was
a "test" and the response was almost predictable.

The technique of role-playing "the other side" is not rare. It is an effective training aid in sales and marketing as well as politics. Lobbying and influencing decision-making is politics, despite an avalanche of noble, altruistic statements and patriotic bunting wearing either "side" brings up. Those whose "side" doesn't "win" generally sit around and grouse and gripe and whine about "dishonest politicians, crooks, etc." when it comes down mainly to imbibing too much sour grapes. :-)

My personal opinions on certain radio regulations generally agree with No Code International's stated policies. They differ with some of the ARRL's past and present policy stands made public by the FCC. Neither I nor any other non-insider knows what is said, communicated between the FCC and organizations in private...yet all organizations insist the public should believe them. In short, each organization expects the public to "owe them" the benefit of any doubt about their sincerity.

Those who are too personally involved with a group, an issue, for whatever reason, become enraged, furious against skeptics for taking an opposing viewpoint. The usual spin disguise for such fury is a careful phrasing of counter-claims of altruism and "service" and "support" to show they are the "good guys."

The ARRL is very good at this, having had a virtual monopoly in the amateur radio field for over a half century. They are self-sustaining in funding through specialty products sales, and as an advertising medium. They employ "professional amateurs." The ARRL retains a legal firm in the DC area and such legal representation is expensive. NCI doesn't do that.

NCI is the more altruistic organization by all public evidence, but they lack the long-term politics experience and a reservoir of spin material. That spin material stock is extensive enough to include spin denying the existance of spin. :-)

>Government vs private organization. Government exists by
>decree of the people and the "checks & balances" are there
>because the "people" want them. Private organizations exist at
>the will of the memberships of each private organization.

"We know this," Bill. :-)

That's only the tip of a very large iceberg.

>Len, I don't care if you do or don't believe that ARRL and/or NCI
>are honest and above board. What difference would it make as to
>what you believe in either case?

I have no idea. :-) A problem in believability is still a problem of believability, whether you or the ARRL wants to acknowledge it or not. An organization needs membership backing of some kind or it loses credibility and influence power with a federal agency.

>Works for me. I learned a long time ago there will
>always be nay sayers to anything I say. The old
>axiom covers that... You can't please all the people
>all the time.

Yes, yes, "You have the strength of ten because your heart
is pure." :-)

The ARRL was founded in 1914 largely on the efforts of Hiram
P. Maxim. Ever since the ARRL has paid him tribute equal
to canonization. The ARRL is very silent on the full history
of US amateur radio's early days, especially the 20-year
reign of Maxim as the League's first leader officer. A number
of radio-interest organizations came up or already existed.
Most dropped away. The longest-lived one is RCA (the club,
not the corporation), founded in 1909, the first ever radio-
interest organization in the world and still in existance.
Does the ARRL acknowledge it exists today?

88 years of the League telling all that the League is responsible
for the existance of amateur radio and other choice gems of
disinformation is a sure guarantee of turning claims into a
virtual "truth" about the history. It's also an excellent base for
brainwashing of several generations of hobbyists.

>More to the point...WHY does ARRL or NCI owe you
>any such "proof" in the first place?

Showing evidence of believability. You will NOT convince
the religious zealots of the PCTA morseodism cult, but you
have the chance of gaining support of the mainstream by
listening to them. Above all you have to refrain from
signs of knee-jerk responses from personal aggravation or
holier-than-thou stances.

Adopting a holier-than-thou attitude may feel very good but
it turns folks away, almost a guarantee to do so. Another
organization has the lock on holier-than-thou-ness, having
practiced it for a very long time.

>Sorry, but that IS the only answer you'd get from me.

"Pride goeth before a fall." Not a good answer to either
skeptics or mainstreamers.

>Perceptions and about a $1 will get you a cup of coffee. If
>ARRL, NCI and many other organizations had to worry about
>everyone's "perceptions" we'd never get to focus on our
>goals.

That begs the question and suspicion about the real goals.
If "focussing on goals" is so easily disturbed by either
positive or negative criticsm then are the goals that worthy?
Or is the goal something else, such as personal for the

organizers, rather apart from the stated goals?

Lots of skeptical folks are suspicious of the ARRL's goals, something evident from in here as well as in other venues. The ARRL of these later years is a combination publishing house, goods reseller, and membership organization. There is a very blurry distinction between those activities. In most instances there is an obvious overlap.

>Do you believe that EVERY phone call, discussion, conversation, >etc between an ARRL person and an FCC person MUST be >reported somewhere?

No. Try to stay focussed. An organization is sustained by believability. Discounting the religious believers, actual proof of what an organization is doing, saying, or accomplishing is only possible from documentation of a disinterested third party. If the organization claims to be doing something and there is nothing else to prove that, the claim is just a claim.

>There comes a point where, having failed to convince or >where the critic just keeps pushing for their way that every >organization ultimately has to simply say: You don't like, >that's tough...don't join, quit or whatever.

Are you taking the ball and going home? End of game? :-)

>No one, neither ARRL, NCI, Ed Hare, Carl S or myself has >ever said that the ONLY partipation in such FCC rule >setting should be via those organziations, already licensed >hams or ourselves.

>NCI and ARRL both avail themselves of the public and well >established processes for input, comment, etc. YOU are >free to do so on your own. Neither NCI nor ARRL owes anyone >a special forum within their own organization to accomodate YOU or >anone else.

As I've said, believability and veracity needs to be established to the membership of any organization...and to the agency it is attempting to influence.

>Whatever perceptions exist, they don't worry me or in >any way cause me concern.

>The "challenge" requires nothing on my part to begin >with. That I state the claim is bogus or of minimal >concern as to not warrant any change in organization and/or >a reply of suffient depth to satisy you my right, it >is NCI's right, it is ARRL's right.

Negative point made. An acceptible answer is simply no answer. Answering in a personal manner can indicate many things to readers.

>So have the feds file an anti-trust suit against the
>aleged ARRL monopoly. Given the availability of
>alternative sources of products from other than ARRL,
>I suspect the "monopoly" is unproveable.

Please note my use of the two connected words "virtual
monopoly" throughout. The "feds anti-trust suit" against
Microsoft on "monopoly" charges is being reviewed again.
Microsoft has a lock established on over 90 percent of all
personal computer operating systems worldwide and that
is a virtual monopoly on OSs without stretching anything.
Definitions on a true monopoly are obscured by legal
activities and influences none of the public can see, not
to mention the quasi-religious aspects of believers who
side with or against Microsoft for emotional reasons.
Any corporation that has 90 percent or more of any
market or activity control are generally accepted as having
a virtual monopoly.

>... No monopoly exists, nor has it ever been so.

Denial will not make it what you want.

>So what? No one is guaranteed any success inife.
>Have those new organizations been unfairly, illegally
>or unethically undermined by actions of ARRL.

Was anyone discussing philosophy of "success in life?"
I don't think so. I made no charges as described in the
quote above.

<snip of the first two of identical statements>

>So what....does ARRL or NCI owe that organization
>any special accomodation, any support to insure it's
>success?

That was never implied. Other organizations have existed
for their stated purpose. Their ceasing to exist may be
attributable to many different reasons or causes.

<snip>

>I repeat...neither ARRL or NCI owes YOU anything. You are not
>a member of either organization.

:-) Here we go again... :-)

Ahem, I can't be a voting member of one of them and the other
never accepted my repeated applications. :-)

Just the same, each organization is engaged in lobbying and
influence towards the FCC on matters directly affecting entry
into amateur radio. It is not logical or reasonable to have an
88-year old organization of voting members already entered

controlling, directing, or influencing entry. That is de facto exclusivity, an extension of the attitude of "we know what is best for amateurs."

If NCI takes the same position of exclusivity, that will only serve to deepen the chasm of differences already established between amateurs and the rest of the radio world.

The expected knee-jerk response of others, non-thinkers, is the phrase "this is amateur radio, only amateur!" They don't realize that amateur radio must share EM spectrum and the same federal regulation agency with every other radio service.

>You don't like our word on it, then don't join.

Taking the ball and going home doesn't end the game and disdain isn't a very good answer, is it?

168. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 06:37:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302013728.23819.00000246@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 36163

In article <MPG.16e9d56034df8eab9896a2@netnews.worldnet.att.net>, Joshua Houk
<jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>In article <dXLf8.179$gc.144503@monger.newsread.com>,
>kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net says...
>
>> Using radio's most basic mode.... (since you didn't state amateur radio's
>> most basic mode) So how come 911 dispatchers, firefighters, law
>enforcement,
>> ambulance jockeys, and many other services who very well may come up with
>an
>> alternate means of communicating when conventional modes fail aren't
>> required to learn it? If there is definitely a case where the need for a
>> message to get through is more important than most we will ever do, publice
>> service frequency occupants would have to be a prime example?
>>
>> If morse code is so important, why aren't they required?
>
>Simply because that for the job that they do, CW isn't required. You're
>talking about local communications on VHF frequencies. It's hard to see
>any kind of advantage that CW would have over voice in those situations.
>However, it's not hard to see the potential advantage of CW in emergency
>communications between stations at large distances.

Public safety radio services have frequency allocations on HF,
VHF, UHF, and microwaves. You can see those in Parts 2, 90
of Title 47 CFR.

Please define "large distances." If you are thinking of dredging
up the Titanic disaster and subsequent implementation of the
500 KHz international disaster calling frequency, autoalarms,
and all that using "CW," please don't. The maritime community
adopted the GMDSS to supplant the old manual morse for ship
distress and the ability to send such a signal, along with the
GPSS-derived position information by any bridge officer. No
"CW" skill desired.

For distances beyond LOS and up to 200 or so miles, the NVIS
technique works very well for any modulation or mode on HF
through VHF. Several military land force radios use that
technique in standard communications doctrine.

I will agree that "CW" has great potential in saving the world
during alien invasion emergencies.

169. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 10:28:43 UTC
From: Radio Ham <no.spam@no.spam>
Message-ID: <3c80ab12_1@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>
Source record: 36164
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

NEARLY RIGHT!
Actually it's the opening statement in the _FOURTH_
book in the series, "De Bello Gallico IV". Julius Caesar
was as prolific in his war memoirs as was Churchill.

Remembering back 35 years to my 'O' Level Latin,
and the context we had to learn....

"All Gaul is divided into three parts, the first of which the
Belgae inhabit; the second, the Acquitani; the third, people
who in their own tongue are called Celtae, in ours, Galli.
All these differ from each other in language, in customs,
and in laws".

The other set book we did was Virgil's Aeneid, containing
the famous, "Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes"

Martin <mdwade@mobiletel.com> wrote in message
news:3C7FCBE1.163A@mobiletel.com...
> Radio Ham wrote:
> > William The Conqueror and the Normans
> > were of Viking descent and not from the Francs.
> Very True!
> > "Gallia est omnes divises in partes tres", etc.
> The opening statement from Juluis Ceaser's Commentary
> on the Gaullic Wars.
> Gaul is divided (only) in three parts.

170. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 10:31:08 UTC
From: Radio Ham <no.spam@no.spam>
Message-ID: <3c80ab13_1@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>
Source record: 36165
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

WRONG! Both top and bottom posting have always
been Internet conventions. Look at the RFC - it specifically
states that bottom posting is a suggestion only and not a ruling; thereby
showing that both habits were extant before the RFC itself
was produced.

Snowbat <snowbat@geocities.com> wrote in message
news:utrv7usj425mv665lhgq278nqth3hdgrv7@4ax.com...
> Top posting is a recent trend.....
> Bottom posting is and always was the Usenet convention.

171. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 11:31:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302063159.26453.00001183@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36166

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>Bill, you and Ed have been "had" by my recent message. :-)

I respect your saying this, Len. Not many people will admit when they are
trolling.

>It was simply a case of "putting on another hat" and "thinking
>out of the box" to try seeing what the "other side sees."

Then again, maybe you won't.

73,
Ed Hare,W1RFI

172. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 11:33:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302063306.26453.00001184@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36167

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>My personal opinions on certain radio regulations generally
>agree with No Code International's stated policies. They
>differ with some of the ARRL's past and present policy stands
>made public by the FCC.

And my personal opinion wrt code testing differs with both NCI's and ARRL's,
but it is closer to that of one organization than the other. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

173. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 11:48:00 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302064800.26453.00001185@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36168

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>Neither I nor any other non-insider
>knows what is said, communicated between the FCC and
>organizations in private...yet all organizations insist the public
>should believe them.

Sure you know what is communicated, Len. The law requires that a summary of any Ex Parte communication be filed into the public record. Such summary is required to contain the essence of what was presented. Both the ARRL and NCI Ex Parte presentations were summarized in great detail.

> In short, each organization expects the
>public to "owe them" the benefit of any doubt about their
>sincerity.

There is little doubt that you will take the suspicious stance every time.

>Those who are too personally involved with a group, an issue,
>for whatever reason, become enraged, furious against skeptics
>for taking an opposing viewpoint.

Not at all, Len. I take an opposing viewpoint to ARRL on the code test issue. Perhaps the furor is over the presentation and your need to "put on the other hat?"

> The usual spin disguise for
>such fury is a careful phrasing of counter-claims of altruism and
>"service" and "support" to show they are the "good guys."

I can speak personally to my work at ARRL supporting ham radio. No need for spin there, Len.

>The ARRL is very good at this, having had a virtual monopoly
>in the amateur radio field for over a half century. They are
>self-sustaining in funding through specialty products sales,
>and as an advertising medium. They employ "professional
>amateurs." The ARRL retains a legal firm in the DC area and
>such legal representation is expensive. NCI doesn't do that.

I am sure NCI would if they could. :-) What is your estimate of the percentage of ARRL's funding that is spent on the code-test issue?

>NCI is the more altruistic organization by all public evidence,
>but they lack the long-term politics experience and a
>reservoir of spin material. That spin material stock is extensive
>enough to include spin denying the existance of spin. :-)

That one was a bit too convoluted for me, Len. Of course ARRL tries to present its best side to amateur radio and the organizations it deals with. I see it up close and personal and I have never seen evidence of fabrication.

> The longest-lived one is RCA (the club,
>not the corporation), founded in 1909, the first ever radio-
>interest organization in the world and still in existance.
>Does the ARRL acknowledge it exists today?

Not that I know of. And that is whose fault? There are a number of organizations that ARRL has worked with over the time I have been there, ranging from the FCC to the Red Cross to the W5YI Group. If you are a member of RCA and feel that they should develop a cooperative relationship with ARRL, approach them, and suggest their prez' call ARRL's prez' and see what common ground can be found.

>88 years of the League telling all that the League is responsible
>for the existance of amateur radio and other choice gems of
>disinformation is a sure guarantee of turning claims into a
>virtual "truth" about the history.

For the existance of amateur radio? Of course not, Len. For saving amateur radio's chestnuts often enough to make it worthwhile? I have been "in" on some of that action myself.

>It's also an excellent base for
>brainwashing of several generations of hobbyists.

I will let your fear of brainwashing speak for itself as to the validity of your views, Len. A good place to close...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

174. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 11:50:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302065014.26453.00001186@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36169

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Again; Alas, poor Ham Radio, RIP. We hardly knew ye.

I wonder what decade some prophet of gloom first uttered those words...

C'mon, Dick; the only reason you stick around is that change gives you a good reason to toss insults at groups of people you don't even know. Admit it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

175. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 11:51:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302065145.26453.00001187@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36170

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Not quite, Kim, since *you* were the one who chose to make a fool of
>herself with an embarrassingly churlish Vanity call sign.

And you are the one who continues to give that callsign as much exposure as
possible by referring to it in every post you make.

And still you deny you are not fascinated by Kim!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

176. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 11:53:38 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302065338.26453.00001188@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36171

From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net

>> I don't know, Kim; you and Larry do seem intensely interested in each
>other on
>> this forum...

>Larry does kinda invoke the same curiosity that I might have in a lab rat...

No, it seems to be more than that. I rather doubt you would spend this much
time and effort to engage in long conversations with Lab rats.

You two argue as if you have been married for 50 years.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
>Kim W5TIT
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

177. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 11:55:24 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302065524.26453.00001189@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36172

From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net

>I would have to believe them both to be trustworthy in order for me to
>believe what they say about themselves. I believe neither.

I don't believe I have seen either of them lie, although Larry does come close when gets into his cut-and-paste buzzwords to see if he can get a rise out of me.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

178. W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 11:58:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302065830.26453.00001190@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36173

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>In the case of those who want a ham radio license but have no technical
>knowledge from
>which to draw upon nor to build up by studying the material, there exists a
>method by
>which they can indeed pass the exams, one at a time. It consists of rote
>memorizing
>word associations so that they can recognize which choice goes with what
>question
>based on the fact that they have seen them before in pairs and are reminded
>of
>those
>associations. No knowledge of subject matter whatever is needed nor any such
>need
>implied.

If you are a newcomer considering entering ham radio, don't listen to this bad advice. This is the hardest way to try to pass the test. It is easier to learn the concepts involved -- they really aren't nearly as hard as Dick is trying to make you believe. And in doing so, you will be helping yourself to make the best of the license you are about to work hard to get.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

179. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 11:59:32 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302065932.26453.00001191@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36174

From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net

>First, envious of my tits. Then, he's telling men he loves them...

Yeah, but "like a brother."

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

180. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 12:02:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302070206.26453.00001192@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36175

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Larry and Dick are extremely proactive in calling everyone dirty
>names who doesn't agree with them.

And I bet that Dick has them all rote memorized. Larry doesn't, from my read --
many of his buzzword posts could have been cut and pasted from previous posts.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

181. Re: Code Is Dead

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 12:04:46 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302070446.26453.00001193@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36176

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>There you have it, folks! A perfect example of the value of the code
>testing requirements as a "LID filter."

I take it back. I had said that it was a pretty poor troll, but if Larry took it seriously enough to think it a "perfect example" of anything other than a "gotcha'," maybe I will give it a 2.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

182. Re: Code Is Dead

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 12:05:50 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302070550.26453.00001194@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36177

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Well, since he landed on his ass more than once, I'm sure the
>French judge gave him at least a 5.9.

I don't know, Larry, you called it a perfect example, so you didn't think it a troll at all, did you? Now in another post, I said that I had never seen you lie, so don't let me down here...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

183. Re: Bootleg Call signs - Identity theft?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 12:09:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302070908.26453.00001195@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36178

From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@no.spam

> In local or state courts, "community service" usually consists of
> spending the weekends in an orange vest and hard hat along the
> freeway building up a good suntan and muscles while appearing to
> pick up trash.

Here in CT, some of our community-service folks manage to get assigned to our Burlington recycling center. Most are in their teens or early twenties. If they act as if they know they messed up, Jimmy, the Recyling Coordinator, is pretty good to them. If not, the oil recycle bin and dog pound do need occasional cleaning. I like Jimmy, so I often hang around drinking a cup of hot chocolate with him while such cleaning is going on. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

184. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 12:10:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302071043.26453.00001196@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36179

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Dick, can you tell him how long he is allowed to be a ham before he must
>> upgrade and what penalty will be imposed on him if he doesn't?

> Are you vying with Cecil for the position of Trollmeister of RRAP?

Not at all, Dick. You are the one that said that there are things about ham radio other than the rules that need to be enforced. It appears to me by the content of your many posts on the subject that you have appointed yourself as the enforcer.

I am just trying to find out if we can take your posts at their word.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

185. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 12:14:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302071435.26453.00001197@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36180

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Does anyone here believe this liar? You don't think he's a liar?

Most of the time, if someone is pulling your leg, a fabrication is involved, Dick. Did you not see right through it? Isn't "liar" a rather strong word for some good old leg pullin'? After all, I think we can safely assume that he didn't think you would believe him.

By the rest of your reaction, though, I think he pulled of some leg pulling of epic proportions!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

186. Re: ARRL Newsgroup?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 12:18:04 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302071804.26453.00001198@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36181

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>I think what would be a better idea is for the ARRL server to have chat rooms
>like some of the other servers. Whaddaya think, Ed?

They don't let me get to think much about what goes on the ARRL web page other than in the TIS area. But a suggestion to webmaster and your Director is a good place to start. Unfortunately, I fear the answer could be "no" because there would be some who would feel a need to be abusive and insultive to others and ARRL probably wouldn't want its site to be used in that way. If there are many other servers doing same, perhaps that is also reason not to duplicate what is being done well by others.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

187. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 12:20:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302072041.26453.00001199@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36182

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>It looks as though you've finally stumbled on something with which I
>can agree. When it comes to technical knowledge and skill, I'm at
>least four times "dumber" than Ed -- and I'll be the first to admit it!

Yes, but that is just an area that I chose to pursue, Larry. Morse code skill
and technical knowledge are just two of the many ways that a ham can
demonstrate that he or she is "real."

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

188. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 14:48:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C80E629.7C9FEEC9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36183

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > It's fact. Unpopular in certain circles, but true.
> >
> > Speaking of which, Dick, I sent in a FISTS application and they said
> > they were reissuing numbers of people who failed to renew their subscription.
> > By some strange coincidence, I was reissued FISTS number 3939. That must make
> > us blood brothers.
>
> Does anyone here believe this liar? You don't think he's a liar?
>
> For your info, Old Troll, I emailed the custodian of the lists after your
> troll of last week,(I'd directly quote his reply except it's on my old laptop
> and I'm tying this on a new one, and am not about to go to the trouble of
> copying it off to run on this one). He reaffirmed exactly what I said here.
> My FISTS number, (3939) is issued for life, and the listings they publish
> include only those listed as "active", meaning those currently paying dues. As I
> said, only the dues paying members receive the monthly newsletter,and
> after a couple years of newsletters I decided I could do without them, and
> so stopped paying dues. He stated in no uncertain terms that my FISTS number
> is valid and indeed mine to keep. So Cecil has,again,been caught red-handed
> in a deliberate lie. This was not a mistake, he flatly lied. He no more received
> any such communications from FISTS than he is a 300,000 foot tall female alien.

Dick, if you measure you legs, I'm sure you will find one is now much longer than
the other. ROTFLMAO
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

189. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 14:49:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C80E66C.74571E97@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36184

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> > Does anyone here believe this liar? You don't think he's a liar?
>
> Most of the time, if someone is pulling your leg, a fabrication is involved,
> Dick. Did you not see right through it? Isn't "liar" a rather strong word for
> some good old leg pullin'? After all, I think we can safely assume that he
> didn't think you would believe him.
>
> By the rest of your reaction, though, I think he pulled of some leg pulling of
> epic proportions!

Oh dear, I didn't mean to dislocate Dick's leg.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

190. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 14:53:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C80E75E.88DCB864@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36185

Dick Carroll wrote:
> In the case of those who want a ham radio license but have no technical
> knowledge from
> which to draw upon nor to build up by studying the material, there exists a
> method by
> which they can indeed pass the exams, one at a time. It consists of rote
> memorizing
> word associations so that they can recognize which choice goes with what
> question
> based on the fact that they have seen them before in pairs and are reminded of
> those
> associations. No knowledge of subject matter whatever is needed nor any such
> need implied.

AND, it has been that way since at least the early 1950's. I had no technical knowledge in 1952 when I rote-memorized/word-associated my way to a Conditional license. That act lead the way to a EE degree and 40 years of engineering so it wasn't all bad, was it?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

191. Re: Code Is Dead

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 15:08:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C80EAE9.97B99A26@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36187

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> leadpipe@pittnet.com (Leadpipe) writes:
> >I cannot wait till the code requirement is dropped completely from ARS
> >so that I can follow in the footsteps of my mentors.
>
> There you have it, folks! A perfect example of the value of the code
> testing requirements as a "LID filter."

Larry, are you anonymously posting crap so you can reply to it?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

192. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 15:10:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302101022.21826.00000208@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 36186

In article <hXLf8.182$gc.144330@monger.newsread.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>That brings up a question.... Is there somewhere where it is written about
>how soon a person MUST upgrade? Since I have seen a select few in here that
>it seems to be a major point of interest to, I was wondering if there was
>some type of listing as to when a person MUST upgrade that I may have
>missed. (sarcasm mode off)

Actually, in the bad old days they useta require a certain amount of experience
before they'd let you even try! Old Class A/Advanced required a year as a
General or equivalent, Extra took two years. The idea was that experience was
part of the license requirement. All gone in the '70s.
>
>Personally, I believe a person should grow within this hobby at a pace that
>makes them comfortable. If a person does not want to "scoot" all the way up
>to extra until later on in their life and not within the various levels of
>testing requirement changes, that is just fine.

Agreed! Also, if a person is satisfied with what a particular license gives
them,
why bother to get privs that won't be used?

>I can see that if a person,
>say for instance, is in the middle of raising kids or some other point in
>their life that is time consuming, there is nothing wrong with taking a
>longer time to upgrade.

Sure. Family, career, all sorts of things can take up the time.

>After all, this is a hobby and not a career.

Actually, it's a service, but even so, the voluntary quality means it's an
at-your-own-pace thing.

>It is
>stated in the Amateur's Code (or somewhere...) that Amateur Radio is
>supposed to be a PART of our lives, not our WHOLE lives.

"The Amateur Is Balanced".

The point I was making, though, was that back in '58 the FCC wasn't satisfied
with what was going on in the ARS. See the thread "ARS Licensing In The USA
Since WW2" for more details.

73 de Jim, N2EY

(N2EY previously wrote):

>> Yup. In fact, some folks say that one of the FCC's driving forces in
>pushing
>> "incentive licensing"
>> was Sputnik fever. The FCC first started asking questions about how to get
>more
>> hams to
>> upgrade beyond General in 1958.
>

193. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 15:35:16 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c80f33f$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36189

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020301235525.21807.00000513@mb-mq.aol.com...
> In article <3c7ef76b_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >- patriotism has become the new measure by which we accept each other
(yes,
> >that is a bad thing)
>
> Kim:
>
> Yes, my dear, you are exactly right -- I do NOT accept American
> citizens who aren't patriotic, loyal, and supportive of this country and
> the precious freedom and liberty we enjoy here.
>
> If you think American patriotism is a bad thing, then I cordially invite
> you to renounce your American citizenship and go live somewhere
> else.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Do you have to practice at being such an ignoramus, Larry, or is it genetic? As usual, you enjoy being miserable and looking at something from the worst possible angle to put your own miserable reflection upon it. What I am talking about are the idiots that *USE PATRIOTISM* as some kind of yardstick to judge other people. Kind of like using whether someone is the same religion or not.

Kind of like you do with CW.

Kim W5TIT

194. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 15:40:37 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c80f486_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36190

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020301235527.21807.00000516@mb-mq.aol.com...
> In article <3c7ef18e_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> >Oh good grief, Larry. The day I win respect and courtesy from the
likes
> >of you would be the day I'd hope I'd come to my senses.
> >>
> >> Kim:
> >>
> >> As it happens, that is correct!
>
> >I'd come to my senses and rid myself of your good graces as quickly as
> >possible. Because, if someone is in your good graces, I am sure they
have a
> >very twisted sense of worth--if their looking for approval from you.
>
> Kim:
>
> Unlike yourself, I hold no delusions that the world is seeking *my*
> approval. If I disapprove of something, I will state that fact, but I
don't
> have any expectation of anyone actually proactively changing their
> behavior merely to please me -- although I have known it to happen.
> I am a person who prefers to gain legitimate acceptance and approval,
> rather than merely sucking up to someone for the purpose of getting
> on their good side. I'll leave that to you.
>

Then you'd better start life over again, Larry, because you fail miserably
at representing yourself as someone who cares about anyone but himself.

> >> >> >By the way, I live for me...no one else.
> >> >>
> >> >> Obviously. I, on the other hand, live in a world populated with
many
> >> >> people other than myself, and I am always careful to treat them with
> >> >> the same courtesy and respect that I myself wish to receive. Of
> >course,
> >> >> here on Usenet, the white gloves come off, especially when someone
> >> >> like yourself -- spoiling for negative attention -- surfaces. Then,
I
> >> >give the devil it's due.
> >>

> >> >If you are so concerned, Larry, about the affect you have on other
> >people, you'd be a lot different kind of person. I suspect you are
exactly
> the
> >same in real life as you are on this newsgroup.
>
> There are similarities between my newsgroup persona and my real-life
> dealings with people. I'm known as a person who doesn't suffer fools
> gladly -- and the proliferation of fools in this world gives me a lot of
> people with which to practice this philosophy. You, naturally, are just
> one of many.
>

You keep saying that. I don't believe it.

> >> This newsgroup is only part of my real life, Kim -- not the whole
thing,
> >> as it may be with you. You have no way of knowing how I am in "real"
> >> life because you simply don't know anything about me other than that
> >> which I choose to expose in this forum.
> >>
> >> >> It shows heinous disrespect
> >> >> for herself, her husband, and anyone who is forced to be exposed
to
> >> >> her callsign -- thereby being placed in the undesired position of
> >> >> being a voyeur to her imprudent and salacious conduct.
> >> >>
> >> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >> >>
> >> >>Make that *your desire* for me to be in an undesired position,
Larry,
> >as you fail miserably to make any valid point, as usual.
>
> Not quite, Kim, since *you* were the one who chose to make a fool of
> herself with an embarrassingly churlish Vanity call sign.
>

Funny. I don't feel like a fool at all. However, I look at you as one huge
fool. See? It's just perspective.

> >> Any points made in this newsgroup which place you in a negative light,
are
> >> gratuitously provided by your own self.
>
> >So, uh, wait a minute. You say I make points in this newsgroup which you
> >say place me in a negative light. BUT, you make points in this newsgroup
> >that...what? Make you look good? ROFLMAO....Hysterically I might add.
>
> How I "look" in this newsgroup will always depend on the point-of-view of
> the reader. Unlike yourself, I'm mature enough to understand and accept
this

> fact of life, and accept the reactions I receive, positive or negative, in
a
> manner
> which helps me reflect on how I have presented myself, and make whatever
> adjustments are necessary to create a more positive image. You don't seem
> to be doing that. In fact, you tend to go out of your way to make a fool
of
> yourself -- and retaining that stupid call sign is only a small part of
it.
>

You're hardly mature, Larry. I doubt you spend any time reflecting at all.
And, like I said, you'd better start alllllllllll over if you think you're
able to project a positive image. You might start on your ham radio antics
to begin with.

> >> >> Totally wasted keystrokes, Kim, as I don't have any concern for your
> >> >opinion regarding the validity of my "points" made here.
>
> >> >Ditto from me to you, Larry.
>
> I shall not lose one moment's sleep over that, Kim dear.
>
> >> Good, since you're the last person from whom I'm seeking any kind of
> >> validation -- unlike yourself.
> >>
> >> (About a dozen lines of Kim's more severe inanity mercifully snipped)
>
> >Rhetoric...your as good as any other conservative groupie. Rhetoric.
>
> And you're as absurdly inane as any other liberal groupie. Keep taking
> the low road, Kim -- it seems to take you where you want to go.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Naw, I'll part company with you on the low road and get back up to high
ground, Larry. See ya...

Kim W5TIT

195. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 15:43:07 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c80f517_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36191

How 'bout you prove that my callsign is destroying the amateur radio service? Numbers tell a different story, Larry. You're a liar. How 'bout you prove your military career, Larry? Until you do, you're a liar. How 'bout you prove there was ever some dream-woman named Natasha? Until you do, you're a liar.

Never mind...you're worthless is what you are.

Kim W5TIT

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20020301235529.21807.00000517@mb-mq.aol.com...
> In article <3c7ef380_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> (It's most of us Tech and Tech+ who,
> >> >at the time, would spend our entire weekends helping out those older hams
> >> >with antenna projects, retuning, etc.) We'd also ultimately fix problems
> >> >with antenna connections into tuners, computer peripherals wrongly
> >attached
> >> >to TNCs, and on it goes.
> >>
> >> Interesting. Prove it. Get one of the "older" hams for whom you've
> >personally
> >> provided such technical assistance to get on this newsgroup and provide
> >> verification. Just one. If you cannot, or will not for any reason, you
> >are a
> >> liar.
> >>
> >
> >Larry, as opposed to you and I, most of the hams and friends I have around
> >here (some hams are nothing more than mere acquaintences) have far better
> >things to do than get involved in this crap. Think of me however you must,
> >Larry, if it makes you feel better. You see, when the truth is known no
> >proof is needed.
>
> Kim:
>
> Uh hunh. Just as I suspected.you *were* lying!
>

> >> >In fact, for a while there we Tech/Tech+'s would
> >> >jokingly gloat that all this stuff would roll down our way, yet it was
us
> >> >who was keeping things going...heh heh
> >> >
> >> >I have a feeling the folks like Little Dick and Larry and Dave would
act
> >the
> >> >way they do without the ham radio forum.
> >>
> >> Oh really? Find one person with whom Dick, Dave, or myself has had an
> >> on-the-air QSO and "acted" like we do in this newsgroup, and get them
to
> >> provide verification -- if you cannot, or will not for any reason, then
> >you
> >> have just gratuitously slandered Dick, Dave, and myself -- thus proving
> >> that you're no better than you claim we are.
> >>
> >
> >Few of us in this newsgroup are any better than the rest, Larry. Your
ego
> >blocks you from understanding that.
>
> Again, a request for verification goes unrequited, thus proving you to
have
> gratuitously slandered Dick, Dave, and myself. Nothing new here.
>
> >> > In fact, it is the ham radio forum
> >> >that gives them the only soapbox they feel they can step up to, is my
> >real
> >> >suspicion.
> >>
> >> Don't look now, Kim, but that's one of the things a Usenet forum is
there
> >> for -- to serve as a "soapbox" for individual opinion. You use it in
the
> >> exact same way.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >Yeah, so you *do* understand we are equal.
>
> We are "equal" only in our status as newsgroup posters, but in no
> other way I can think of as radio amateurs.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

196. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 15:44:12 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c80f57d_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36193

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020301235530.21807.00000518@mb-mq.aol.com...
> In article <3C7FFDF6.CB471362@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >W1RFI wrote:
> >> The other context is related to "dumming down." It is clear that the
exams
> >of
> >> today are more comprehensive than the exams I took -- completely so at
the
> >> entry level, and with the exception of the code test at the "all
> >priveleges"
> >> level, so the premise that amateur radio is dumbed down is, IMHO, a
flawed
> >one.
> >
> >If a 5wpm exam dumbs a person down, can you imagine what my 13wpm exam
did to
> >me? And what the 20wpm exam did to Dick and Larry? Dumbed down four times
as
> >much as a 5wpm ham? :-) Ed, you must have had some kind of antidote for
the
> >dumbing-down syndrome that Morse code causes.
>
> Cecil:
>
> It looks as though you've finally stumbled on something with which I
> can agree. When it comes to technical knowledge and skill, I'm at
> least four times "dumber" than Ed -- and I'll be the first to admit it!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

You're more than four times dumber than Ed, Larry. And that is *proven*
every time you post here....

Kim W5TIT

197. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 15:45:50 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c80f3bc_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36188

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C7F05D7.767523EE@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > So if not enforcement, how do you propose to ensure the parts
that
> > > are not enforced?
> >
> > The FCC calls it "Selfpolicing".
>
> So why don't you just "self police" everyone into learning Morse
code?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Cecil,

I'm sure that Dick would LOVE to have the power to "self police"
everyone into learing Morse code. However, he's demonstrated
repeatedly that even if he did have the power, he wouldn't be willing
to put forth the effort to exercise it. Dick prefers to have the
govt.
do his work for him, through the welfare state promotion of Morse
by proficiency test requirements.

However, having said that, the more important point is that Dick
doesn't seem to be able or willing to grasp the fundamental
concept that enforcing some sort of "work ethic" (making sure
that folks have to "work hard, so that they earn their licenses")
is not a legitimate govt. regulatory function. Fortunately, the
government DOES recognize this fact, which really seems to
get Dick all "honked off."

I think that Dick resents the fact that you (Cecil) and I (just as
two examples) didn't really HAVE to "work hard" to pass the
tests ... because we already knew the necessary material.
I can only surmise that Dick must HAVE had to work really
hard to pass his tests, and it really pisses him off that others
didnt' have to expend the same effort ...

Carl - wa6vse

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPIDzo5e+N6+q84HiEQLeNACg2TXALnMLqvfw72hFkV8u+YML9nsAn32g
c8iVohYWxTnmLFnVCkoT2LP+
=Kb4D
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

198. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 15:49:22 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c80f68d_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36195

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C805F36.EC49F02C@worldnet.att.net...
> Krell wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C7EECD8.54378369@worldnet.att.net...
> > > Krell, you really aren't very bright, are you? So what did Stevenson
do
> > for
> > > over 25 years,
> > > instead of hang out on HF (as he clearly was desperate to do)? Huh?
> >
> > From the looks of his website, a helluva lot more than you've done.
>
> So he toots his own horn, and loudly. That's news???
>
>

Why, Little Dick! You have no trouble at all tooting your own horn (uh, not
that horn). heh heh heh, think ya got 'im, Krell...

Kim W5TIT

199. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 15:54:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C80F5BA.D92E79BB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 36192

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <fXLf8.180$gc.144243@monger.newsread.com>, "KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

> Cheer up, there are many happy old men out there...also avoiding those
> gumpy old men. They feel the same way you do.

I would imagine you've encountered a few of those happy old men if they were unable to avoid running into you. It might be interesting to find out just how many are still "happy old men" after an encounter with you. One can only assume that your street persona is much like the creature we've seen on display here.

> >4. Education/Elmerism is just not there as well as it should be. From a
>
> It's my opinion that much of the "elmerism" is more fish story than
> actuality. Yes, I believe that there have been one-on-one tutoring
> situations but more likely the recipient was an impressionable
> teen-ager and the "elmer" was a family member. Such recountings
> may be exaggerations due to their nostalgia of a quarter century
> back. :-)

Another case of, "I don't have any first hand experience so it must not be true", Len? Such doubt could have been erased if only those of us who found mentors eager assist the beginner had the foresight to document the encounter and to have forwarded proof to you.

> Finding a volunteer teacher who can actually teach something,
> anything, reasonably effectively would be a rare treasure find. That's
> an acquired skill and depends on their experience with different
> age groups. Different age groups need different techniques. Based
> on insider information and suggestions I have, it would be a better
> bet to ask a professional teacher to help tutor a knowledgeable ham
> in the rudiments of teaching techniques...and to review his/her
> presentation. Actual teaching is NOT the same as giving a one-hour
> presentation.

Yeah, these things are best left to a professional--let's say someone like you--a guy who could not only teach the basics but actually whip the neophyte into shape. Actual formal instruction on technical material could be interspersed with some of the historical material on other radio services--maybe you could call that portion, "Stuff I gleaned from the internet". I hope you've saved all the past sermons. We wouldn't want new hams to be totally unaware that there are other services with whom we share the radio sprectrum.

Dave K8MN

200. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 15:56:05 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c80f820_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36196

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C8065D1.6567183D@worldnet.att.net...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> > In article <3c7ef380_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> >
> > >
> > >Yeah, so you *do* understand we are equal.
> >
> > We are "equal" only in our status as newsgroup posters, but in no
> > other way I can think of as radio amateurs.
>
> Get used to it, Larry. W5TiTs=KIM=CB=Ham radio. Before we know, it, FCC
> will formalize it all, one license for all in "ham radio" that will be so
much a
> done deal in advance that not even the lowest knuckledragging CBer can,
should,
> nor will be able to resist.

Awww, poor wittle Dickie....poo. I'd like you to find me one example of whining, Little Dick. Could ya do that for me? Take all the time you need. (HINT: look in the paragraph right above this one).

>
> Ed Hare says that we drive off newcomers by calling them
Knuckledraggers. I
> guess,
> rather I would hope, he's right, some of them really NEED to be driven
off. If
> Kim
> fits that category in your opinion, well, so shall it be.
>

Ya think I'm going to be driven off? ROFLMAO...it sounds to me more like you're driving yourself off, Little Dick. Your thoughts and Larry's thoughts--at least those you have expressed here--are extremely offensive to people. Now, that represents to me that you guys are the minority thinkers on the thoughts you've posted here. You've "disjointed" yourselves from any semblance of being friendly, able to inspire desire, etc.

You also show what a little man you are by seeking out posts that have some authorship from me in them, yet claim you don't read "my posts." You're so full of shit your eyes are brown.

>
> Ham radio, RIP. Oh, it'll be around, all right, in name. ARRL will still

be
> called ARRL
> and it will still be chasing the cash and membership rolls increases,
regardless
> of source..
>

Actually, I suspsect the ARRL's new name will become more and more a focus.

>
> But facts are facts::: When it has been flooded with the illicit offspring
of 27
> mcs
> it will be ham radio in name only. The beef will be long gone. Much of it
already
> is gone,
> the rest is going fast.
>
> Again; Alas, poor Ham Radio, RIP. We hardly knew ye.
>

And, why don't you and Larry just run on over and have a beer or two or three with Vince Fiscus. At least you'd then have an eager audience who would agree with you.

Kim W5TIT

201. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 15:57:27 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c80f872_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36198

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020302065014.26453.00001186@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Again; Alas, poor Ham Radio, RIP. We hardly knew ye.
>
> I wonder what decade some prophet of gloom first uttered those words...
>
> C'mon, Dick; the only reason you stick around is that change gives you a
good
> reason to toss insults at groups of people you don't even know. Admit it.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Thank you...

Kim W5TIT

202. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 15:58:02 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c80f699_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36194

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020302065830.26453.00001190@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >In the case of those who want a ham radio license but have no
technical
> >knowledge from
> >which to draw upon nor to build up by studying the material, there
exists a
> >method by
> >which they can indeed pass the exams, one at a time. It consists of
rote
> >memorizing
> >word associations so that they can recognize which choice goes with
what
> >question
> >based on the fact that they have seen them before in pairs and are
reminded
> >of those
> >associations. No knowledge of subject matter whatever is needed nor
any such
> >need implied.
>
> If you are a newcomer considering entering ham radio, don't listen
to this bad
> advice. This is the hardest way to try to pass the test. It is
easier to learn
> the concepts involved -- they really aren't nearly as hard as Dick
is trying to
> make you believe. And in doing so, you will be helping yourself to
make the
> best of the license you are about to work hard to get.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

I agree !000% with Ed ... it is much easier to study the basic
material and understand the principles of the electronics
theory parts of the exams than to try to simply memorize every
question and the correct answer ... besides, as Ed says, the
```

things you learn will be useful in the future as you use the
privileges you earn by passing the test.

However, this aspect only applies to the theory parts ... things
like rules, regulations, sub-band limits, etc. can ONLY be learned
by memorizing them.

Thus, there are two basic categories ...

theory things where you are FAR better served by learning the
principles that will allow you to solve ANY similar problem
(as opposed to just memorizing the correct answer to a single,
particular example of the problem)

those rules/regs things that can only be learned by memorizing
things like band edges, power limits, spurious emissions limits,
etc.

Ed is right ... don't follow Dick's advice above ... LEARN the
two categories as Ed and I have described above and you'll
know more, be more competent, and enjoy your ham experience
much more ...

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPID2hJe+N6+q84HiEQLgBwCfbRN3r2DTYMTvwgLVpVBVmCvnaLAAoOqf
Qxni0nk7z/eAAhKA29unzezm
=Mz0c
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

203. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 15:58:30 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c80f8b8_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36199

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020302065338.26453.00001188@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>
> >> I don't know, Kim; you and Larry do seem intensely interested in each
> >other on
> >> this forum...
>
> >Larry does kinda invoke the same curiosity that I might have in a lab
rat...
>
> No, it seems to be more than that. I rather doubt you would spend this
much
> time and effort to engage in long conversations with Lab rats.
>
> You two argue as if you have been married for 50 years.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >Kim W5TIT
> >

Well, my three year marriage to a jerk just like him did seem like an
eternity...

Kim W5TIT

204. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 15:59:53 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c80f907$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36200

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020302065524.26453.00001189@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>
> >I would have to believe them both to be trustworthy in order for me to
> >believe what they say about themselves. I believe neither.
>
> I don't believe I have seen either of them lie, although Larry does come
close
> when gets into his cut-and-paste buzzwords to see if he can get a rise out
of
> me.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

I don't know if I've seen a lie from Larry, Dick, or anyone else for that matter. However, I know whom from this newsgroup I would feel is more trustworthy--based on posts I've seen. Larry and Dick are not among them.

Kim W5TIT

205. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 16:01:25 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c80f960$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36201

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020302065932.26453.00001191@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>
> >First, envious of my tits. Then, he's telling men he loves them...
>
> Yeah, but "like a brother."
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

I've always felt there was an incestuous little clique on this newsgroup...
:o

Kim W5TIT

206. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 16:03:51 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c80f9f3_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36202

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020302072041.26453.00001199@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >It looks as though you've finally stumbled on something with which I
> >can agree. When it comes to technical knowledge and skill, I'm at
> >least four times "dumber" than Ed -- and I'll be the first to admit it!
>
> Yes, but that is just an area that I chose to pursue, Larry. Morse code
skill
> and technical knowledge are just two of the many ways that a ham can
> demonstrate that he or she is "real."
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Yeah, the best way is to show up at a club meeting...<snicker>

Kim W5TIT

207. Re: I Am An Outlaw CB Genius!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 16:07:44 UTC
From: Landshark
Message-ID: <kN6g8.19435$F53.546766908@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 36197
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Three guesses Richard, one of the three
resident trolls on Rec.Radio.Cb using twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com
Yes it looks as though the kill files are working
and they are going through withdrawals

Landshark

--
Please note that any post that is from
S3Buell_SBCGlobailnet@hotmail.com
is a FORGE. My Addy is always going to
be from SBCGlobal.Net This person has
been a troll on Rec.Radio.CB for a long
time now. If you want to send a complaint,
forward each message complete with headers
to TOSUSENET@AOL.COM. abuse@hotmail.com,
groups-abuse@google.com
Beware of George WA3MO^

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:5HTf8.7398$gK2.533973@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Who resurrected this old piece of crap and why is it crossposted to
> everywhere??????????

208. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 16:19:57 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c80fbc0_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36203

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020228180731.16934.00001122@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >p.s. Please don't listen to Ed when he tries to tell you that
you're
> >your own worst enemies, either :-)
>
> The problem, Carl, is that the things they are saying to "defend"
morse code by
> trying to keep a code test are the very things I would NOT say to a
ham to
> encourage him to actually try Morse code.
>
> I am sure you don't care one way or the other about what hams choose
to do with
> Morse code, but I sure would like to see more hams use and enjoy it.

Ed,

And I will stand shoulder to shoulder with you to preserve their right
to CHOOSE to use Morse in the event that anyone attempts to ban
the use of Morse. The difference between us and Dick is that we
recognize that Morse is just one of many modes and that not ALL
people need to choose to learn/use it in order for it to survive.

Dick clearly thinks that when the govt. stops making all learn
Morse to get a license with HF privs. Morse usage will rapidly
die. I don't believe that for a minute. I have no intention of
encouraging the "death of Morse (usage)" ... however, if there
is not enough (effective, "honey rather than vinegar") promotion
of Morse by Morse enthusiasts, Morse usage may well drop.
(That is a "problem" for Morse enthusiasts to solve ... and your
[Ed's] approach will be FAR more effective than Dick's.)

As Cecil has pointed out ... if Morse cannot "survive" in a
"free market of modes," that may simply be "evolution."

> On one of
> the QRP lists, we are having a nice discussion about how to
> help the newly minted 5 wpm QRPers with QSOs and fun with CW.

This sounds like a good move from the perspective of (rational)
Morse enthusiasts ... much better than Dick's approach.

Carl - wa6vse
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPID7Y5e+N6+q84HiEQLquACgzAUVsA9gzKtaKaVC4z0oIj1J6BsAn0rz
q5bGoGCQmNlgbuCYuyiNp83u
=Ikru
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

209. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 16:36:43 UTC
From: Martin <mdwade@mobiletel.com>
Message-ID: <3C80FF9B.683@mobiletel.com>
Source record: 36204
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Radio Ham wrote:
>
> NEARLY RIGHT!
> Actually it's the opening statement in the _FOURTH_
> book in the series, "De Bello Gallico IV". Julius Caesar
> was as prolific in his war memoirs as was Churchill.
>
> Remembering back 35 years to my 'O' Level Latin,
> and the context we had to learn....
>
> "All Gaul is divided into three parts, the first of which the
> Belgae inhabit; the second, the Acquitani; the third, people
> who in their own tongue are called Celtae, in ours, Galli.
> All these differ from each other in language, in customs,
> and in laws".
>
> The other set book we did was Virgil's Aeneid, containing
> the famous, "Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes"
>
> Martin <mdwade@mobiletel.com> wrote in message
> news:3C7FCBE1.163A@mobiletel.com...
> > Radio Ham wrote:
> > > William The Conqueror and the Normans
> > > were of Viking descent and not from the Francs.
> > Very True!
> > > "Gallia est omnes divises in partes tres", etc.
> > The opening statement from Juluis Ceaser's Commentary
> > on the Gaullic Wars.
> > Gaul is divided (only) in three parts.

You bring back memories of Strict Christian Brothers
(A strict Catholic High School) who drilled Latin
(1 year) in to my mushed brain.
Martin

210. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 16:59:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5s0av$j83$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36239

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020302005443.10663.00000216@mb-fp.aol.com...
> In article <a5o39t$ol9$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020228233108.25762.00000244@mb-mg.aol.com...
> >> In article <a5mk3hgmp1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:20020228174629.16934.00001114@mb-dd.aol.com...
> >> >> From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >> >>
> >> >> >To be honest, the PERCEPTION of many, licensed or unlicensed,
> >> >> >is that the ARRL has controlled most of the past of the ARS from
> >> >> >a decided minority group that is NOT required to be accountable
> >> >> >to either the membership or non-members.
> >> >>
> >> >> An odd perception to have of a group of Directors that is elected by
> >> >> by the direct vote of that membership.
> >> >
> >> >Ed,
> >> >Welcome to the club. NCI get's the same accusation from some
> >> >people.
> >>
> >> Bill, you BIT very hard on this one, ey? :-)
> >>
> >> Alright, together now...PROVE that either election is honestly done
> >> without any shadow of a doubt. Simply SAYING so is not proof.
> >> Simply saying so requires an article of faith of the membership and
> >> a strained believability factor on the part of non-members.
> >
> >Len,
> >Neither ARRL nor NCI (nor any other "private" organization
> >has to prove anything. The answer to anyone that either disagrees,
> >wants more "proof" or doesn't like the internal
> >policies/process/voting procedures is to simply NOT join
> >or to quit if already a member. Voluntary association...simple
> >concept in my book.
>
> Bill, you and Ed have been "had" by my recent message. :-)
>
> It was simply a case of "putting on another hat" and "thinking

> out of the box" to try seeing what the "other side sees." It was
> a "test" and the response was almost predictable.

Yet "the other hat" isn't apparently worn by many to begin with.

> The technique of role-playing "the other side" is not rare. It is
> an effective training aid in sales and marketing as well as
> politics. Lobbying and influencing decision-making is politics,
> despite an avalanche of noble, altruistic statements and
> patriotic bunting wearing either "side" brings up. Those whose
> "side" doesn't "win" generally sit around and grouse and gripe
> and whine about "dishonest politicians, crooks, etc." when it
> comes down mainly to imbibing too much sour grapes. :-)

So you are say which side won? Neither Ed nor I have
groused, griped or whined about dishonest politicians, crooks, etc.

> My personal opinions on certain radio regulations generally
> agree with No Code International's stated policies. They
> differ with some of the ARRL's past and present policy stands
> made public by the FCC. Neither I nor any other non-insider
> knows what is said, communicated between the FCC and
> organizations in private...yet all organizations insist the public
> should believe them. In short, each organization expects the
> public to "owe them" the benefit of any doubt about their
> sincerity.

WRONG! The public is free to believe whatever the public
wants. Absent any proofs of illegal, unethical or immoral
behavior, MOST people assume sincerity and honesty...there
are, however, and always will be...the black helicopter
element that sees a plot in everything.

> Those who are too personally involved with a group, an issue,
> for whatever reason, become enraged, furious against skeptics
> for taking an opposing viewpoint. The usual spin disguise for
> such fury is a careful phrasing of counter-claims of altruism and
> "service" and "support" to show they are the "good guys."

Welcome to the role of marketing ones ideas...nothing
new there.

> The ARRL is very good at this, having had a virtual monopoly
> in the amateur radio field for over a half century.

The ARRL has NO monopoly...your insistent reference
to monopoly misses the mark as to being able to "keep
a monopoloy" status. While ARRL may be one of the
only games in town, the ARRL has never exhibited monopoly
behavior to keep others out.

> They are
> self-sustaining in funding through specialty products sales,

> and as an advertising medium. They employ "professional
> amateurs." The ARRL retains a legal firm in the DC area and
> such legal representation is expensive.

Are you saying any of that is wrong?

> NCI doesn't do that.

So?

> NCI is the more altruistic organization by all public evidence,
> but they lack the long-term politics experience and a
> reservoir of spin material. That spin material stock is extensive
> enough to include spin denying the existance of spin. :-)

Again, so? More to the point, for lacking the attributes
you claim, NCI seems to have managed quite well working
the "system" exactly as it is supposed to be done.

> >Government vs private organization. Government exists by
> >decree of the people and the "checks & balances" are there
> >because the "people" want them. Private organizations exist at
> >the will of the memberships of each private organization.
>
> "We know this," Bill. :-)
>
> That's only the tip of a very large iceberg.

I have no clue what that iceberg reference means.

> >Len, I don't care if you do or don't believe that ARRL and/or NCI
> >are honest and above board. What difference would it make as to
> >what you believe in either case?
>
> I have no idea. :-) A problem in believability is still a problem of
> believability, whether you or the ARRL wants to acknowledge it
> or not.

BUT lack of believeability doesn't seem to be a problem for the
membership of ARRL or NCI. Beyond their respective memberships,
what difference does it make?

> An organization needs membership backing of some kind
> or it loses credibility and influence power with a federal agency.

We know this Len :-)

> >Works for me. I learned a long time ago there will
> >always be nay sayers to anything I say. The old
> >axiom covers that... You can't please all the people
> >all the time.
>
> Yes, yes, "You have the strength of ten because your heart
> is pure." :-)

Purity of heart isn't needed. Common sense tells me that
any idea almost never will find favor with 100% of members.

> The ARRL was founded in 1914 largely on the efforts of Hiram
> P. Maxim. Ever since the ARRL has paid him tribute equal
> to canonization. The ARRL is very silent on the full history
> of US amateur radio's early days, especially the 20-year
> reign of Maxim as the League's first leader officer.

80 year old history of an organization has little relavence
(IMHO) on current membership thinking.

> A number
> of radio-interest organizations came up or already existed.
> Most dropped away. The longest-lived one is RCA (the club,
> not the corporation), founded in 1909, the first ever radio-
> interest organization in the world and still in existance.
> Does the ARRL acknowledge it exists today?

WHY should ARRL acknowledge those other organizations?

> 88 years of the League telling all that the League is responsible
> for the existance of amateur radio and other choice gems of
> disinformation is a sure guarantee of turning claims into a
> virtual "truth" about the history. It's also an excellent base for
> brainwashing of several generations of hobbyists.

You obviously read more into such commentary than I do.
At this point, who cares as long as amateur radio prevails.

> >More to the point...WHY does ARRL or NCI owe you
> >any such "proof" in the first place?
>
> Showing evidence of believability. You will NOT convince
> the religious zealots of the PCTA morseodism cult, but you
> have the chance of gaining support of the mainstream by
> listening to them.

I don't see the mainstream being opposed to what ARRL (or NCI)
stands for. A political reality is that people who are content with
what is happening will rarely say anything. Those in opposition,
however, will become to pubic antagonists. Based on that, neither ARRL
nor NCI appear (IMHO) to have a credibility problem with
members, with the public and/or with the FCC.

> Above all you have to refrain from
> signs of knee-jerk responses from personal aggravation or
> holier-than-thou stances.

What holier than thou attitude?

> Adopting a holier-than-thou attitude may feel very good but
> it turns folks away, almost a guarantee to do so. Another
> organization has the lock on holier-than-thou-ness, having
> practiced it for a very long time.

???

> >Sorry, but that IS the only answer you'd get from me.
>
> "Pride goeth before a fall." Not a good answer to either
> skeptics or mainstreamers.

No other answer has been needed. By your own comment
above...this whole dialog has been nothing but a "strawman"
on your part. There appears to be NO issue of credibility
with membership, with the Public or with the FCC on the
part of ARRL or NCI.

> >Perceptions and about a $1 will get you a cup of coffee. If
> >ARRL, NCI and many other organizations had to worry about
> >everyone's "perceptions" we'd never get to focus on our
> >goals.
>
> That begs the question and suspicion about the real goals.
> If "focussing on goals" is so easily disturbed by either
> positive or negative criticsm then are the goals that worthy?
> Or is the goal something else, such as personal for the
> organizers, rather apart from the stated goals?

Let's see...no one in NCI gets paid anything...most people
in ARRL are volunteers with some paid staff. Just WHO
in either organziation might have a personal goal or hidden agenda.

> Lots of skeptical folks are suspicious of the ARRL's goals,

LOTS????

What goals are any of those LOTS suspicios of?

> something evident from in here as well as in other venues.

Not too evident to me...except for a HANDFUL of vocal
people. As I said, those that agree are generally quiet.

> The ARRL of these later years is a combination publishing
> house, goods reseller, and membership organization. There
> is a very blurry distinction between those activities. In most
> instances there is an obvious overlap.

And that's bad because?

> >Do you believe that EVERY phone call, discussion, conversation,
> >etc between an ARRL person and an FCC person MUST be
> >reported somewhere?
>
> No. Try to stay focussed. An organization is sustained by
> believability. Discounting the religious believers, actual proof of
> what an organization is doing, saying, or accomplishing is only
> possible from documentation of a disinterested third party. If the
> organization claims to be doing something and there is nothing

> else to prove that, the claim is just a claim.
>
> >There comes a point where, having failed to convince or
> >where the critic just keeps pushing for their way that every
> >organization ultimately has to simply say: You don't like,
> >that's tough...don't join, quit or whatever.
>
> Are you taking the ball and going home? End of game? :-)

Nope, I'm just saying you are NOT owed an answer.

> >No one, neither ARRL, NCI, Ed Hare, Carl S or myself has
> >ever said that the ONLY partipation in such FCC rule
> >setting should be via those organziations, already licensed
> >hams or ourselves.
>
> >NCI and ARRL both avail themselves of the public and well
> >established processes for input, comment, etc. YOU are
> >free to do so on your own. Neither NCI nor ARRL owes anyone
> >a special forum within their own organization to accomodate YOU or
> >anone else.
>
> As I've said, believability and veracity needs to be established to
> the membership of any organization...and to the agency it is
> attempting to influence.

Beliveability for ARRL is measured in renewals of membership.

> >Whatever perceptions exist, they don't worry me or in
> >any way cause me concern.
>
> >The "challenge" requires nothing on my part to begin
> >with. That I state the claim is bogus or of minimal
> >concern as to not warrant any change in organization and/or
> >a reply of suffient depth to satisy you my right, it
> >is NCI's right, it is ARRL's right.
>
> Negative point made. An acceptible answer is simply no
> answer. Answering in a personal manner can indicate
> many things to readers.
>
>
> >So have the feds file an anti-trust suit against the
> >aleged ARRL monopoly. Given the availability of
> >alternative sources of products from other than ARRL,
> >I suspect the "monopoly" is unproveable.
>
> Please note my use of the two connected words "virtual
> monopoly" throughout. The "feds anti-trust suit" against
> Microsoft on "monopoly" charges is being reviewed again.
> Microsoft has a lock established on over 90 percent of all

> personal computer operating systems worldwide and that
> is a virtual monopoly on OSs without stretching anything.
> Definitions on a true monopoly are obscured by legal
> activities and influences none of the public can see, not
> to mention the quasi-religious aspects of believers who
> side with or against Microsoft for emotional reasons.
> Any corporation that has 90 percent or more of any
> market or activity control are generally accepted as having
> a virtual monopoly.
>
>
> >... No monopoly exists, nor has it ever been so.
>
> Denial will not make it what you want.
>
>
> >So what? No one is guaranteed any success inife.
> >Have those new organizations been unfairly, illegally
> >or unethically undermined by actions of ARRL.
>
> Was anyone discussing philosophy of "success in life?"
> I don't think so. I made no charges as described in the
> quote above.
>
> <snip of the first two of identical statements>
>
> >So what....does ARRL or NCI owe that organization
> >any special accomodation, any support to insure it's
> >success?
>
> That was never implied. Other organizations have existed
> for their stated purpose. Their ceasing to exist may be
> attributable to many different reasons or causes.
>
> <snip>
>
> >I repeat...neither ARRL or NCI owes YOU anything. You are not
> >a member of either organization.
>
> :-) Here we go again... :-)
>
> Ahem, I can't be a voting member of one of them and the other
> never accepted my repeated applications. :-)
>
> Just the same, each organization is engaged in lobbying and
> influence towards the FCC on matters directly affecting entry
> into amateur radio. It is not logical or reasonable to have an
> 88-year old organization of voting members already entered
> controlling, directing, or influencing entry. That is de facto
> exclusivity, an extension of the attitude of "we know what is

> best for amateurs."
>
> If NCI takes the same position of exclusivity, that will only
> serve to deepen the chasm of differences already established
> between amateurs and the rest of the radio world.
>
> The expected knee-jerk response of others, non-thinkers, is the
> phrase "this is amateur radio, only amateur!" They don't realize
> that amateur radio must share EM spectrum and the same
> federal regulation agency with every other radio service.
>
>
> >You don't like our word on it, then don't join.
>
> Taking the ball and going home doesn't end the game and
> disdain isn't a very good answer, is it?

211. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 17:04:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C81061F.F1CD312D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36205

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Again; Alas, poor Ham Radio, RIP. We hardly knew ye.
>
> I wonder what decade some prophet of gloom first uttered those words...
>
> C'mon, Dick; the only reason you stick around is that change gives you a good
> reason to toss insults at groups of people you don't even know. Admit it.

The only reason you keep repeating all that is you hope it will prompt me
to shut up and leave. Admit it.
And, I see you ably ignored the meat of my post. Must have been close to a
nerve.

212. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 17:04:57 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c810654_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36206

```
"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0202281612.56fc138@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c7cdcbd_1@news7.fast.net>...
> > -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> > Hash: SHA1
> >
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020227065021.26726.00000109@mb-fm.aol.com...
> > > In article <3c7c3d6f_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > > <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
> > >
> > > >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > >news:20020226160954.04655.00000108@mb-mw.aol.com...
> > > >>
> > > >> Let's see:
> > > >>
> > > >> - permanent/renewable license vs. 1 year one-time license
> > > >
> > > >[begin sarcasm mode]
> > >
> > > Wasn't meant as sarcasm, Carl. I was just listing the differences.
> > > Are any of my facts incorrect?
> >
> > Note the placement of the [begin ... end sarcasm mode] markers.
> > I was pointing out that MY new text in response to your list of
> > comparisons was sarcasm, NOT that you were being sarcastic,
> > Jim.
>
> Ah, OK. I wasn't sure.
>
> But why be sarcastic here? The facts are correct, are they not?

The facts are (AFAIK) *technically* correct .. that wasn't my point
(read on ...)

> The point I was trying to make is this:
>
> Ed keeps mentioning the "4 page study guide" story, but doesn't
> mention the vast difference in privileges granted.

The point that I was trying to make is "times change" and that
the mentality of the past is no longer suited to today's world
in terms of promoting a healthy future for the ARS.
```

"Complaining" about liberalizations in outdated technical
restrictions vs. tests is not the answer.

Recognizing that the ARS needs to modernize constantly
to remain interesting to potential newcomers and to remain
competitive technologically with other alternatives that
compete for people's interest and discretionary time is
something that MUST occur ...

> Fact is, we really don't have an effective entry-level license today.

I don't TOTALLY buy that ... let me list a few comments in
"bullet point" form:

* It is IMHO *very* arguable that without the no code license,
which has become the de facto entry point into ham radio,
and the newcomers that have become hams via that route,
that our numbers would likely have plummeted SERIOUSLY
over the past 10 years.

* I have elaborated on my concerns with the power levels
vs. demonstrated level of technical competence for the
NCT license.

* The main problem in terms of "an effective entry-level
license" IMHO is that we are still stuck, for the relatively
short-term, at least, with most of the newcomers being
relegated to VHF/UHF because of the Morse test
requirement for HF access.

* Once the Morse test is eliminated, it would seem to
make sense to adjust the Tech test to cover HF principles
and grant newcomers much broader HF privs ... or maybe
it would make sense to "merge" the tech and general
classes ... the only problem with such a merger would be
that it might make the step from "unlicensed" to "licensed"
unnecessarily large ... I'm certainly open to ideas on how
the license structure and written test requirements could
best be modified in a "post Morse test" era.

> > > >(remember the "No lids, kids, or space kadets" guy? A real
> > > >"welcome to ham radio" if I ever heard one ...}
> > > >(not!)
> > >
> > > That was Mike, W2OY. He was on phone - 75 meter AM, actually. Not
> > > CW and not in the Novice subbands. He's been dead several years now.
> > >
> > > Do you know what his gripe was?
> >
> > Does it REALLY matter in terms of the impression his
> > diatribe must have made on newcomers?
>
> Actually, YES.

OK ... I'm reading and will respond.

> For one thing, they guy is remembered because he was so unusual. He
> stuck out like a sore thumb. Also had a big signal.
>
> His gripe was that prior to 1953 it took an Advanced/Class A license,
> or
> an Extra, to operate 'phone on 20 or 75. Everybody else had to use
> what
> bits of 160 were available, or the ham bands above 25 MHz. 40 had no
> phone segment and 15 wasn't a ham band yet.
>
> Then, without an NPRM, RM or anything else, in late 1952 FCC opens all
> privs to all hams except Novices and Techs. All of a sudden ol' Mike
> has lotsa new company.

Ah, so I was correct in perceiving him as a "cranky olde fart" who
resented sharing "his" "sandbox" with newcomers who he perceived
were not as "superior" as he imagined himself to be ...

That's why I mentioned him ... because I perceived him as
a good example of EXACTLY THE WORST attitude that
hams should show to newcomers.

> But not with using the written tests to do the same thing. One
> man's "reasonable and relevant" is another's "hoop". Why is a Tech
> Plus
> competent to run AM on 6 meters but not 10 meters? Why is a Tech Plus
> competent to run 1500 W PEP on VHF/UHF but only a fraction of that
> on HF, even though the RF exposure hazard is less on HF/MF?

Those are good points ... with which I agree. You know that
I think the Tech test is inadequate for 1500W ... but you seem
in some sense to disagree. I agree FULLY that there is no
distinction between the level of technical knowledge required
to use "mode x" on VHF/UHF vs. HF ... in fact, in some
respects, it is "easier to stay out of trouble" at HF ... particularly
with homebrew gear, because the technical requirements for
stable, clean gear are somewhat easier to meet at HF, due
to circuit parasitics, layout, etc. being less critical that at the
higher frequencies ...

> > That's
> > part of the problem ... you can't keep ham radio "like it was 40 years
> > ago" and expect it to be vital, heathy, and viable for the long haul.
> > EVERYTHING changes and hams need to accept change as well.
>
> Only if the change is for the better. Many changes are NOT for the
> better. The mantra that "change must be accepted" as if all change
> is inevitable and good is simply bogus.

Change IS inevitable in a technically-oriented pursuit ... to ignore
it and not figure out how to make use of new developments can

only result in stagnation and irrelevance as the rest of the world
passes by ...

> > > I have also suggested (with Richard Plourde) a post-S25.5 license
> > structure to
> > > address some of the imbalances of the current system (like 1500 W
> > for
> > > newcomers) and at the same time LOWER the requirements for new hams.
> >
> > You're right ... I remember seeing some of that, but it got a bit
> > involved and I missed a lot due to business travel, then it seemed
> > to be gone ...
>
> Still in the archives. Seems odd to me that nobody but Mr. Plourde and
> me want to discuss stuff like that.

As I said, I saw some of it, but missed a lot due to business
travel (I don't have time for r.r.a.p. when I'm on business trips,
nor do I have ready, convenient access to my ISP's news server).

I'm sure that there will be more discussion in that direction
in the future, but right now, the focus of my limited time is
on the elimination of the Morse test. Once that is accomplished,
I will have more time to focus on how other aspects of licensing
and testing can be improved ...

> > > One additional fact: Nobody is required to start out with a Tech
> > today, just as
> > > nobody was required to start with a Novice in 1963. All newcomers
> > have always
> > > had the option to skip over the "entry level" and go straight for
> > General or
> > > its historic equivalent.
> >
> > Yes, but I believe that the leap from nothing to General is a larger
> > leap today than it was in the past, with the exception of 5 wpm vs.
> > 13.
>
> I disagree! The new General test is 35 questions from a publicly
> available pool. The 5 wpm can be taken independently (CSCEs didn't
> exist in 1963, either).

OK ... good point ... one doesn't HAVE to do it all at one sitting.
However, the number of questions isn't, IMHO, the defining factor
in the difficulty of the test(s) ... as Ed has pointed out, there's a
hell of a difference between the 4 page study guide he used and
the current one, which if I recall correctly runs about 250 pages!
(Then another one of ?how_how_many_pages? to make the
move from Tech to General???)

I simply can't understand, given the MUCH larger amount of
material one has to cover, how anyone can claim that the

tests are "easier" or have been "dumbed down."
(Not saying that you are saying that ... but rather that quite
a few make that complaint.)

Carl - wa6vse

213. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 17:06:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C81069A.E5D26DBC@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36207

W1RFI wrote:

> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >Not quite, Kim, since *you* were the one who chose to make a fool of
> >herself with an embarrassingly churlish Vanity call sign.
>
> And you are the one who continues to give that callsign as much exposure as
> possible by referring to it in every post you make.

ARE you kidding? She "exposes" it every time she signs it, either here or on
the air
There's no way, as you well know, that Larry or anyone else comes close to that

level of "exposure".

214. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 17:08:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C810721.AD40930C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36208

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >In the case of those who want a ham radio license but have no technical
> >knowledge from
> >which to draw upon nor to build up by studying the material, there exists a
> >method by
> >which they can indeed pass the exams, one at a time. It consists of rote
> >memorizing
> >word associations so that they can recognize which choice goes with what
> >question
> >based on the fact that they have seen them before in pairs and are reminded
> >of
> >those
> >associations. No knowledge of subject matter whatever is needed nor any such
> >need
> >implied.
>
> If you are a newcomer considering entering ham radio, don't listen to this bad
> advice. This is the hardest way to try to pass the test. It is easier to learn
> the concepts involved -- they really aren't nearly as hard as Dick is trying to
> make you believe. And in doing so, you will be helping yourself to make the
> best of the license you are about to work hard to get.

Sorry, Ed, you're working on the wrong end of the problem. I learned it from them,

not them from me.

215. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 17:11:12 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c8107c7_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36209

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020301235530.21807.00000518@mb-mq.aol.com...
> In article <3C7FFDF6.CB471362@IEEE.org>, CAM
<Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >W1RFI wrote:
> >> The other context is related to "dumming down." It is clear that
the exams
> >of
> >> today are more comprehensive than the exams I took -- completely
so at the
> >> entry level, and with the exception of the code test at the "all
> >priveleges"
> >> level, so the premise that amateur radio is dumbed down is, IMHO,
a flawed
> >one.
> >
> >If a 5wpm exam dumbs a person down, can you imagine what my 13wpm
exam did to
> >me? And what the 20wpm exam did to Dick and Larry? Dumbed down four
times as
> >much as a 5wpm ham? :-) Ed, you must have had some kind of antidote
for the
> >dumbing-down syndrome that Morse code causes.
>
> Cecil:
>
> It looks as though you've finally stumbled on something with which I
> can agree. When it comes to technical knowledge and skill, I'm at
> least four times "dumber" than Ed -- and I'll be the first to admit
it!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Congratulations on being open-minded, Larry ... I was going to respond
to Cecil's "antidote" quip by stating that Ed's antidote was technical
knowledge.

I'm SO glad that we've finally convinced you that technical knowledge
IS THE antidote to dumbing down (and Morse proficency or lack thereof
has nothing to with "being dumbed down.")

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPIEHmpe+N6+q84HiEQIGWwCeJGg4CIKRr5BEle/ae0zqeCLwXDsAn3o+
4zlyDQuB8TWB5o2SPycM3cKp
=P/HW
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

216. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 17:15:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8108AC.E0BB0E17@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36210

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Does anyone here believe this liar? You don't think he's a liar?
>
> Most of the time, if someone is pulling your leg, a fabrication is involved,
> Dick. Did you not see right through it? Isn't "liar" a rather strong word for
> some good old leg pullin'? After all, I think we can safely assume that he
> didn't think you would believe him.

So you ARE becoming the co-Trollmeister, Cecil's chief apologist. Just as we
thought.

217. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 17:19:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8109BB.57B06AF6@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36211

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > It's fact. Unpopular in certain circles, but true.
> > >
> > > Speaking of which, Dick, I sent in a FISTS application and they said
> > > they were reissuing numbers of people who failed to renew their subscription.
> > > By some strange coincidence, I was reissued FISTS number 3939. That must make
> > > us blood brothers.
> >
> > Does anyone here believe this liar? You don't think he's a liar?
> >
> > For your info, Old Troll, I emailed the custodian of the lists after your
> > troll of last week,(I'd directly quote his reply except it's on my old laptop
> > and I'm tying this on a new one, and am not about to go to the trouble of
> > copying it off to run on this one). He reaffirmed exactly what I said here.
> > My FISTS number, (3939) is issued for life, and the listings they publish
> > include only those listed as "active", meaning those currently paying dues. As I
> > said, only the dues paying members receive the monthly newsletter,and
> > after a couple years of newsletters I decided I could do without them, and
> > so stopped paying dues. He stated in no uncertain terms that my FISTS number
> > is valid and indeed mine to keep. So Cecil has,again,been caught red-handed
> > in a deliberate lie. This was not a mistake, he flatly lied. He no more received
> > any such communications from FISTS than he is a 300,000 foot tall female alien.
>
> Dick, if you measure you legs, I'm sure you will find one is now much longer than
> the other. ROTFLMAO

Yeah, right, when you get caught with your pants down, it's all a joke, with none of your usual smelly, Right. Troll,troll, troll. You surely are growing horns by now.

218. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 17:21:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C810A14.9AF1F3AA@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36212

N2EY wrote:

> The point I was making, though, was that back in '58 the FCC wasn't satisfied
> with what was going on in the ARS.

And today, they couldn't care less.

219. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 17:31:02 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c810c71_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36213

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020228211410.19404.00000168@mb-cs.aol.com...
>
> Any question in the pools can be subjected to a simple test. Just
> consider if an amateur could properly and safely operate a ham
station
> without the knowledge contained in the question. If so, the question
> does not cover knowledge that is absolutely necessary.

Here we go again with the apparently TOTAL emphasis
on "operating." (as in using a radio to communicate)

> For example, we must identify ourselves on the air using our
callsigns,
> so questions about proper ID involve "absolutely necessary"
knowledge.

Agreed ...

> But one can operate without knowing the difference between a tunnel
> diode and a zener diode, so that knowledge is not "absolutely
necessary".
> Instead, it's part of the hoop.

Here is where our views diverge ...

While I agree FULLY that rules/regs, etc. related to "operating"
in compliance are necessary and legitimate, there are other
aspects that go beyond "operating" in the sense that you seem
to imply, which (no offense intended), seems to equate "operating"
with what I would term "appliance operation."

The other aspect to OPERATING is having the requisite technical
knowledge to recognize problems, know how to correct them, etc.
in order to avoid interference and assure compliance with the
technical aspects of the rules ...

> I would venture to say that there are more hams on the air today
using
> Morse/CW than there are hams using homebrew rigs. Yet a technical
> knowledge test is held up as a "reasonable and relevant" requirement
> for an amateur license while a basic Morse/CW skill test is not.

First, Morse proficency is a matter of whether you choose to
use the mode (or not). I would assert that a person who doesn't
choose to use Morse will cause no "problem" by not knowing how
to use it ... however, a person who doesn't have sufficent technical
knowledge to recognize and correct (or at least cease operation
of a malfunctioning transmitter until the problem is corrected) DOES
present a potential problem by causing interference to other hams
and other services. The fact that we are a service where we are
permitted to make all sorts of adjustments to, and even build, our
own transmitters REQUIRES that we have knowledge of at least
basic levels of "how it works," "how to detect when it's not working
right," etc.

Now some will assert that a person who has not demonstrated
a high level of Morse proficiency will "make a mess of things
on the bands." First, if someone has not chosen to learn
Morse, they probably won't be using it, thus, "no problem."
Even if they do decide to learn it, even "on the air" as "OJT,"
I don't see this as a big deal ... for decades, novices have been
allowed to start with a minimal level of proficiency and "learn
by doing" on the air ... I'm not aware that this has resulted in
"the end of the world as we know it." :-)

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPIEMUpe+N6+q84HiEQIKYgCeL5YsEycnpIjJ0yDpkPEbvskFIAoAn0WT
tgjqckWMvk+N66J7juhvWpYO
=Bx0v
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

220. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 18:08:55 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c81155c_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36214

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16e9d56034df8eab9896a2@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <dXLf8.179$gc.144503@monger.newsread.com>,
> kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net says...
>
> > Using radio's most basic mode.... (since you didn't state amateur
radio's
> > most basic mode) So how come 911 dispatchers, firefighters, law
enforcement,
> > ambulance jockeys, and many other services who very well may come up
with an
> > alternate means of communicating when conventional modes fail aren't
> > required to learn it? If there is definitely a case where the need for
a
> > message to get through is more important than most we will ever do,
publice
> > service frequency occupants would have to be a prime example?
> >
> > If morse code is so important, why aren't they required?
>
> Simply because that for the job that they do, CW isn't required. You're
> talking about local communications on VHF frequencies. It's hard to see
> any kind of advantage that CW would have over voice in those situations.
> However, it's not hard to see the potential advantage of CW in emergency
> communications between stations at large distances.

Sure it is ... PARTICULARLY since that's NOT the type of service
that the emergency management folks WANT.

They couldn't care LESS about NTS-like "radiograms", etc. They
want tactical voice and data communications ... not Morse.

The entire argument that "Morse is essential to emergency
communications" is SO bogus that it's ridiculous, thus it
doesn't hold water as "justification" for continued Morse testing.

Carl - wa6vse

221. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 18:11:11 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302131111.26494.00001286@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36215

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:

>> Any question in the pools can be subjected to a simple test. Just
>> consider if an amateur could properly and safely operate a ham
>station
>> without the knowledge contained in the question. If so, the question
>> does not cover knowledge that is absolutely necessary.

>Here we go again with the apparently TOTAL emphasis
>on "operating." (as in using a radio to communicate)

I have no difficulty with this as long as the concept of "operate" includes the fact that the rules permit a ham to design and build a transmitting device and put it on the air.

Operating IS what it is all about, Carl. Anything else we do relative to ham radio can be done without an FCC license.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

222. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 18:14:26 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302131426.26494.00001287@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36216

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> The only reason you keep repeating all that is you hope it will prompt me
>to shut up and leave. Admit it.
> And, I see you ably ignored the meat of my post. Must have been close to a
>nerve.

I commented on the part that I believe merited a comment. That is not exactly
my nerve.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

223. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 18:15:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8116DE.114F857E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36218

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Dick, if you measure you legs, I'm sure you will find one is now much longer than
> > the other. ROTFLMAO
>
> Yeah, right, when you get caught with your pants down, it's all a joke, with none of
> your usual smelly, Right. Troll,troll, troll. You surely are growing horns by now.

Egads, Dick, r.r.a.p needs to take up a collection so you can buy a sense of
humor. It is you who is trolling now because nobody could possibly have taken
my posting seriously.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

224. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 18:16:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302131656.26494.00001288@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36217

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>ARE you kidding? She "exposes" it every time she signs it, either here or on
>the air
>There's no way, as you well know, that Larry or anyone else comes close to
>that
>
>level of "exposure".

Do you really think that DE <callsign> is as much exposure as paragraph after paragraph discussing that callsign? Or making up cute names for her using that callsign? You chose do do that, Dick, and you chose to give it exposure by posting it.

Is this another "she made me beat her" sort of thing?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

225. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 18:20:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302132027.26494.00001289@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36219

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Sorry, Ed, you're working on the wrong end of the problem. I learned it from
>them,
>
>not them from me.

Is this another "look at what they made me do" sort of things?

I don't care where you learned it, Dick; you are giving advice to newcomers that is setting them up to fail in ham radio. I disagree with you; it is not best to try to use word association to pass the tests. It isn't even the easiest way.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

226. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 18:21:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C811818.7A900E42@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36221

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> I think that Dick resents the fact that you (Cecil) and I (just as
> two examples) didn't really HAVE to "work hard" to pass the
> tests ... because we already knew the necessary material.

The Extra exam was a snap for me but I did have to work relatively
hard to memorize all the word associations for my Conditional in
1952 when I was 14 years old. Memorizing the schematics was fairly
difficult for me because I didn't know what the components really did.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

227. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 18:22:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302132213.26494.00001290@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36220

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Dick. Did you not see right through it? Isn't "liar" a rather strong word
>for
>> some good old leg pullin'? After all, I think we can safely assume that he
>> didn't think you would believe him.
>
> So you ARE becoming the co-Trollmeister, Cecil's chief apologist. Just as we
>thought.

I don't think he needs an apologist on this one, Dick. It is as good a leg
pullin' as I have seen in quite some time. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

228. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 18:30:15 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c811a66_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36222

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020302131111.26494.00001286@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>
> >> Any question in the pools can be subjected to a simple test. Just
> >> consider if an amateur could properly and safely operate a ham
> >station
> >> without the knowledge contained in the question. If so, the question
> >> does not cover knowledge that is absolutely necessary.
>
> >Here we go again with the apparently TOTAL emphasis
> >on "operating." (as in using a radio to communicate)
>
> I have no difficulty with this as long as the concept of "operate"
includes the
> fact that the rules permit a ham to design and build a transmitting device
and
> put it on the air.
>
> Operating IS what it is all about, Carl. Anything else we do relative to
ham
> radio can be done without an FCC license.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed,

I *think* we're probably "on the same page" but using different
semantics ...

Yes, I can design and build a rig without having a license. But,
why would I do so unless I intended to operate it? THAT, we
agree requires a license.

The point I was trying to make is that there is more to "operating"
just "geting on the air" ... and it DOES include the need to have
knowledge not just on rules/regs/practices, but ALSO how to
prevent, avoid, recognize, and correct technical problems that
could cause interference to other services or other forms of
non-compliance with the rules. That aspect REQUIRES more
than just the parts of the test (rules/regs/band limits, etc.) that
can only be memorized ... it requires understanding of the basic

technical principles of how/why radio works. THAT is why the
technical content in the written tests is legitimate and justified.

With this attempt at clarification, do we agree??

73,
Carl - wa6vse

229. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 19:26:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302142613.26498.00001177@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36223

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>With this attempt at clarification, do we agree??

Why, Carl, have we ever disagreed? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

230. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 19:42:43 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16eaca49ec7dfb679896a3@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36224

In article <3c81155c_2@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net says...
> "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16e9d56034df8eab9896a2@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
>
> > Simply because that for the job that they do, CW isn't required. You're
> > talking about local communications on VHF frequencies. It's hard to see
> > any kind of advantage that CW would have over voice in those situations.
> > However, it's not hard to see the potential advantage of CW in emergency
> > communications between stations at large distances.
>
> Sure it is ... PARTICULARLY since that's NOT the type of service
> that the emergency management folks WANT.

"Emergency management folks" are not the only people involved with
emergencies.

joshua houk
ac7ri

231. Re: ARRL again affirms eQSL Cards -OK- for DXCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 21:01:38 UTC
From: Ronald Oberloh <wa0kds@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3C813DB2.E4376C6B@yahoo.com>
Source record: 36225
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

From: Moore, Bill, NC1L
[mailto:bmoore@arrl.org]
Sent: Friday, February 08, 2002 12:31 PM
To: 'Richard B. Drake'
Cc: DXCC
Subject: RE: Professionally Printed and
mailed eQSL's
Hi Rich:

Something does not sound right here. You are
saying that Dave is physically mailing out QSL
cards by the US postal system? This is news to
me.

If you are my QSL manager and I send you my
logs by e-mail, I am sending them direct from
point A to point B. Just as if I was sending them
to you by regular mail. This is OK. I remember
somewhere several years ago that some people
used to get their logs over the air on RTTY and
another digital mode (AMTOR I think). Not a
problem.

However, if as the result of a log being sent to
E-QSL, someone goes in and receives a card
electronically and uses it for DXCC, that
e-QSL cannot be accepted for DXCC credit
under rule 2. I spent a bit of time with a simple
shareware program to prove the unreliability of
that method.

However, if Dave, acting as QSL manager
with station logs completes a card (even
one from his printer) and sends it by mail to
you, this is an acceptable exchange and we
have see this often for several years now.
(assuming he phyiscally checks the log). Many
people use self-made cards from their printer.
Each one is evaluated on a case by case basis,
and many times under Section IV rule 4(b) we
have conducted an audit to insure the vaildity of
a card like this.

In cases like this it would be REAL nice if they
used a stamp or placed their initials or signature
on it, but this is not required by the rules.
However, this issue has been discussed and has
been given some consideration.

To clarify, if Dave is sending out cards
through the US Postal System as the result
of the log(s) he receives, this is OK. (This
would basically be operating as QSL
manager).

Regards,

Bill Moore NC1L
DXCC Manager

Note: Use of this message is authorized in
discussions as long as it is used in its entirity and

as long as parts are not edited out.

Jim Higgins wrote:

> On Fri, 01 Mar 2002 18:58:49 -0700, in
> <3C8031D8.F66E004A@yahoo.com>, Ronald Oberloh <wa0kds@yahoo.com>
> wrote:
>
> >Think you are wrong on this one but that is your choose.
>
> OK, but I think you would be well advised to check directly with
> the ARRL yourself before you commit to collecting eQSLs toward
> any ARRL sponsored award. They do NOT accept them.
>
> --
> Jim Higgins, quasimodo AT yahoo DOT com
> icbm: 33.55.34N, 80.24.21W

232. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 21:09:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302160937.03941.00000492@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 36229

In article <20020302064800.26453.00001185@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>Neither I nor any other non-insider
>>knows what is said, communicated between the FCC and
>>organizations in private...yet all organizations insist the public
>>should believe them.
>
>Sure you know what is communicated, Len. The law requires that a
>summary of any Ex Parte communication be filed into the public record. Such
>summary is required to contain the essence of what was presented. Both the
>ARRL and NCI Ex Parte presentations were summarized in great detail.

One may argue the "summary" and "essence" but that is still a subjective viewpoint when there is no confirmation to the exact presentation from a third party.

Skeptics have justifiable fuel for suspicion from several areas. As an example, take the minutes of the IWG-6 concerning Agenda Items 1.7.1 through 1.7.3. The September 2001 minutes were not posted until FOUR MONTHS LATER. The January 24, 2002 meeting minutes were not posted until March 1, 2002. The "scribe" for IWG-6 is allied with the ARRL.

The first indication of the USA FCC preliminary position on Agenda Item 1.7.1, the most important one for amateur radio in that it has the basic changes to S25, has not been supplied to the public until 30 November 2001. That document is one of a series that contains a collection of different Informal Working Groups' recommendations as they have been (presumed) completed. That document was not referenced by either the ARRL nor NCI; an official of NCI made a vague reference to it. I supplied the exact reference and mentioned that the IARU "takes credit" for originating the removal of the morse code test as a requirement by adminstrations.

The public may view the USA-FCC Preliminary Views and Draft on 1.7.1 in a document released 21 February 2002 which may be accessed through the FCC IB WRC-2003 pages under "US Preliminary Views" link page. The titles of the document links specifically state the Agenda Item covered. The Agenda Items specifically for amateur radio at WRC-03 are 1.7.1, 1.7.2, 1.7.3.

The document concerning 1.7.1 gives a synopsis of the code test issue history beginning with WARC-1995 through all the World Radio Conferences, culminating with recommendation for WRC-03 and the Recommendations of ITU Working Group 8A. "Credit" for the formulation of it is again given to the IARU but there are some changes in this preliminary view relative to the one released on 30 November 2001. There is no publicly-released information on how those changes were enacted nor of the parties various actions in regards to those changes.

What appears in publicly accessible information is that each organization "is working hard and dilligently toward seeking the best solution for amateur radio" or words to that effect. Such phrasing is very, very ambiguous with rather obvious self-serving attributions (normally classified as "spin" or "propaganda" but such definitions cannot be used without invoking organization wrath). No specifics were given, only standard boilerplate assurances of honest, dilligence, and hard work.

An honest reply to public queries of organization staffers would have been to mention the specific document and sources of information. I'll give NCI executive director Carl Stevenson credit for being honest about not knowing the exact document title of my query but he did know the approximate date of release. The only other replies did not yield anything of value, only the usual offended psyches' psychological wailing of terrible wounds received in message wars.

Okay, now this member of the public has given other members of the public a rather specific clue on what the Preliminary USA-FCC views are concerning 1.7 et al. That seems to be far more specific than I've seen from any other organization (except NCI) concerning amateur radio. Why does it take an unlicensed-in-amateur-radio person to show where the exact information is located?

>That one was a bit too convoluted for me, Len. Of course ARRL tries to
>present
>its best side to amateur radio and the organizations it deals with. I see it
>up close and personal and I have never seen evidence of fabrication.

The ARRL constantly promotes itself in every media output it controls. It's "news" reports what the ARRL does with considerable selective editing to de-emphasize what other organizations are doing, sometimes in outright omission of such facts. Such selective editing is called "spin" or "propaganda."

Words such as "spin" or "propaganda" are common in definitions in political arenas, accepted as true descriptors by the public. Loyalty to an organization causes organization staffers to exhibit much outrage that spin or propaganda ever happens, followed by a vigorous denial. Denial of existance in light of obvious evidence is ludicrous.

>> The longest-lived one is RCA (the club,
>>not the corporation), founded in 1909, the first ever radio-
>>interest organization in the world and still in existance.
>>Does the ARRL acknowledge it exists today?
>
>Not that I know of. And that is whose fault? There are a number of
>organizations that ARRL has worked with over the time I have been there,
>ranging from the FCC to the Red Cross to the W5YI Group. If you are a member
>of RCA and feel that they should develop a cooperative relationship with
>ARRL, approach them, and suggest their prez' call ARRL's prez' and see what
>common ground can be found.

I am not a member of the Radio Club of America.

I raised that name as an example of "selective editing" and expected
some misdirection. Got it. There is NO issue, no issue raised, just
a mention of the first-ever radio interest club in the world. The RCA
has many radio amateurs as members, was active in early amateur
radio in the USA, and exhibits an interest in the entire field of radio,
not just amateurism.

As part of its own self-promotion, the ARRL selectively omits
mention of other radio organizations. That is a common tool
in spinning.

>I will let your fear of brainwashing speak for itself as to the validity of
>your views, Len. A good place to close...

Misdirection is a common tactic in messaging. I have no "fear of
brainwashing." I know the techniques, can recognize the tactics,
am quite used to spinners and propagandists outrage at being
"outed."

I have presented places to look and names of documents for others
to view. They may look for themselves and judge for themselves,
come to their own decisions, their own opinions. Is that "validation"
enough?

233. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 21:09:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302160938.03941.00000493@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 36228

In article <9f4bfe89.0202281507.62b5fffb@posting.google.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:<a5ln5j011a1@enews3.newsguy.com>...
>
>> The point I'm trying to make is that is the
>> pro-coders want CW to endure, they have to do so without welfare support of
>> the mode via mandated testing at high speeds.
>
>There has never been mandated testing at "high speeds", though. 20 wpm
>isn't really fast CW at all.

There is NO regulation or reference in Part 97, Title 47 CFR which defines the exact rate in words per minute for on-off keying telegraphy. None.

The ONLY rate reference is an ITU document that specifies the relative time duration for character lengths and spacings. Relative only to themselves. It does not have any rate in words per minute. It never did.

234. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 21:09:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302160939.03941.00000494@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 36226

In article <3c80f960$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020302065932.26453.00001191@mb-fx.aol.com...
>> From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>>
>> >First, envious of my tits. Then, he's telling men he loves them...
>>
>> Yeah, but "like a brother."
>>
>> 73,
>> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>I've always felt there was an incestuous little clique on this newsgroup...
>:o

This isn't a newsgroup, it is a chat room.

235. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 21:10:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302161006.20570.00000186@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 36227

In article <3C810A14.9AF1F3AA@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> The point I was making, though, was that back in '58 the FCC wasn't
>satisfied
>> with what was going on in the ARS.
>
>And today, they couldn't care less.
>
Actually, I think the FCC does "care", to a certain extent. They just don't want to get involved with directing the ARS via license requirements. That way, they bear no responsibility for what happens to the ARS.

For example, if don't use our VHF/UHF bands, or don't use them effectively, the FCC can self-justify reallocating some of them.

The basic point is that it's up to us hams. The FCC cares about the result.

73 de Jim, N2EY

236. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 22:19:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302171924.25762.00000326@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 36230

In article <20020302063159.26453.00001183@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>Bill, you and Ed have been "had" by my recent message. :-)
>
>I respect your saying this, Len. Not many people will admit when they are
>trolling.

It is sad demonstration of reading and understanding by others
when they have to be told what is happening.

237. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 22:27:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302172745.28185.00000207@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 36231

In article <20020302161006.20570.00000186@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>In article <3C810A14.9AF1F3AA@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
><dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>> The point I was making, though, was that back in '58 the FCC wasn't
>>satisfied
>>> with what was going on in the ARS.
>>
>>And today, they couldn't care less.
>>
>Actually, I think the FCC does "care", to a certain extent. They just don't
>want to get involved with directing the ARS via license requirements. That
>way, they bear no responsibility for what happens to the ARS.
>
>For example, if don't use our VHF/UHF bands, or don't use them effectively,
>the FCC can self-justify reallocating some of them.
>
>The basic point is that it's up to us hams. The FCC cares about the result.

The NTIA routinely monitors spectral occupancy and signal
content in urban areas, recording such for days at a time.
NTIA reports are forwarded to the FCC. Those reports are
publicly available and downloadable from the NTIA website.
Full details of the monitoring equipment and recordings are
included.

238. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 23:02:21 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302180221.26465.00001329@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36232

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>One may argue the "summary" and "essence" but that is still a
>subjective viewpoint when there is no confirmation to the exact
>presentation from a third party.

Or one could actually look at the summaries of ARRL Ex Parte presentations and decide whether they are complete. Are you saying that the same FCC that mandates that an Ex Parte summary contain the content of that summary would be in on this collusion you have dreamed up?

>I supplied the exact
>reference and mentioned that the IARU "takes credit" for originating
>the removal of the morse code test as a requirement by
>adminstrations.

I agree; that was an IARU decision.

>An honest reply to public queries of organization staffers would
>have been to mention the specific document and sources of
>information.

Assuming, of course, that you made a public inquiry of a staffer that is involved in the S25 matters and is aware of what is available...

>Why does it take an unlicensed-in-
>amateur-radio person to show where the exact information is
>located?

Because you took the time to go looking for it. It was clearly available to the public, so you are just making a fuss.

>It's "news" reports what the ARRL does with considerable
>selective editing to de-emphasize what other organizations are
>doing, sometimes in outright omission of such facts.

Can you provide some examples of selective editing and outright omission of facts known to ARRL?

> Such selective
>editing is called "spin" or "propaganda."

Assuming it was selective editing in the first place, Len.

>Words such as "spin" or "propaganda" are common in definitions
>in political arenas, accepted as true descriptors by the public.

Some would say that the overuse of the term "spin" is spin in and of itself, too.

>I am not a member of the Radio Club of America. I raised that name as an example of "selective editing" and expected
>some misdirection. Got it

My suggesting that RCA could contact ARRL to work toward seeing if there is some common ground between the two organizations is "misdirection?" Quite a bit of spin there yourself, OM.

>As part of its own self-promotion, the ARRL selectively omits
>mention of other radio organizations.

A bit of Anderson spin not supported by the numerous organizations found in ARRL's publications and web page all the time.

>I have no "fear of
>brainwashing." I know the techniques, can recognize the tactics,
>am quite used to spinners and propagandists outrage at being
>"outed."

If you believe that ARRL can brainwash people by its news and publications, I expect that you do not quite understand the term. Or is the accusation of brainwashing a bit more Anderson spin, too? :-)

>I have presented places to look and names of documents for others
>to view. They may look for themselves and judge for themselves,
>come to their own decisions, their own opinions. Is that "validation"
>enough?

Works for me, Len. Thanks for the information.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

239. Re: I Am An Outlaw CB Genius!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 23:22:16 UTC
From: Sabrina_Frederick@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <23e8cbcf.0203021522.476fc734@posting.google.com>
Source record: 36233
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Wouldn't "CB Genius" be an oxymoron? Kind of like Jerry Springer Mensa Club?

240. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-02 23:43:18 UTC
From: arcweb@bnnorth.net
Message-ID: <3c816266.4368079@news.bright.net>
Source record: 36234

On Sat, 2 Mar 2002 15:58:02 -0000, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote:

>-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
>Hash: SHA1
>
>
>"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020302065830.26453.00001190@mb-fx.aol.com...
>> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>>
>> >In the case of those who want a ham radio license but have no
>technical
>> >knowledge from
>> >which to draw upon nor to build up by studying the material, there
>exists a
>> >method by
>> >which they can indeed pass the exams, one at a time. It consists of
>rote
>> >memorizing
>> >word associations so that they can recognize which choice goes with
>what
>> >question
>> >based on the fact that they have seen them before in pairs and are
>reminded
>> >of those
>> >associations. No knowledge of subject matter whatever is needed nor
>any such
>> >need implied.
>>
>> If you are a newcomer considering entering ham radio, don't listen
>to this bad
>> advice. This is the hardest way to try to pass the test. It is
>easier to learn
>> the concepts involved -- they really aren't nearly as hard as Dick
>is trying to
>> make you believe. And in doing so, you will be helping yourself to
>make the
>> best of the license you are about to work hard to get.
>>
>> 73,
>> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

>I agree !000% with Ed ... it is much easier to study the basic
>material and understand the principles of the electronics
>theory parts of the exams than to try to simply memorize every
>question and the correct answer ... besides, as Ed says, the
>things you learn will be useful in the future as you use the
>privileges you earn by passing the test.
>
>However, this aspect only applies to the theory parts ... things
>like rules, regulations, sub-band limits, etc. can ONLY be learned
>by memorizing them.
>
>Thus, there are two basic categories ...
>
>theory things where you are FAR better served by learning the
>principles that will allow you to solve ANY similar problem
>(as opposed to just memorizing the correct answer to a single,
>particular example of the problem)
>
>those rules/regs things that can only be learned by memorizing
>things like band edges, power limits, spurious emissions limits,
>etc.
>
>Ed is right ... don't follow Dick's advice above ... LEARN the
>two categories as Ed and I have described above and you'll
>know more, be more competent, and enjoy your ham experience
>much more ...
>
>Carl - wa6vse

I agree with both the above posters, I just recently took the test, and studied the material rather than just learning it, I aced it. At the same time, another person was there the same testing session, he tried to memorize the study tests he took online, and the practice tests in the back of "Now you're talking" and the tests, while the questions and answers were the same, the orders were mixed up i.e. a,b,c,d that he new was reversed or otherwise modified. He failed miserably. You need to know the material. I am currently preparing to take the test for my General, and am using the same technique, learn the material, the theory ect. My biggest problem is the code, I have heard different suggestions on it, and I am making progress, but not as fast as I would like. But then part of that might be due to the partial hearing loss (tone deaf) and the pitch I have problems with is the pitch the code programs send in.

73 de Keith

KC8TCQ
Vice President: REACT of Henry County
Executive Board Member: Henry County Chapter - American Red Cross
American Red Cross Disaster Services Logistics Specialist

241. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 00:17:26 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gsd6wdd.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 36235

On 02 Mar 2002 22:27:45 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

>The NTIA routinely monitors spectral occupancy and signal
>content in urban areas, recording such for days at a time.
>NTIA reports are forwarded to the FCC. Those reports are
>publicly available and downloadable from the NTIA website.
>Full details of the monitoring equipment and recordings are
>included.

The FCC Spectrum Task Force did those surveys in the early 1970s and said reports proved to be totally useless absent content intercepts. Typical problems where electrical noise or intermods showing up as "occupancies", low-power or distant transmitters not triggering the sophisticated receiving equipment, and lots of "empty" air time on emergency channels (fire, rescue, etc) when there were no disasters to handle. In some cases the "regular" field office engineers had to go out to resolve "stuck carriers" which turned out to be electrical noise or overload at the receiving site.

So they conned the NTIA into doing it, eh?

Your taxpayers' dollars at work.....

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

242. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 01:55:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302205528.16943.00001387@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36236

>Subject: Re: The tests that Real Hams took
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/2/2002 3:09 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020302160939.03941.00000494@mb-ck.aol.com>

>This isn't a newsgroup, it is a chat room.

Oh?

243. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 01:58:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302205848.16943.00001388@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36237

>Subject: Re: The tests that Real Hams took
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/1/2002 11:54 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020302005443.10663.00000216@mb-fp.aol.com>

>The technique of role-playing "the other side" is not rare.

So I guess tonight must be your turn to be the man in bed, huh Lennie?

SR

244. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 02:01:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302210108.16943.00001389@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36238

>Subject: Re: The tests that Real Hams took
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/2/2002 4:19 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020302171924.25762.00000326@mb-mg.aol.com>

>It is sad demonstration of reading and understanding by others
>when they have to be told what is happening.

And YOU are the "teller"...?!?!

I don't think so. You are so far behind the power curve as to be still
operating with "B" batteries.

No matter.

SR

245. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 02:14:23 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <3Gfg8.20017$dM4.2912632995@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 36240

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C7C5E28.C8455DB@earthlink.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> > Sure, that sounds -exactly- like something smug Dave would say.
> > Meanwhile, I, an undeserving Tech, worked them by the thousands. Get
over
> > it.
>
> It was exactly something Dave *did* say. There wasn't any smugness to
> it. It was plain observation. Even a blind pig finds some acorns.

Sure, Dave, pick on blind pigs. Do you want to go double or nothing and
make fun of blind hams while you're on a roll?

> > >You didn't address my reply to your statement of
> > > my views toward those holding Tech Plus tickets.
> >
> > No need to. Your reply indicated that Tech Plusses can be every bit the
> > DXer that you are. Right?
>
> Sure they can, Brian and I've never said otherwise.

> > Let me bring you back to speed. We had a Frenchman on here and he
verified
> > that you were working out of band Frenchmen on 6 meters. I mentioned
that I
> > used to work FR6DX all the time on 10 meters.
>
> ...and you expected me to remember that you used to work FR6DX on ten?
> Sheesh.

No, I expect nothing from you. But lets see if your memory gets any better.
Did you go ahead and confirm those out of band contacts? I hope that you at
least printed the exact frequency and not just "6M" so they wouldn't have
the balls to submit them to the ARRL for credit. But hey, for a
greenstamp...

> > > What you call snobbishness, others
> > > would call experience.
> >
> > Dave, I'm not the only one on rrap whose commented on your smugness, and
not
> > just about DX. Why piss on my DX fun? Is that the mark of experience?
>
> If I've only got you and Kim to worry about I don't think I'll toss and
> turn much over the issue of smugness.

You wouldn't anyway, it's a trait that smug people have.

You can have all the DX fun you
> can muster.

You probably thought that I needed your permission. Thanks Dave.

> > > I do just fine on this side of the pileup, thanks. Nailed a 5R8 on 6m
> > > the other day
> >
> > Do they have 6m privileges?
>
> Drop the licensing authorities a line and make an inquiry. I'm sure
> they'll be happy to hear from you.

They'd be even happier to hear you're not luring their folks out of band.

> Brian, your lack of DX knowledge is not based on your having fun working
> stations with non-U.S. calls. Go back to your OH2BH nonsense or your
> material on selling QSL cards for fun and profit for clues. One of the
> wonderful things about being human is that I get to pick and choose
> those for whom I reserve my admiration or my disdain. I don't reserve
> blocks based on license class for either group.

OH2BH "nonsense???" I guess you have no memory after all.

All I was saying was that if one wealthy ham like Marty can get the Axis of Evil/North Koreans to allow amateur radio, what could a group (like the ARRL) do to promote amateur radio there? You're the one who shanghai'd that theme and tried to convince us that the VP of Nokia lived in the low rent district. His income wasn't even the point, but you made it so, because you needed to put me down. Can't have anyone else on here commenting on DX. That's your exclusive domain.

As far as selling QSLs for fun and profit, Steve/KF2TI recently made statement about "charging for a contact." The reason that he made the mistake is because thats pretty much what it is. The brain has to be retrained so that the words that come out are in agreement with Part 97. Not always easy to do when it goes against common practice, and thus it comes out wrong.

> > What's your new countries on 160M? I want to use a small coax loop to
> > monitor 160 (I'm in a restricted neighborhood).
>
> PW0, H7, OM, KG4, EA6, J3, V73, VP8 S. Georgia among others. Coaxial
> loops work well. I use a 5 foot diameter hardline loop about two feet
> off the ground here with a variable gain preamp and a U-100 to turn it.
> An MFJ 1026 noise canceler helps too.

Holy Cow! Is your QTH by itself or do you live in a subdivision?

I can't even hear the clear channel stations on AM sometimes because of all the buzzing noise. Besides its a restricted development (which ones aren't???). You need a minimum 5 acres "estate" around here to build a lone house. Anyway, I intend to get up in the attic tomorrow and see what's

there to work with.

Brian/N0iMD

246. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 02:19:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302211957.16943.00001393@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36241

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/1/2002 11:54 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020302005440.10663.00000215@mb-fp.aol.com>

> As a "happy old man" skeptic of the established
>quasi-religion of radio amateurism, I'll comment and draw some of the
>fire away from you.

Lennie tried to draw in another unsuspecting "rube" with unusually
friendly and congenial banter.

It won't last long, no matter how much Ryan's vies coincide with his.

>>1. Lack of promotion (a good offense) by our largest psuedo-representative.
>>(ARRL)
>
>Saying such a thing is heresy of the highest order, an automatic cause
>for ostracism and possible burning at the stake. :-)
>
>The number one excuse for this is "lack of funds and time" and "it is
>very difficult to get the media to listen." Other equal-size or smaller
>recreation organizations manage to do so.

Oh? You DO have proof of this, right? Equal or smaller organizations?
OK...I am waiting...Pick ANY occupational field, Your Oneupmanshipness, and
then report back.

>>2. Lack of promotion on a local level. Some clubs and groups may be doing a
>> great job with that, but most aren't. There is so much that could be
>done

>The only "easy" way
>to get information is to know a ham who is active in some local
>group.

This is simply not true. Is it an "easy" way? Sure...knowing someone
who is involved in ANY organization is the best point of reference in any
organization.

However, Your Wordsmithmaness, it is NOT the "only" way.

>>3. NEGATIVITY. Now I understand that the older a person gets, the grumpier
>> they get
>> and that in and of itself must be justification for that. Would you
>> want to involve yourself
>> in something where you are constantly told you are a bad or lesser

>> person, even before
>> you put a signal on the air? I don't think so.
>
>Heh heh heh heh...having to coexist with lots of grumpy old men for a
>long time, I can understand your feelings. :-) I don't like them either.

Lennie's problem here is "bird's of a feather". Problem is none of them
like Lennie, either.

>>4. Education/Elmerism is just not there as well as it should be. From a
>
>It's my opinion that much of the "elmerism" is more fish story than
>actuality. Yes, I believe that there have been one-on-one tutoring
>situations but more likely the recipient was an impressionable
>teen-ager and the "elmer" was a family member. Such recountings
>may be exaggerations due to their nostalgia of a quarter century
>back.

When it comes to YOU, it IS a fish story. YOU have no room in your life
for being that helping hand, therefore YOU assume that no one else does either.

>Finding a volunteer teacher who can actually teach something,
>anything, reasonably effectively would be a rare treasure find.

It's not as hard as you think. No, not everyone can stand in front of a
classroom and impart knowledge or understanding, but then most of the best
instructing AND learning I ahve ever done has been in small groups, even
one-on-one.

>Based
>on insider information and suggestions I have, it would be a better
>bet to ask a professional teacher to help tutor a knowledgeable ham
>in the rudiments of teaching techniques...and to review his/her
>presentation.

I am sure this is what you have been told. As with any opinion, it and a
finback will get you coffee at Starbucks.

>> 5. The "If you build it, they will come" syndrome. I guess this one
>>ties into the promotion idea. I have seen clubs and VE groups that offer
>>test sessions and only get a few testees. (as well as other functions) Just
>>because we exist does not mean that people automatically come to us.
>
>From what I've seen for a few decades the general feelings within
>the club are simply as fraternal orders and their events are for
>themselves. I don't find that strange at all.

To what Amateur Radio clubs do YOU belong and actively participate in,
Lennie, in order to amke an INFORMED opinion?

>>Constant promotion in a positive way is needed to get people to these
>>events. Some of these events are ONLY listed with ham circles, (ARRL site,
>>club web sites etc.) so how does the general public get to know about all

>>the wonderful things we have access to as hams?
>
>National events such as Field Day could be promoted far more than
>it is; it's a perfect propaganda byte opportunity for TV, open-air,
>mysterious morse code beeping sound over-lay on video, strange
>radio equipment, etc., etc. I don't think that ever happened here in
>the L.A. area during the years Roy Neal, K6DUE, was a journalist
>with KNBC-TV, channel 4.

That's because you were not paying attention.

Too bad for you.

Steve

247. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 02:20:51 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <7Mfg8.20019$_R4.2913010815@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 36242

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C7BF89D.7474BCE5@earthlink.net...
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >
> > >Many of Kim's views are formed from a similar lack of knowledge of the
> > >subject at hand.
> >
> > I know much of what I know because someone took the time to say that
words that
> > taught me new things.
>
> Here's your chance to repay that debt by clueing in our Kim. I'd be
> curious if, during your period of unenlightenment, you went about
> demonstrating your lack of knowledge or if you simply realized there
> much you didn't know and sought out the advice of those who did.
>
> Dave K8MN

Another indication that Dave expects us to seek him out for advice.

Perhaps if Dave were to list the subject matters that he believes himself to be an expert in, or merely very knowledgeable in, we could then direct our queries in his direction.

248. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 02:32:10 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5s233fvg1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36243

The first response accidentally may have been sent before
being completed.

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020302005443.10663.00000216@mb-fp.aol.com...
> In article <a5o39t$ol9$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020228233108.25762.00000244@mb-mg.aol.com...
> >> In article <a5mk3hgmp1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:20020228174629.16934.00001114@mb-dd.aol.com...
> >> >> From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >> >>
> >> >> >To be honest, the PERCEPTION of many, licensed or unlicensed,
> >> >> >is that the ARRL has controlled most of the past of the ARS from
> >> >> >a decided minority group that is NOT required to be accountable
> >> >> >to either the membership or non-members.
> >> >>
> >> >> An odd perception to have of a group of Directors that is elected by
> >> >> by the direct vote of that membership.
> >> >
> >> >Ed,
> >> >Welcome to the club. NCI get's the same accusation from some
> >> >people.
> >>
> >> Bill, you BIT very hard on this one, ey? :-)
> >>
> >> Alright, together now...PROVE that either election is honestly done
> >> without any shadow of a doubt. Simply SAYING so is not proof.
> >> Simply saying so requires an article of faith of the membership and
> >> a strained believability factor on the part of non-members.
> >
> >Len,
> >Neither ARRL nor NCI (nor any other "private" organization
> >has to prove anything. The answer to anyone that either disagrees,
> >wants more "proof" or doesn't like the internal
> >policies/process/voting procedures is to simply NOT join
> >or to quit if already a member. Voluntary association...simple
> >concept in my book.
>

> Bill, you and Ed have been "had" by my recent message. :-)
>
> It was simply a case of "putting on another hat" and "thinking
> out of the box" to try seeing what the "other side sees." It was
> a "test" and the response was almost predictable.

Yet "the other hat" isn't apparently worn by many to begin with.

> The technique of role-playing "the other side" is not rare. It is
> an effective training aid in sales and marketing as well as
> politics. Lobbying and influencing decision-making is politics,
> despite an avalanche of noble, altruistic statements and
> patriotic bunting wearing either "side" brings up. Those whose
> "side" doesn't "win" generally sit around and grouse and gripe
> and whine about "dishonest politicians, crooks, etc." when it
> comes down mainly to imbibing too much sour grapes. :-)

So you are say which side won? Neither Ed nor I have
groused, griped or whined about dishonest politicians, crooks, etc.

> My personal opinions on certain radio regulations generally
> agree with No Code International's stated policies. They
> differ with some of the ARRL's past and present policy stands
> made public by the FCC. Neither I nor any other non-insider
> knows what is said, communicated between the FCC and
> organizations in private...yet all organizations insist the public
> should believe them. In short, each organization expects the
> public to "owe them" the benefit of any doubt about their
> sincerity.

WRONG! The public is free to believe whatever the public
wants. Absent any proofs of illegal, unethical or immoral
behavior, MOST people assume sincerity and honesty...there
are, however, and always will be...the black helicopter
element that sees a plot in everything.

> Those who are too personally involved with a group, an issue,
> for whatever reason, become enraged, furious against skeptics
> for taking an opposing viewpoint. The usual spin disguise for
> such fury is a careful phrasing of counter-claims of altruism and
> "service" and "support" to show they are the "good guys."

Welcome to the role of marketing ones ideas...nothing
new there.

> The ARRL is very good at this, having had a virtual monopoly
> in the amateur radio field for over a half century.

The ARRL has NO monopoly...your insistent reference
to monopoly misses the mark as to being able to "keep
a monopoloy" status. While ARRL may be one of the
only games in town, the ARRL has never exhibited monopoly
behavior to keep others out.

> They are
> self-sustaining in funding through specialty products sales,
> and as an advertising medium. They employ "professional
> amateurs." The ARRL retains a legal firm in the DC area and
> such legal representation is expensive.

Are you saying any of that is wrong?

> NCI doesn't do that.

So?

> NCI is the more altruistic organization by all public evidence,
> but they lack the long-term politics experience and a
> reservoir of spin material. That spin material stock is extensive
> enough to include spin denying the existance of spin. :-)

Again, so? More to the point, for lacking the attributes
you claim, NCI seems to have managed quite well working
the "system" exactly as it is supposed to be done.

> >Government vs private organization. Government exists by
> >decree of the people and the "checks & balances" are there
> >because the "people" want them. Private organizations exist at
> >the will of the memberships of each private organization.
>
> "We know this," Bill. :-)
>
> That's only the tip of a very large iceberg.

I have no clue what that iceberg reference means.

> >Len, I don't care if you do or don't believe that ARRL and/or NCI
> >are honest and above board. What difference would it make as to
> >what you believe in either case?
>
> I have no idea. :-) A problem in believability is still a problem of
> believability, whether you or the ARRL wants to acknowledge it
> or not.

BUT lack of believeability doesn't seem to be a problem for the
membership of ARRL or NCI. Beyond their respective memberships,
what difference does it make?

> An organization needs membership backing of some kind
> or it loses credibility and influence power with a federal agency.

We know this Len :-)

> >Works for me. I learned a long time ago there will
> >always be nay sayers to anything I say. The old
> >axiom covers that... You can't please all the people
> >all the time.
>
> Yes, yes, "You have the strength of ten because your heart

> is pure." :-)

Purity of heart isn't needed. Common sense tells me that
any idea almost never will find favor with 100% of members.

> The ARRL was founded in 1914 largely on the efforts of Hiram
> P. Maxim. Ever since the ARRL has paid him tribute equal
> to canonization. The ARRL is very silent on the full history
> of US amateur radio's early days, especially the 20-year
> reign of Maxim as the League's first leader officer.

80 year old history of an organization has little relavence
(IMHO) on current membership thinking.

> A number
> of radio-interest organizations came up or already existed.
> Most dropped away. The longest-lived one is RCA (the club,
> not the corporation), founded in 1909, the first ever radio-
> interest organization in the world and still in existance.
> Does the ARRL acknowledge it exists today?

WHY should ARRL acknowledge those other organizations?

> 88 years of the League telling all that the League is responsible
> for the existance of amateur radio and other choice gems of
> disinformation is a sure guarantee of turning claims into a
> virtual "truth" about the history. It's also an excellent base for
> brainwashing of several generations of hobbyists.

You obviously read more into such commentary than I do.
At this point, who cares as long as amateur radio prevails.

> >More to the point...WHY does ARRL or NCI owe you
> >any such "proof" in the first place?
>
> Showing evidence of believability. You will NOT convince
> the religious zealots of the PCTA morseodism cult, but you
> have the chance of gaining support of the mainstream by
> listening to them.

I don't see the mainstream being opposed to what ARRL (or NCI)
stands for. A political reality is that people who are content with
what is happening will rarely say anything. Those in opposition,
however, will become to pubic antagonists. Based on that, neither ARRL
nor NCI appear (IMHO) to have a credibility problem with
members, with the public and/or with the FCC.

> Above all you have to refrain from
> signs of knee-jerk responses from personal aggravation or
> holier-than-thou stances.

What holier than thou attitude?

> Adopting a holier-than-thou attitude may feel very good but
> it turns folks away, almost a guarantee to do so. Another
> organization has the lock on holier-than-thou-ness, having
> practiced it for a very long time.

???

> >Sorry, but that IS the only answer you'd get from me.
>
> "Pride goeth before a fall." Not a good answer to either
> skeptics or mainstreamers.

No other answer has been needed. By your own comment
above...this whole dialog has been nothing but a "strawman"
on your part. There appears to be NO issue of credibility
with membership, with the Public or with the FCC on the
part of ARRL or NCI.

> >Perceptions and about a $1 will get you a cup of coffee. If
> >ARRL, NCI and many other organizations had to worry about
> >everyone's "perceptions" we'd never get to focus on our
> >goals.
>
> That begs the question and suspicion about the real goals.
> If "focussing on goals" is so easily disturbed by either
> positive or negative criticsm then are the goals that worthy?
> Or is the goal something else, such as personal for the
> organizers, rather apart from the stated goals?

Let's see...no one in NCI gets paid anything...most people
in ARRL are volunteers with some paid staff. Just WHO
in either organziation might have a personal goal or hidden agenda.

> Lots of skeptical folks are suspicious of the ARRL's goals,

LOTS????

What goals are any of those LOTS suspicios of?

> something evident from in here as well as in other venues.

Not too evident to me...except for a HANDFUL of vocal
people. As I said, those that agree are generally quiet.

> The ARRL of these later years is a combination publishing
> house, goods reseller, and membership organization. There
> is a very blurry distinction between those activities. In most
> instances there is an obvious overlap.

And that's bad because?

> >Do you believe that EVERY phone call, discussion, conversation,
> >etc between an ARRL person and an FCC person MUST be
> >reported somewhere?
>

> No. Try to stay focussed. An organization is sustained by
> believability. Discounting the religious believers, actual proof of
> what an organization is doing, saying, or accomplishing is only
> possible from documentation of a disinterested third party. If the
> organization claims to be doing something and there is nothing
> else to prove that, the claim is just a claim.
>
> >There comes a point where, having failed to convince or
> >where the critic just keeps pushing for their way that every
> >organization ultimately has to simply say: You don't like,
> >that's tough...don't join, quit or whatever.
>
> Are you taking the ball and going home? End of game? :-)

Nope, I'm just saying you are NOT owed an answer.

> >No one, neither ARRL, NCI, Ed Hare, Carl S or myself has
> >ever said that the ONLY partipation in such FCC rule
> >setting should be via those organziations, already licensed
> >hams or ourselves.
>
> >NCI and ARRL both avail themselves of the public and well
> >established processes for input, comment, etc. YOU are
> >free to do so on your own. Neither NCI nor ARRL owes anyone
> >a special forum within their own organization to accomodate YOU or
> >anone else.
>
> As I've said, believability and veracity needs to be established to
> the membership of any organization...and to the agency it is
> attempting to influence.

Beliveability for ARRL is measured in renewals of membership.

> >Whatever perceptions exist, they don't worry me or in
> >any way cause me concern.
>
> >The "challenge" requires nothing on my part to begin
> >with. That I state the claim is bogus or of minimal
> >concern as to not warrant any change in organization and/or
> >a reply of suffient depth to satisy you my right, it
> >is NCI's right, it is ARRL's right.
>
> Negative point made. An acceptible answer is simply no
> answer. Answering in a personal manner can indicate
> many things to readers.

So be it.

> >So have the feds file an anti-trust suit against the
> >aleged ARRL monopoly. Given the availability of
> >alternative sources of products from other than ARRL,
> >I suspect the "monopoly" is unproveable.

>
> Please note my use of the two connected words "virtual
> monopoly" throughout. The "feds anti-trust suit" against
> Microsoft on "monopoly" charges is being reviewed again.
> Microsoft has a lock established on over 90 percent of all
> personal computer operating systems worldwide and that
> is a virtual monopoly on OSs without stretching anything.
> Definitions on a true monopoly are obscured by legal
> activities and influences none of the public can see, not
> to mention the quasi-religious aspects of believers who
> side with or against Microsoft for emotional reasons.
> Any corporation that has 90 percent or more of any
> market or activity control are generally accepted as having
> a virtual monopoly.

By many comments, ARRL certainly has nothing near even 50%
support of all hams. Is CQ magazine only less than 10%
of whatever you lump into the "ARRL virtual monopoly?"

> >... No monopoly exists, nor has it ever been so.
>
> Denial will not make it what you want.

Claiming it is so without anything of substance
doesn't make it what you want either. The burden of
proof is the role of the accuser.

> >So what? No one is guaranteed any success inife.
> >Have those new organizations been unfairly, illegally
> >or unethically undermined by actions of ARRL.
>
> Was anyone discussing philosophy of "success in life?"
> I don't think so. I made no charges as described in the
> quote above.

You implied (IMHO) that alternative organizations
don't survive because of the claimed ARRL virtual monopoly.

> <snip of the first two of identical statements>
>
> >So what....does ARRL or NCI owe that organization
> >any special accomodation, any support to insure it's
> >success?
>
> That was never implied. Other organizations have existed
> for their stated purpose. Their ceasing to exist may be
> attributable to many different reasons or causes.

But what about that monopoloy you claim?

> <snip>
>
> >I repeat...neither ARRL or NCI owes YOU anything. You are not

> >a member of either organization.
>
> :-) Here we go again... :-)
>
> Ahem, I can't be a voting member of one of them

So what...should ARRL change its membership rules to
accomodate you.

> and the other
> never accepted my repeated applications. :-)

So you stated...and Carl has indicated we have no
idea as to why you encountered a problem.

> Just the same, each organization is engaged in lobbying and
> influence towards the FCC on matters directly affecting entry
> into amateur radio.

Is that illegal, immoral, unethical?

> It is not logical or reasonable to have an
> 88-year old organization of voting members already entered
> controlling, directing, or influencing entry.

PLEASE tell us HOW ARRL is able to hold such influence.
Are you saying ARRL is operating illegally?

> That is de facto
> exclusivity, an extension of the attitude of "we know what is
> best for amateurs."

YOU are free to participate in contrast to ARRL.

> If NCI takes the same position of exclusivity, that will only
> serve to deepen the chasm of differences already established
> between amateurs and the rest of the radio world.

Methinks you see a chasm where none exists.

> The expected knee-jerk response of others, non-thinkers, is the
> phrase "this is amateur radio, only amateur!" They don't realize
> that amateur radio must share EM spectrum and the same
> federal regulation agency with every other radio service.

Some may, most understand otherwise.

> >You don't like our word on it, then don't join.
>
> Taking the ball and going home doesn't end the game and
> disdain isn't a very good answer, is it?

Yet for some, that's the ONLY answer. You don't
like the rules, don't play.

Cheers,,
Bill K2UNK

249. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 02:45:41 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5s2ld02up2@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 36245

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C81069A.E5D26DBC@worldnet.att.net...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> >
> > >Not quite, Kim, since *you* were the one who chose to make a fool of
> > >herself with an embarrassingly churlish Vanity call sign.
> >
> > And you are the one who continues to give that callsign as much exposure
as
> > possible by referring to it in every post you make.
>
> ARE you kidding? She "exposes" it every time she signs it, either here or
on
> the air
> There's no way, as you well know, that Larry or anyone else comes close to
that
>
> level of "exposure".
>

Most hams have a chuckle at Kim's callsign, and then never give it a second thought. By continuing to show your disapproval, you're giving it more publicity than it would normally get by Kim posting it.

250. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 02:53:42 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5s32802vv9@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 36247

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C805C71.8BD3140E@worldnet.att.net...
> So good luck when all the high tech transportation modes breaks down
and
> you
> find yourself barefoot. Just shows where some people have no idea what's
out
> there waiting for you.
> If you really believe the old Stevenson/NCI saw about CW hams being
> technogolically
> backward it merely shows you're as stupid as he is. HE's the jerk with the
> microphone
> stuck in his face.(you too?) I'm off doing HF soundcard digital modes.

Does that mean you won't be posting here anymore?

251. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 02:53:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020302215348.16943.00001400@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36244

Subject: Re: Radio Policy
From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
Date: 3/1/2002 10:15 PM Central Standard Time
Message-id: <3c8053e4_1@newsa.ev1.net>

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020301104725.16967.00001184@mb-dd.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> >From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
> >Date: 2/28/2002 9:28 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3c7ef76b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
>
> >- our government continues to legislate and impinge upon civil liberties
> >over it
>
> Which one's, Kim?

Just for a start, because you'd have to read the whole Act to find
everything uncomfortable about it, how about the ability of the government
to now "scan" our discourses on the interent; listen in on phone
conversations; hold people in custody for much longer a period of time than
is even reasonable...

"Read the whole act"...?!? Being informed is a citizens responsibility,
Kim...An obligation, even. How can you ever expect to really participate in our
government if you only want the Reader's Digest version of it?

> Were you unable to vote today?
>
> Did anyone refuse to hire you because of your gender or
predisposition to
> an "alternative" lifestyle?
>

That happens every day to people. Nothing new about that at all.

Yes, it does, but it happens in ever-decreasing rate. We have worked
dilligently to make sure our society encompasses all citizens as equals. But
only in death will we ever be truly equals. The rest is, at best, a balancing
act.

> Did a police officer not inform you of your right to legal
representation
> after he (since we no longer allow women officers) arresetd you?

Women officers? They're all over Dallas. And, Miranda was suspended before
the WTC, so I don't think that could be included as a result of the

disaster.

"Miranda was suspended"...??? When? And the reference to "no women" was
a suggestion that your suggestions about artificial restrictions are
implausible.

> >- patriotism has become the new measure by which we accept each other
(yes,
> >that is a bad thing)
>
> I don't believe you really mean this. You can BE a patriot and still
> disagree with "the system". And I DO consider someone based upon THIER
frame
> of reference to what thier views on America are.
>

I *do* mean that. It's almost like if one does not have flag glued to their
vehicle in some manner, or hanging from their home, their patriotism comes
into question. That is beginning to die down a little here.

> >
> >And that probably just scratches the surface. Internationally,
financially,
> >emotionally, this disaster continues to spread out like a nuclear blast.
>
> And unfortunately there are a great number of people who made comments
to
> the like of "it will take an act of war or grand act of terrorism to get
them
> to wake up..."
>
> They were right. Unfortunately, what we consider as "rights" are NOT
> really "rights". They are what society THINKS are "rights" at any given
moment
> and are subject to change by vote or convention.
>

Well, I consider them freedoms. Your mileage may vary.

True "freedom" is anarchy. We will never, except in death, have true
"freedom". No society that has ever flourished on Earth has ever been a truly
"free" society. I am willing to wager there never will be. Even if we lived
our lives by "just" the Ten Commandments, someone would still whine about how
thier "freedoms" are being bound.

> Even more unfortunate is that had we been "riding herd" on some of
these
> groups a long time ago, WTC 9/11 would have never occured. Yes, some
> individuals may have gotten thier individual toes stepped on in the
process and
> that is unfortunate. But look at what FAILING to invest in our security
did to

> us.

Hmmmm, we always seem to feel so safe and warm. For how long has the "Made in China" tag been around; Japan; etc. In my opinion, we've been "asleep at the wheel" while America's been taken over silently. Never a shot fired...

Yep. I agree. However it's not germane to the conversation. How do you equate commercial trade with terrorsim?

> You are right, Kim. The dust hasn't settled yet. The financial fallout
> will be years in settling. Families have been torn apart and billions of
> dollars wasted that could have been invested in our future and wellbeing.

Yeah, I love these companies who are suddenly doing so awful. There's those that are legitimate. There's also those that are playing this to the hilt and taking every opportunity they will.

I have no doubt of the abuses and "excuse" of 9/11 being the cause for financial failure of some companies. There will always be charlatans. Still not germane.

> Can you honestly say that all that was lost is worth it since, along the
> way, someone didn't get hassled by a federal investigator trying to make sure
> this could never happen?
>

I can't quite get that question, Steve...maybe I need a shot ;)

Do we allow more 9/11's to occur because we hamstring our intelligence services because they MIGHT infringe on someone's civil rights?

IF the civil rights of one...even 100 people had been intruded upon by various investigators over the years, would that have not been worth the lives of thousands of people? And even THOSE people would still be alive.

> Our "security" and our "rights" are fluid concepts. Only the Bible has
> rules in it that are supposedly unvioable, and those are the one's we seem to
> break most often. What makes anyone think anything written by the hand of man
> is so sacrosanct?

When there's a entity in power out there that begins making decisions on what I say--whether intended as a joke or perfectly serious--and is given leeway to begin scanning what I say, I get real nervous. I don't think any entity in power should have that latitude. Maybe if I'd always grown up and lived under dictatorial type governments the concept wouldn't bother me so much.

Then at what point do we allow surveillence? How? When? According to all media sources, the hijackers used regular Internet, just as we are, to coordinate thier activities. What if we had allowed the FBI to surveil these resources more finitely?

Your words and actions have been "scanned" all your life, Kim. First by your parents, then by educators. They actually have the least amount of "rules" on what they can or cannot do in regards to monitoring your comings and goings.

At least we DO have civil oversight over these organizations.

88

Steve, K4YZ

252. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 02:58:51 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5s3bt030sl@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 36246

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c80f68d_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C805F36.EC49F02C@worldnet.att.net...
> > > From the looks of his website, a helluva lot more than you've done.
> > >
> > So he toots his own horn, and loudly. That's news???
> > >
> > >
>
> Why, Little Dick! You have no trouble at all tooting your own horn (uh,
not
> *that* horn). heh heh heh, think ya got 'im, Krell...
>
> Kim W5TIT

You call that tooting his horn? From the looks of things, it's just so much
hot air.

253. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 05:10:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303001004.20570.00000192@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 36248

In article <3c810654_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>> But why be sarcastic here? The facts are correct, are they not?
>
>The facts are (AFAIK) *technically* correct .. that wasn't my point
>(read on ...)
>
>> The point I was trying to make is this:
>>
>> Ed keeps mentioning the "4 page study guide" story, but doesn't
>> mention the vast difference in privileges granted.
>
>The point that I was trying to make is "times change" and that
>the mentality of the past is no longer suited to today's world
>in terms of promoting a healthy future for the ARS.

Which "mentality of the past"? The mentality that ham radio is G-rated
and suitable for every member of the family? The mentality that hams
are more than users of manufactured gear? The mentality of making
getting started easy, but reserving full privileges for those who have
gained some knowledge and proficiency?

See what I mean?
>
>"Complaining" about liberalizations in outdated technical
>restrictions vs. tests is not the answer.

I agree! I wasn't complaining - I was comparing.
>
>Recognizing that the ARS needs to modernize constantly
>to remain interesting to potential newcomers and to remain
>competitive technologically with other alternatives that
>compete for people's interest and discretionary time is
>something that MUST occur ...

That all depends on what you mean by "modernize". Is
there no room for both the old and the new?
>
>> Fact is, we really don't have an effective entry-level license today.
>
>I don't TOTALLY buy that ...

>let me list a few comments in
>"bullet point" form:
>

>* It is IMHO *very* arguable that without the no code license,
>which has become the de facto entry point into ham radio,
>and the newcomers that have become hams via that route,
>that our numbers would likely have plummeted SERIOUSLY
>over the past 10 years.

That's only speculation. There are entire NGs devoted to alternative historic timelines, like "what if Hitler had focused on giving Doenitz all the U-boats he needed instead of wasting resources on debacles like the Bismarck and Turpitz?" Interesting but unprovable and a moot point.

Fact is, the FCC DID drop the code test from the Tech in 1991. They'd been pushing for a nocodetest license since 1975.
>
>* I have elaborated on my concerns with the power levels
>vs. demonstrated level of technical competence for the
>NCT license.

FCC doesn't see that as a problem. Have there been ANY cases of problems related to high power connected to lack of testing?
>
>* The main problem in terms of "an effective entry-level
>license" IMHO is that we are still stuck, for the relatively
>short-term, at least, with most of the newcomers being
>relegated to VHF/UHF because of the Morse test
>requirement for HF access.

You miss some important points:

- Passing the 5 wpm code test gets a Tech minimal HF privs. It takes 5 wpm and another written test to get more than a bit of 10 and tiny slices of 3 other bands.
- The 5 wpm CSCE is only good for a year.

Both these can be fixed. See below.
>
>* Once the Morse test is eliminated, it would seem to
>make sense to adjust the Tech test to cover HF principles
>and grant newcomers much broader HF privs ...

Why not do it now? The current license structure is a patched-up version of what was started in 1951 and last seriously revised on 1968. Talk about needing modernization!

> or maybe
>it would make sense to "merge" the tech and general
>classes ...

Without further testing?

> the only problem with such a merger would be
>that it might make the step from "unlicensed" to "licensed"

>unnecessarily large ...

The step is already too big. That's one of the problems, irrespective
of code testing.

>I'm certainly open to ideas on how
>the license structure and written test requirements could
>best be modified in a "post Morse test" era.
>
See below.

>> > > >(remember the "No lids, kids, or space kadets" guy? A real
>> > > >"welcome to ham radio" if I ever heard one ...}
>> > > >(not!)
>> > >
>> > > That was Mike, W2OY. He was on phone - 75 meter AM, actually. Not
>> > > CW and not in the Novice subbands. He's been dead several years now.
>> > >
>> > > Do you know what his gripe was?
>> >
>> > Does it REALLY matter in terms of the impression his
>> > diatribe must have made on newcomers?
>>
>> Actually, YES.
>
>OK ... I'm reading and will respond.
>
>> For one thing, they guy is remembered because he was so unusual. He
>> stuck out like a sore thumb. Also had a big signal.
>>
>> His gripe was that prior to 1953 it took an Advanced/Class A license,
>> or
>> an Extra, to operate 'phone on 20 or 75. Everybody else had to use
>> what
>> bits of 160 were available, or the ham bands above 25 MHz. 40 had no
>> phone segment and 15 wasn't a ham band yet.
>>
>> Then, without an NPRM, RM or anything else, in late 1952 FCC opens all
>> privs to all hams except Novices and Techs. All of a sudden ol' Mike
>> has lotsa new company.
>
>Ah, so I was correct in perceiving him as a "cranky olde fart" who
>resented sharing "his" "sandbox" with newcomers who he perceived
>were not as "superior" as he imagined himself to be ...

He was a guy who saw what he'd worked hard for being given away for
much less - and with NO reason being given.

Of course the way he did it was very counterproductive.
>
>That's why I mentioned him ... because I perceived him as
>a good example of EXACTLY THE WORST attitude that

>hams should show to newcomers.

How about the attitude that calls other hams names like "cranky old
fart" because of a disagreement? Is that what we want newcomers to see?

I was a newcomer in 1967, when "incentive licensing" was getting started. I
recall lots of hams being mad about losing "their" privileges. Most of them
thought that Generals had always had all amateur privs in the USA. Their
attitude was much like ol' Mike's.

>> But not with using the written tests to do the same thing. One
>> man's "reasonable and relevant" is another's "hoop". Why is a Tech
>> Plus
>> competent to run AM on 6 meters but not 10 meters? Why is a Tech Plus
>> competent to run 1500 W PEP on VHF/UHF but only a fraction of that
>> on HF, even though the RF exposure hazard is less on HF/MF?
>
>Those are good points ... with which I agree. You know that
>I think the Tech test is inadequate for 1500W ... but you seem
>in some sense to disagree. I agree FULLY that there is no
>distinction between the level of technical knowledge required
>to use "mode x" on VHF/UHF vs. HF ... in fact, in some
>respects, it is "easier to stay out of trouble" at HF ... particularly
>with homebrew gear, because the technical requirements for
>stable, clean gear are somewhat easier to meet at HF, due
>to circuit parasitics, layout, etc. being less critical that at the
>higher frequencies ...

But the FCC disagrees, and has disagreed for decades. Odd, isn't it?
>
>> > That's
>> > part of the problem ... you can't keep ham radio "like it was 40 years
>> > ago" and expect it to be vital, heathy, and viable for the long haul.
>> > EVERYTHING changes and hams need to accept change as well.
>>
>> Only if the change is for the better. Many changes are NOT for the
>> better. The mantra that "change must be accepted" as if all change
>> is inevitable and good is simply bogus.
>
>Change IS inevitable in a technically-oriented pursuit ... to ignore
>it and not figure out how to make use of new developments can
>only result in stagnation and irrelevance as the rest of the world
>passes by ...

Sure - but that does not mean the old stuff has to go, or that the bases
and purposes of the service are any different.
>
>> > > I have also suggested (with Richard Plourde) a post-S25.5 license
>> > structure to
>> > > address some of the imbalances of the current system (like 1500 W
>> > for
>> > > newcomers) and at the same time LOWER the requirements for new hams.

>> >
>> > You're right ... I remember seeing some of that, but it got a bit
>> > involved and I missed a lot due to business travel, then it seemed
>> > to be gone ...
>>
>> Still in the archives. Seems odd to me that nobody but Mr. Plourde and
>> me want to discuss stuff like that.
>
>As I said, I saw some of it, but missed a lot due to business
>travel (I don't have time for r.r.a.p. when I'm on business trips,
>nor do I have ready, convenient access to my ISP's news server).

See below.
>
>I'm sure that there will be more discussion in that direction
>in the future, but right now, the focus of my limited time is
>on the elimination of the Morse test.

What remains to be done in the USA? Is it not perfectly clear
what the FCC wants to do?

Do you really think that S25.5 has any chance of lasting past WRC 2003,
or that there will be any code testing left soon after that? Many countries are
already moving to 5 wpm only - if they haven't already.

>Once that is accomplished,
>I will have more time to focus on how other aspects of licensing
>and testing can be improved ...

The time to consider a new license structure is now, so that a
consensus can be built. FCC will not want to do it piecemeal. If we wait,
they will table the whole mess for several years.

Doesn't it make sense to develop a plan for post-S25.5 licensing now, instead
of leaving it to the future and more patchwork?
>
>> > > One additional fact: Nobody is required to start out with a Tech
>> > today, just as
>> > > nobody was required to start with a Novice in 1963. All newcomers
>> > have always
>> > > had the option to skip over the "entry level" and go straight for
>> > General or
>> > > its historic equivalent.
>> >
>> > Yes, but I believe that the leap from nothing to General is a larger
>> > leap today than it was in the past, with the exception of 5 wpm vs.
>> > 13.
>>
>> I disagree! The new General test is 35 questions from a publicly
>> available pool. The 5 wpm can be taken independently (CSCEs didn't
>> exist in 1963, either).
>

>OK ... good point ... one doesn't HAVE to do it all at one sitting.
>However, the number of questions isn't, IMHO, the defining factor
>in the difficulty of the test(s) ... as Ed has pointed out, there's a
>hell of a difference between the 4 page study guide he used and
>the current one, which if I recall correctly runs about 250 pages!

200 - but that includes the entire Q&A pool, and detailed explanations of the theory behind them.

I can easily write 5-10 pages on Ohm's Law for DC circuits. The old LM devotes perhaps one small question to it. Yet Novices were expected to know it and how to use it.

>(Then another one of ?how_how_many_pages? to make the
>move from Tech to General???)

At least another 100.

>I simply can't understand, given the MUCH larger amount of
>material one has to cover, how anyone can claim that the
>tests are "easier" or have been "dumbed down."
>(Not saying that you are saying that ... but rather that quite
>a few make that complaint.)

It's the METHOD.

--

Here's a summary of the ideas Rich Plourde and I worked up.

Underlying concepts:

First, nobody should lose existing privileges
Second, FCC isn't going to accept lots of license classes, so we stick with 3 classes
Third, the privileges should match the tests taken.

For clarity, let's call the new classes First, Second and Third to avoid confusion with the existing 51-year-old names. (The names aren't critical).

Third Class is entry level. Easy to get - a Novice for the 21st century. Simplified written test, focusing on the basics, mostly rules, operating procedures and safety. Allowed power levels kept low to avoid needing lots of questions on RF exposure - say, 100-150 W on HF/MF and 25-50 W on VHF/UHF. Wide selections and modes and access to parts of all HF/MF bands - probably all of 160 and the WARC bands. Third Classers can't be VEs, club trustees, repeater control ops, etc - all to simplify the written. Callsigns are all six character (like
WA3IYC)

Second Class adds more power (400 W or so) and more subbands. Written test is more comprehensive - about half and half rules and theory. Also allowed to be VEs, trustees, etc. Callsigns are five or six characters (W6BXC, WA3IYC) One

years as Third Class required experience

First Class is full privileges. Test is mostly theory, with rules to match full privs.
Calls signs are four, five or six characters. One year as Second Class required experience.

Bands are divided into subbands by mode type - CW, digital, analog phone/image. Typical division 35/15/50% of a band

Existing Novices and Techs get Third Class, existing Generals and Advanceds get Second Class, and existing Extras get First. Existing hams do not lose high power privs as long as they retain old license documents.

This structure could be implemented now, even with the code test still in place.
Those who have passed the code test get HF, those who haven't get VHF/UHF.
If/when S25.5 goes away, those who haven't passed code test get HF/MF.

End result is a simplified system where the privs granted match the tests passed,
plus incentives to upgrade without the entry level being too limited to be attractive.

Sure, there are parts you don't like. There are parts I don't like, either. But

doesn't it make more sense than what we have now, or what we'll have if all that happens is dropping the code test?

73 de Jim, N2EY

254. Posting of new club websites?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 05:50:01 UTC
From: cust8857@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <f16cb6cc.0203022150.7368033f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 36249

Gentlemen,

Could someone please educate me on the ethical and legal views
involved in posting my club's new web site?

Thank you

255. Re: Bootleg Call signs - Identity theft?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 06:21:31 UTC
From: Technomage <proudhawk@uswestmail.net>
Message-ID: <pan.2002.03.02.23.21.33.380.16944@uswestmail.net>
Source record: 36250

no, I don't jest and stop calling me shirley! :)

In article <CBRf8.8421$106.529160@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

> I was referring to mange; if the shoe fits, by all means wear it.
>
> You don't seriously expect unidentified opinion to be given full weight.
> Shirley you jest.

--
I will not be pushed, filed, stamped, indexed, briefed, debriefed, or numbered!
My life is my own - No. 6

256. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 06:29:42 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c81c4e6_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36251

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020302215348.16943.00001400@mb-dd.aol.com...
> Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
> Date: 3/1/2002 10:15 PM Central Standard Time
> Message-id: <3c8053e4_1@newsa.ev1.net>
>
> Just for a start, because you'd have to read the whole Act to find
> everything uncomfortable about it, how about the ability of the government
> to now "scan" our discourses on the interent; listen in on phone
> conversations; hold people in custody for much longer a period of time
than
> is even reasonable...
>
> "Read the whole act"...?!? Being informed is a citizens
responsibility,
> Kim...An obligation, even. How can you ever expect to really participate
in our
> government if you only want the Reader's Digest version of it?
>

Steve! C'mon. I think you know me better than that...I meant *you'd* have
to read the whole Act (because I bet there's things in it that you would
disagree with, also). I automatically assumed that you had not read it.
Maybe I am wrong. I have read most of it--online.

[SNIP]
>
> Well, I consider them freedoms. Your mileage may vary.
>
> True "freedom" is anarchy. We will never, except in death, have true
> "freedom". No society that has ever flourished on Earth has ever been a
truly
> "free" society. I am willing to wager there never will be. Even if we
lived
> our lives by "just" the Ten Commandments, someone would still whine about
how
> thier "freedoms" are being bound.
>

It seems awfully "convenient" to begin redefining things such as freedoms
and liberties, simply because of this situation.

[SNIP]

>
> Hmmmm, we always seem to feel so safe and warm. For how long has the
"Made
> in China" tag been around; Japan; etc. In my opinion, we've been "asleep
at
> the wheel" while America's been taken over silently. Never a shot
fired...
>
> Yep. I agree. However it's not germane to the conversation. How do
you
> equate commercial trade with terrorsim?
>

Can you say "not much difference" in the end result?

[SNIP]
>
> > Can you honestly say that all that was lost is worth it since,
along
> the
> > way, someone didn't get hassled by a federal investigator trying to make
> sure
> > this could never happen?
> >
>
> I can't quite get that question, Steve...maybe I need a shot ;)
>
> Do we allow more 9/11's to occur because we hamstring our intelligence
> services because they MIGHT infringe on someone's civil rights?
>

Quite frankly? I don't think there's really any way to avoid things such as terrorist attacks. I really don't. I also don't think you'll find many of the proportion of the WTC. I truly, truly don't want to sound flippant here but, for the sake of debate, didn't Osama bin Laden himself say that the magnitude of destruction was more than they had realized would happen?

Terrorism is a way of life...like life in the big city. All we end up doing by striking out to erradicate it, is probably putting ourselves into more of a box. I don't particularly care to give in like that.

>
>
> IF the civil rights of one...even 100 people had been intruded upon
by
> various investigators over the years, would that have not been worth the
lives
> of thousands of people? And even THOSE people would still be alive.
>

Truly? I'd rather ask those thousands of people. Myself? I'd be willing to put my life on the line to allow more liberty, freedom, whatever we want to call it. To do otherwise, in my opinion, is to let "them" win.

> >
> > Our "security" and our "rights" are fluid concepts. Only the Bible
> has
> > rules in it that are supposedly unvioable, and those are the one's we
seem
> to
> > break most often. What makes anyone think anything written by the hand
of
> man
> > is so sacrosanct?
>
> When there's a entity in power out there that begins making decisions on
> what I say--whether intended as a joke or perfectly serious--and is given
> leeway to begin scanning what I say, I get real nervous. I don't think
any
> entity in power should have that latitude. Maybe if I'd always grown up
and
> lived under dictatorial type governments the concept wouldn't bother me so
> much.
>
> Then at what point do we allow surveillence? How? When? According
to
> all media sources, the hijackers used regular Internet, just as we are, to
> coordinate thier activities. What if we had allowed the FBI to surveil
these
> resources more finitely?
>

What if you and I "joke around" about something that raises suspicion? Next thing you know, we're arrested, or at least detained, for questioning. Next thing you know, it's you and I that have to spend the bucks on attorneys to get us out of perfectly innocent talk, letter writing, phone conversation, emailing, chat room, take-your-pick.

>
> Your words and actions have been "scanned" all your life, Kim. First
by
> your parents, then by educators. They actually have the least amount of
> "rules" on what they can or cannot do in regards to monitoring your
comings and
> goings.
>
> At least we DO have civil oversight over these organizations.
>
> 88
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>

I don't think we have enough oversight any more. And, I think we'll have less and less as time goes on. I may be wrong. I hope I am.

88 to you, Kim W5TIT

257. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 07:27:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303022758.03606.00001648@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 36252

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>Date: 3/3/2002 12:29 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3c81c4e6_1@newsa.ev1.net>

>Quite frankly? I don't think there's really any way to avoid things such as
>terrorist attacks. I really don't. I also don't think you'll find many of
>the proportion of the WTC.

Now THIS scares me...it's defeatism.

And you know where you don't find one's of the proportion of WTC..?!?!
Well, how about Isreal, for one. Although they still ahve to deal with bus bombers and other suicide idiots, I don't think we'll ever see airliners flying into buildings there.

Perhaps because the Moussad doesn't take no for an answer...And I don't think too many Isreali's are as concerned about their intelligence agencies limiting thier freedoms.

>I truly, truly don't want to sound flippant here
>but, for the sake of debate, didn't Osama bin Laden himself say that the
>magnitude of destruction was more than they had realized would happen?

And just because he didn't expect it to be that big means it's OK?

>Terrorism is a way of life...like life in the big city.

Then it's OK, huh?

Got a 13 year old daughter I can molest? Isn't molestation a way of life for some? Must be, if we accept your logic. Drugs...Let's pass 'em out at the lunch counter at school with hotdogs and cokes (ooops! Freudian slip!)

No...terrorism is NOT a way of life. It's an interruption of life.

>All we end up doing
>by striking out to erradicate it, is probably putting ourselves into more of
>a box. I don't particularly care to give in like that.

The Jews tried that...it was called apeasement. It didn't work for them, either.

>Truly? I'd rather ask those thousands of people. Myself? I'd be willing
>to put my life on the line to allow more liberty, freedom, whatever we want
>to call it. To do otherwise, in my opinion, is to let "them" win.

Then you can't have it both ways. We either decide that our way of life is righteous and worthy of defense, or we surrender. It's that simple.

>What if you and I "joke around" about something that raises suspicion? Next
>thing you know, we're arrested, or at least detained, for questioning.

I don't say "bomb" on an airliner and I don't stick my finger in my pocket
at the 7-11 and say "give me the money. Ergo I have nothing to fear of the
feds.

>Next
>thing you know, it's you and I that have to spend the bucks on attorneys to
>get us out of perfectly innocent talk, letter writing, phone conversation,
>emailing, chat room, take-your-pick.

It's ben going on since J.Edgar's day. Other than the technology being
different, what do you think is diffrent now?

>I don't think we have enough oversight any more. And, I think we'll have
>less and less as time goes on. I may be wrong. I hope I am.

Oversight is fine. But not when it lays our intelligence agencies and
Armed Forces open to such public scrutiny that they can't function.

Our "opponents" and even some of our Allies think it's really funny that we
actually make a big deal about security, then lay that information out for all
to see as if "the bad guys" are going to respect our privacy and not peek.

Time to take off the gloves. I am sorry that some innocent people may
come out of this with a bloody nose, but they will be able to bitch about it.

88

Steve

258. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 07:48:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020303024828.21231.00000909@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 36258

In article <3C8065D1.6567183D@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>
> Ham radio, RIP. Oh, it'll be around, all right, in name. ARRL will still be
>called ARRL
>and it will still be chasing the cash and membership rolls increases,
>regardless of source..
>But facts are facts::: When it has been flooded with the illicit offspring of
>27 mcs it will be ham radio in name only. The beef will be long gone.
>Much of it already is gone, the rest is going fast.
>
> Again; Alas, poor Ham Radio, RIP. We hardly knew ye.

Dick:

I must agree. Ham radio seems to be fairly stable at the moment,
from a standpoint of numbers of licensees. However, after the
final chapter of dumbing-down is written, and the 5 WPM code test
goes away, the chaos on the HF phone bands will be so bad that
it won't be resolved by any amount of "refarming" of spectrum. At
that point, any remaining "old timers" will give up in disgust, and
the CW/Digital sub-bands will be given over to phone band
expansion out of sheer demand -- or rather outcry from the whiners
who can't get a word in edgewise on HF and want the ARRL/FCC
to do something about it. Ultimately, the FCC will tire of managing
this mess, and either totally deregulate the amateur HF allocations,
or merely pull the rug out from under our feet, sell everything above
500 MHz to the highest bidder, and leave us with deregulated, CB-like
chaos on HF and fill-in-the-application-blank licensed repeater
monkeys. OH, right -- there will be all those eager new CW users
who were "sold" on the value of that mode. Right.

73 de Larry, K3LT

259. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 07:48:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020303024829.21231.00000911@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 36253

In article <20020302065524.26453.00001189@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>I would have to believe them both to be trustworthy in order for me to
>>believe what they say about themselves. I believe neither.
>
>I don't believe I have seen either of them lie, although Larry does come
>close
>when gets into his cut-and-paste buzzwords to see if he can get a rise out of
>me.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Wrong again, Ed -- it is Kim who wishes to get a "rise" out of you.

73 de Larry, K3LT

260. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 07:48:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020303024829.21231.00000910@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 36255

In article <3c8107c7_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>
>Congratulations on being open-minded, Larry ... I was going to respond
>to Cecil's "antidote" quip by stating that Ed's antidote was technical
>knowledge.
>
>I'm SO glad that we've finally convinced you that technical knowledge
>IS THE antidote to dumbing down (and Morse proficency or lack thereof
>has nothing to with "being dumbed down.")
>
>Carl - wa6vse

Carl:

The way I see it, there are two parts to being a ham. One is basic,
useful operating skill, and the other is the technical knowledge that
permits one to "operate" in the first place. I don't separate one from
the other, therefore a lack of knowledge of one of our simplest,
most durable, and most effective operating modes does, indeed,
cause a general "dumbing down" of radio amateurs.

You are absolutely correct that technical knowledge does not depend
on Morse code skill -- but being a completely capable amateur
communicator does. The plain truth is that those who haven't been
bothered to gain useful Morse proficiency simply don't understand
where the PCTA is coming from. Therefore, IMHO, they are not
qualified to judge the value of code testing as a licensing requirement.
Those code-proficient hams who also possess high technical skill
yet claim that code testing isn't necessary to keep the mode alive
are merely electing to stay out of a political shooting match.

73 de Larry, K3LT

261. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 07:48:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020303024830.21231.00000912@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 36257

In article <3c80f33f$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>
>Do you have to practice at being such an ignoramus, Larry, or is it genetic?
>As usual, you enjoy being miserable and looking at something from the worst
>possible angle to put your own miserable reflection upon it. What I am
>talking about are the idiots that *USE PATRIOTISM* as some kind of yardstick
>to judge other people. Kind of like using whether someone is the same
>religion or not.
>
>Kind of like you do with CW.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

How, pray tell, do you think I *should* judge non-patriotic Americans?
This is one of the few countries in the world where freedom, liberty,
and equality of opportunity are guaranteed to each and every citizen.
It is one of a very small handful where true ethnic and cultural diversity
are the norm -- not the exception. It is the only country with the generosity
of spirit to export our concepts of freedom and liberty to other nations
who suffer under the oppressive rule of tyrannical dictators. We sacrifice
the lives of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines to give others a
chance to live as we do, and get little thanks and hardly no appreciation
for our trouble. Other nations would rather foment hatred of us for our
wealth and lifestyle, rather than foster the freedom which could bring it into
their own lives. Yes, Kim -- I DO use patriotism as a yardstick to
"judge" other people. If you're an American, and enjoy the way of life
that being an American brings to you -- then you'd damn well better
be patriotic as all heck -- or you will have a problem with me!

Military veterans like myself have sacrificed the best and most
productive part of our lives to ensure that the rest of our countrymen
can continue to enjoy the benefits of life as Americans. Hundreds
of thousands of U.S. veterans have given their very lives to this
cause. I appreciate this sacrifice, I honor those who made it, and I
value the patriotic fervor that inspired it. There is a perfection of
liberty enjoyed by Americans that exists in few other places on the
face of this planet -- made possible by patriotic American military
personnel and all of the hard-working, courageous, self-sacrificing
citizens who have supported them through the years. We have
defeated the oppression of Nazism, Fascism, and Communism
in Europe and Japan, and will defeat the threat of terrorism anywhere

it is found -- but only if all Americans stand together and freely express their patriotic fervor without fear, compromise, or apology.

I have no doubt that if our country were attacked again in a manner which put us back in a global war, you would gladly go to a wartime defense factory, pick up your rivet gun, and work just as hard to help defeat our potential oppressors as Rosie the Riveter did during WWII. So please think twice before you criticize people who "judge" others on the basis of patriotism. Here in the USA, that's the best yardstick to use!

73 de Larry, K3LT

262. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 07:48:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020303024831.21231.00000913@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 36254

In article <20020302065145.26453.00001187@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>Not quite, Kim, since *you* were the one who chose to make a fool of
>>herself with an embarrassingly churlish Vanity call sign.
>
>And you are the one who continues to give that callsign as much exposure as
>possible by referring to it in every post you make.

Ed:

In ***every*** post I make? Wanna bet me a lobster dinner I can find
at least one posting where I don't use Kim's call sign?

>And still you deny you are not fascinated by Kim!

Don't look now, but that's right -- I do -- because I'm not!

73 de Larry, K3LT

263. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 07:48:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020303024831.21231.00000914@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 36256

In article <20020302131656.26494.00001288@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
>>ARE you kidding? She "exposes" it every time she signs it, either here or on
>>the air
>>There's no way, as you well know, that Larry or anyone else comes close to
>>that
>>
>>level of "exposure".
>
>Do you really think that DE <callsign> is as much exposure as paragraph after
>paragraph discussing that callsign? Or making up cute names for her using
>that
>callsign? You chose do do that, Dick, and you chose to give it exposure by
>posting it.
>
>Is this another "she made me beat her" sort of thing?
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

Cute trick, but no lobster for you. Kim started this thing with her callsign, and it isn't going to end unless and until she either vacates this newsgroup or changes it. It's as simple as that. Dick and I aren't going to show tacit approval of her deliberate attempt to undermine the good opinion the public has of the ARS through her ill-conceived call sign. My only question is -- why do YOU?

73 de Larry, K3LT

264. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 08:54:58 UTC
From: Radio Ham <no.spam@no.spam>
Message-ID: <3c81e64a_3@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>
Source record: 36259
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Stupid Boy. I have been top posting since coming on the Internet
in 1994. Merely looking at my postings will satisfy
your meaningless challenge.

Snowbat <snowbat@geocities.com> wrote in message
news:42138ukdc5hgrc1cpqu49vltqth81rgb21@4ax.com...
> Radio Ham wrote in message
> <3c80ab13_1@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>:
> >Snowbat <snowbat@geocities.com> wrote in message
> >news:utrv7usj425mv665lhgq278nqth3hdgrv7@4ax.com...
> >> Top posting is a recent trend.....
> >> Bottom posting is and always was the Usenet convention.
> >>
> >
> >WRONG! Both top and bottom posting have always
> >been Internet conventions.
>
> PROVE IT! Please provide Message IDs of at any 5 Usenet posts in any
> single month of your choice prior to 1997 by different authors that
> feature 'top posting' to establish it was a convention. Can you do
> it? I think not.
>
> Here are 10 from January 1996 showing bottom posting was the
> convention.
> Message-ID: <DM243E.IA2@ul.ie> (Paul Power)
> Message-ID: <4emlcp$amr@bell.maths.tcd.ie> (Timothy Murphy)
> Message-ID: <4enutf$3rk@news.cs.tcd.ie> (Colm Buckley)
> Message-ID: <310e77cb.6194745@news.iol.ie> (Peter Shawe)
> Message-ID: <4em0lc$q9j@barnacle.iol.ie> (Tony Geraghty)
> Message-ID: <DLu3sG.A0K@news.tcd.ie> (Bwana)
> Message-ID: <4eiscm$o3s@gosset.maths.tcd.ie> (Dermot Frost)
> Message-ID: <4ekrk6$6k3@news.Ieunet.ie> (Eoin Keith)
> Message-ID: <4el24c$bea@gosset.maths.tcd.ie> (Alan Keegan)
> Message-ID: <4du9m3$7kq@barnacle.iol.ie> (Richard Barry)
>
>
> >Look at the RFC - it specifically
> >states that bottom posting is a suggestion only and not a ruling;
>
> RFC1855 although stating that it "does not specify an Internet
> standard of any kind" describes itself as "a minimum set of guidelines
> for individuals, both users and administrators." It is a suggestion
> in the same sense that an agreed bandplan is a suggestion - something

> for the common good that you ignore only if absolutely necessary
> whilst taking into account the impact on users who abide by it.
>
> http://rfc1855.x42.com/
> RFC1855 (3.1.1)
> "If you are sending a reply to a message or a posting be sure you
> summarize the original at the top of the message, or include just
> enough text of the original to give a context. This will make sure
> readers understand when they start to read your response. Since
> NetNews, especially, is proliferated by distributing the postings from
> one host to another, it is possible to see a response to a message
> before seeing the original. Giving context helps everyone. But do not
> include the entire original!"
>
> Top posting is officially discouraged in microsoft.* groups:
> http://www.jsiinc.com/newsgroup_document.htm
> "When including text from a previous message in the thread, trim it
> down to include only text pertinent to your response. Your response
> should appear below the quoted information."
>
>
> Do you have a _good_ excuse to ignore these widely accepted
> guidelines? Please take the points raised at
> http://www.fmf.nl/~anton/topposting.html into consideration in your
> reply.
>
>
>
> >thereby
> >showing that both habits were extant before the RFC itself
> >was produced.
>
> It doesn't show anything of the kind. Examples of both techniques
> from posts made prior to October 1995 (RFC1855) would show that.
>
> Here are 10 examples of bottom posting from January 1995. I await
> your examples of top posting prior to October 1995. Can you find any?
> I think not.
>
> Message-ID: <D2nE9u.5E0@ul.ie> (Liam Relihan)
> Message-ID: <3g4cfu$r60@gate2.internet-eireann.ie> (Dermot McNally)
> Message-ID: <D2nMw1.3D1@curia.ucc.ie> (John O'Regan)
> Message-ID: <D38uz3.ECo@cwi.nl> (Dik T. Winter)
> Message-ID: <3glh7g$n8q@doc.armltd.co.uk> (Michael Kilpatrick)
> Message-ID: <3gm16q$1pj@lehua.ilhawaii.net> (Jay Hanson)
> Message-ID: <791619127snx@tiny.demon.co.uk> (Richard Phillips)
> Message-ID: <1995Jan31.125555@specialix.co.uk> (Steve Thomas)
> Message-ID: <3glbfa$3q4@lyra.csx.cam.ac.uk> (David Sawford)
> Message-ID: <1e32lbe5f@1776.COM> (Robert Coe)

265. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 09:58:35 UTC
From: Pete Rixon <uksatman@btinternet.com>
Message-ID: <e2t38ucbofhn8cro3uar9p2d08ldphn142@4ax.com>
Source record: 36370
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sat, 2 Mar 2002 10:31:08 -0000, "Radio Ham" <no.spam@no.spam>
wrote:

>WRONG! Both top and bottom posting have always
>been Internet conventions. Look at the RFC - it specifically
>states that bottom posting is a suggestion only and not a ruling; thereby
>showing that both habits were extant before the RFC itself
>was produced.
>

http://fmf.fwn.rug.nl/~anton/topposting.html
http://www.blakjak.demon.co.uk/gey_chr0.htm
http://www.blakjak.demon.co.uk/gey_stv0.htm
http://www.geocities.com/nnqweb/nquote.html
http://www.greenend.org.uk/rjk/2000/06/14/quoting.html
http://www.html-faq.com/faq.php?clue=topposting
http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc1855.txt
http://www.jsiinc.com/newsgroup_document.htm
http://www.malibutelecom.fi/yucca/usenet/brox.html
http://www.newsreaders.com/
http://www.planefacts.ndirect.co.uk/group/advice/
http://www.plig.net/nnq/nquote.html
http://www.star-one.org.uk/computer/format.htm
http://www.usenet.org.uk/ukpost.html#s3
http://www.uwasa.fi/~ts/http/quote.html

Thanks to Huge for that information.

--
"We don't have to know - we are the management".

266. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 10:53:57 UTC
From: QrizB@dev.nul
Message-ID: <3c81fcd3.49560137@news.ntlworld.com>
Source record: 36260
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 3 Mar 2002 08:54:58 -0000, "Radio Ham" <no.spam@no.spam>
wrote:

>Stupid Boy. I have been top posting since coming on the Internet
>in 1994. Merely looking at my postings will satisfy
>your meaningless challenge.

Well, Google can't find any message posted by an author called "Radio
Ham" before 1998.

I suggest you're not being entirely truthful.

--
QrizB

I sound like I know what I'm talking about, but don't
be fooled.

267. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 11:30:32 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5t1bc024ds@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 36261
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"QrizB" <QrizB@dev.nul> wrote in message
news:3c81fcd3.49560137@news.ntlworld.com...
> On Sun, 3 Mar 2002 08:54:58 -0000, "Radio Ham" <no.spam@no.spam>
> wrote:
>
> >Stupid Boy. I have been top posting since coming on the Internet
> >in 1994. Merely looking at my postings will satisfy
> >your meaningless challenge.
>
> Well, Google can't find any message posted by an author called "Radio
> Ham" before 1998.
>
> I suggest you're not being entirely truthful.

Usenet allows one to maintain a certain amount of anonymity. It's quite
possible that he has been posting since 1994, but not necessarliy under the
pseudonym of "Radio Ham" all that time.

268. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 12:47:38 UTC
From: QrizB@dev.nul
Message-ID: <3c821ad0.57238692@news.ntlworld.com>
Source record: 36262
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 3 Mar 2002 06:30:32 -0500, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>"QrizB" <QrizB@dev.nul> wrote in message
>news:3c81fcd3.49560137@news.ntlworld.com...
>> On Sun, 3 Mar 2002 08:54:58 -0000, "Radio Ham" <no.spam@no.spam>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >Stupid Boy. I have been top posting since coming on the Internet
>> >in 1994. Merely looking at my postings will satisfy
>> >your meaningless challenge.
>>
>> Well, Google can't find any message posted by an author called "Radio
>> Ham" before 1998.
>>
>> I suggest you're not being entirely truthful.
>
>Usenet allows one to maintain a certain amount of anonymity. It's quite
>possible that he has been posting since 1994, but not necessarliy under the
>pseudonym of "Radio Ham" all that time.

True. However, it still somewhat invalidates his claim that "merely
looking at my postings will satisfy your meaningless challenge" when
he doesn't tell you who he *was*, doesn't it?

(I'll drop this now, what with me being a brain-dead CB'er and all.)

--
QrizB

I sound like I know what I'm talking about, but don't
be fooled.

269. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 13:08:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C822065.B8DD114D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 36263

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20020302063159.26453.00001183@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >>Bill, you and Ed have been "had" by my recent message. :-)
> >
> >I respect your saying this, Len. Not many people will admit when they are
> >trolling.
>
> It is sad demonstration of reading and understanding by others
> when they have to be told what is happening.

That is similar to the sad lament of poor actors who can't understand
why the audience throws tomatoes after they've given what they consider
to be a brilliant performance.

Dave K8MN

270. Re: I Am An Outlaw CB Genius!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 13:25:54 UTC
From: Brainbuster <brain@buster.com>
Message-ID: <a5t9bb$b7a$9@newsg2.svr.pol.co.uk>
Source record: 36291
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Brian Gray <kd4fun@cox.net> wrote in message
news:RYSf8.21085$s03.702495@news2.east.cox.net...
> The frequencies are reserved for the U.S. Goverment you bunch of free band
> Morons. You have the technical skill of a dead turtle. You give RTiley
> Hollingsworth plenty of job security!
> "ZX11D" <w9jcm@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:3c58b8b0_2@corp.newsgroups.com...
> > 2 meter hams???????????? LOL thats funny. That show how much you know
> > pal.
> > Boy there is allot of 2M dx.!!
> > "Twistedhed" <twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com> wrote in message
> > news:e9de0154.0112201650.5423f9f0@posting.google.com...
> > >
> > > <snipped>
===

The original post was a forge...
"Twistedhed" <twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com>

That is not the real "Twistedhed", just some asswipe "Anti-Keyclown" trying
to justify their existance. Nothing to moan about, so they make
something themselves and cross post it.

--
Brainbuster.

271. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 13:35:23 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303083523.11714.00001254@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 36264

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Those code-proficient hams who also possess high technical skill
>yet claim that code testing isn't necessary to keep the mode alive
>are merely electing to stay out of a political shooting match.
>

Is that what I have been doing. Imagine that. I think that your description
also fits Cecil; he, too, will be amused to know that you thik he adopted his
view on Morse code testing to avoid a shooting match.

You are quite amusing at time, Larry. Thanks.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

272. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 13:36:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C8226CB.7073380B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 36265

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C7C5E28.C8455DB@earthlink.net...
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > Sure, that sounds -exactly- like something smug Dave would say.
> > > Meanwhile, I, an undeserving Tech, worked them by the thousands. Get
> over
> > > it.
> >
> > It was exactly something Dave *did* say. There wasn't any smugness to
> > it. It was plain observation. Even a blind pig finds some acorns.
>
> Sure, Dave, pick on blind pigs. Do you want to go double or nothing and
> make fun of blind hams while you're on a roll?

Are there blind hams out looking for acorns?

>
> > > >You didn't address my reply to your statement of
> > > > my views toward those holding Tech Plus tickets.
> > >
> > > No need to. Your reply indicated that Tech Plusses can be every bit the
> > > DXer that you are. Right?
> >
> > Sure they can, Brian and I've never said otherwise.
>
> > > Let me bring you back to speed. We had a Frenchman on here and he
> verified
> > > that you were working out of band Frenchmen on 6 meters. I mentioned
> that I
> > > used to work FR6DX all the time on 10 meters.
> >
> > ...and you expected me to remember that you used to work FR6DX on ten?
> > Sheesh.
>
> No, I expect nothing from you.

Your replies indicate otherwise.

> But lets see if your memory gets any better.
> Did you go ahead and confirm those out of band contacts? I hope that > you at
> least printed the exact frequency and not just "6M" so they wouldn't have
> the balls to submit them to the ARRL for credit. But hey, for a
> greenstamp...

Drop a line to WA8JOC and make inquiry. I did not make out QSLs for
QSOs. My cards may have indicated an actual frequency since QSL labels
were printed from my logs. The implication from your "greenstamp"
comment is that we were somehow raking in the dough on QSLing. I went
out of pocket some $1000 on QSLing.

> > > > What you call snobbishness, others
> > > > would call experience.
> > > >
> > > > Dave, I'm not the only one on rrap whose commented on your smugness, and
> not
> > > > just about DX. Why piss on my DX fun? Is that the mark of experience?
> > >
> > > If I've only got you and Kim to worry about I don't think I'll toss and
> > > turn much over the issue of smugness.
> >
> > You wouldn't anyway, it's a trait that smug people have.

Can you tell us about the traits which those people who have chips on
their shoulders have?

>
> > You can have all the DX fun you
> > > can muster.
> >
> > You probably thought that I needed your permission. Thanks Dave.

It was a suggestion. If it offends you, then DON'T have all the DX fun
you can muster. Either result makes little difference in my life.
>
> > > > > I do just fine on this side of the pileup, thanks. Nailed a 5R8 on 6m
> > > > > the other day
> > > >
> > > > Do they have 6m privileges?
> > >
> > > Drop the licensing authorities a line and make an inquiry. I'm sure
> > > they'll be happy to hear from you.
> >
> > They'd be even happier to hear you're not luring their folks out of band.

So, to be sure that I understand you, the fact that I got on the air
made me guilty of luring folks outside their band segments? Wowser,
that is some power I have.

> > Brian, your lack of DX knowledge is not based on your having fun working
> > stations with non-U.S. calls. Go back to your OH2BH nonsense or your
> > material on selling QSL cards for fun and profit for clues. One of the
> > wonderful things about being human is that I get to pick and choose
> > those for whom I reserve my admiration or my disdain. I don't reserve
> > blocks based on license class for either group.
> >
> > OH2BH "nonsense???" I guess you have no memory after all.

It would appear that you are correct.

>
> All I was saying was that if one wealthy ham like Marty...

I've seen this part of the movie. This is where I told you that Martti
is not wealthy and that he was not VP of Nokia--that he was a salesman
for Nokia.

> can get the Axis of
> Evil/North Koreans to allow amateur radio, what could a group (like the
> ARRL) do to promote amateur radio there? You're the one who shanghai'd that
> theme and tried to convince us that the VP of Nokia lived in the low rent
> district. His income wasn't even the point, but you made it so, because you
> needed to put me down. Can't have anyone else on here commenting on DX.
> That's your exclusive domain.

All I'd ask is that if someone does care to comment on DX, he has his
facts straight. I don't have a need to put you down. The chip on your
shoulder puts you down. You could have easily thanked me for the
correction. Instead, you attempted to argue the point with someone who
knows the man. Any who have a real interest in the matter are likely to
find the record of our exchange in Google.

>
> As far as selling QSLs for fun and profit, Steve/KF2TI recently made
> statement about "charging for a contact." The reason that he made the
> mistake is because thats pretty much what it is.

That's your story and you're sticking with it.

> The brain has to be
> retrained so that the words that come out are in agreement with Part 97.
> Not always easy to do when it goes against common practice, and thus it
> comes out wrong.

If you believe what you've just written, allow me to suggest that you
have no idea of what common practice in QSLing is.

>
> > > What's your new countries on 160M? I want to use a small coax loop to
> > > monitor 160 (I'm in a restricted neighborhood).
> >
> > PW0, H7, OM, KG4, EA6, J3, V73, VP8 S. Georgia among others. Coaxial
> > loops work well. I use a 5 foot diameter hardline loop about two feet
> > off the ground here with a variable gain preamp and a U-100 to turn it.
> > An MFJ 1026 noise canceler helps too.
>
> Holy Cow! Is your QTH by itself or do you live in a subdivision?

Subdivision? The nearest would be about 25 miles away. We have a plot
of land up on a ridge. I have a couple of neighbors, one at the foot of
my drive and one across the road. They're each about a hundred yards
away. The rest of the area is woods and pasture land.

> I can't even hear the clear channel stations on AM sometimes because of all
> the buzzing noise.

I did find some noise interfering with reception on MW and on 80m. It
turned out to be fluorescent lighting in my barn. Bypass caps and a
brute force line filter fixed that. I also found that a smaller, indoor
loop didn't work well since it largely heard the noise from my
computers.

> Besides its a restricted development (which ones
> aren't???). You need a minimum 5 acres "estate" around here to build a lone
> house. Anyway, I intend to get up in the attic tomorrow and see what's
> there to work with.

That is one of the sad things about modern life. You are prevented from
doing things you'd like because of the lack of alternatives to the CC&R
nonsense which swept the nation.

Dave K8MN

273. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 13:39:36 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303083936.11714.00001255@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 36266

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>Is this another "she made me beat her" sort of thing?

>Cute trick, but no lobster for you. Kim started this thing with her
>callsign, and it isn't going to end unless and until she either vacates this
newsgroup
>or changes it. It's as simple as that.

Yup, it is another "she made me beat her" sort of thing.

In your holy crusade to protect everyone's morals, Larry, you are doing some
pretty unholy things.

>Dick and I aren't going to show
>tacit approval of her deliberate attempt to undermine the good opinion
>the public has of the ARS through her ill-conceived call sign.

By calling more of the public's attention to it. That is a pretty illogical
approach to take, Larry.

>My only question is -- why do YOU?

I have not approved or disapproved of her callsign, Larry. I do not feel that I
should be given the power to enforce unwritten laws by bullying other people
into either changing what they are doing or going away.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

274. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 13:40:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C8227E7.5DA1BE29@earthlink.net>
Source record: 36267

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C7BF89D.7474BCE5@earthlink.net...
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > >
> > > From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> > >
> > > >Many of Kim's views are formed from a similar lack of knowledge of the
> > > >subject at hand.
> > >
> > > I know much of what I know because someone took the time to say that
> words that
> > > taught me new things.
> >
> > Here's your chance to repay that debt by clueing in our Kim. I'd be
> > curious if, during your period of unenlightenment, you went about
> > demonstrating your lack of knowledge or if you simply realized there
> > much you didn't know and sought out the advice of those who did.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Another indication that Dave expects us to seek him out for advice.

You read something into my comment which was not there. I thought it
was pretty clear that I did not intend to give Kim advice. I was quite
happy to dump the matter into Ed's lap.

> Perhaps if Dave were to list the subject matters that he believes himself to
> be an expert in, or merely very knowledgeable in, we could then direct our
> queries in his direction.

I don't have time for that, Brian. If you're really on a quest for
knowledge, perhaps I can suggest some good books or steer you to someone
with the knowledge and the inclination of devote large hunks of his time
to your quest.

Dave K8MN

275. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 13:41:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303084103.11714.00001256@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 36268

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>I don't believe I have seen either of them lie, although Larry does come
>>close
>>when gets into his cut-and-paste buzzwords to see if he can get a rise out
>of
>>me.

>Wrong again, Ed -- it is Kim who wishes to get a "rise" out of you.

I have never seen Kim cut and paste all the buzzwords that I have seen you use in your posts to me, Larry. Although you do sometimes engage me in rational conversation, it is not very consistent.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

276. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 13:42:44 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303084244.11714.00001257@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 36269

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>And you are the one who continues to give that callsign as much exposure as
>>possible by referring to it in every post you make.

>In ***every*** post I make? Wanna bet me a lobster dinner I can find
>at least one posting where I don't use Kim's call sign?

No, I cede the point that if one does a Google search, one can find a post in
which you do not refer to Kim's callsign.

Of course, most people use Google to find something that WAS said, not an
example of what was not said.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

277. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 13:52:01 UTC
From: Radio Ham <no.spam@no.spam>
Message-ID: <3c822c3f_3@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>
Source record: 36270
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Stupid Boy. One's id changes with the years.

I suggest you're not being entirely intelligent.

QrizB <QrizB@dev.nul> wrote in message
news:3c81fcd3.49560137@news.ntlworld.com...
> On Sun, 3 Mar 2002 08:54:58 -0000, "Radio Ham" <no.spam@no.spam>
> wrote:
>
> >Stupid Boy. I have been top posting since coming on the Internet
> >in 1994. Merely looking at my postings will satisfy
> >your meaningless challenge.
>
> Well, Google can't find any message posted by an author called "Radio
> Ham" before 1998.
>
> I suggest you're not being entirely truthful.
>
> --
> QrizB
>
> I sound like I know what I'm talking about, but don't
> be fooled.

278. Len's issues with NCI and ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 14:13:04 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c823124_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36271

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020302005443.10663.00000216@mb-fp.aol.com...
> >

[LARGE snip]

> > Ahem, I can't be a voting member of one of them and the other
> > never accepted my repeated applications. :-)

Granted, Len that you can't be a voting member of ARRL because
you're not a licensed ham (unless they've changed that rule, which
I doubt) ... if you have a beef with that, take it to the ARRL, 'cause
those are THEIR rules.

As far as NCI goes, I can't fathom why you would have had a
problem in joining if you've really tried to do so ... the process
is simply a matter of filling in the necessary information in an
HTML form on the NCI website and clicking a button ...
thousands of people have done it without problems, so I don't
understand why you and you alone haven't been successful.

The data from the HTML form is processed by a database
front-end script and goes DIRECTLY into the membership
database. I get an automated e-mail for each and every new
member signup ... I don't recall every getting such an e-mail
regarding your completion of the form (and I'd recognize your
name ...) and there is NO entry in the database for you.

Again, literally thousands of people have succesfully
completed this process with no apparent difficulty and new
members continue to sign up at what I would characterize as
a brisk pace for an organization of our size.

While I'm not questioning your veracity, I frankly and honestly
don't recall any of your previously referenced communications
with me regarding your inability to join (which you've somehow
twisted into "rejection.") I have assured you that you were
NEVER deliberately, consciously "rejected" as a member
of NCI.

If you wish to become a member of NCI, I would state without
reservation that I can think of no reason that you should not
be able to do so ... there is no "conspiracy" to "keep Len out
of NCI."

Simply fill in the form (completely, and please use proper
capitalization) and click the correct button at the bottom.
Just to see if there IS some strange, unknown software
issue, send me an e-mail at my main e-mail address
wa6vse@fast.net letting me know when you've sucessfully
completed and submitted the form and I'll both watch for the
automated notification e-mail that I should receive and also
check the database for a new entry. You should also receive
an automated e-mail acknowledging receipt of your information
and stating that you will be contacted with further information
shortly. (If any or all of these things don't happen, there must
be a VERY obscure bug in one of the database scripts and
I'll certainly look into it. Any feedback you send me, such as
copies of any error messages you receive, would be appreciated
and will help me to resolve the problem if one exists.)

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast.net> [personal and NCI-related mail]
<mailto:wa6vse-shack@fast.net> [sked, QSO/QSL, and usenet related
messages ONLY, please]
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPIIu5Je+N6+q84HiEQLZZACff0+tQZBqSQH3+m7eqJdKm6dnaBkAn1eW
Uvm0/f2Ac3zWDxIEHXcK9VWY
=/hGM
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

279. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 14:17:34 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c823237_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36273

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020302205848.16943.00001388@mb-dd.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: The tests that Real Hams took
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 3/1/2002 11:54 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20020302005443.10663.00000216@mb-fp.aol.com>
>
> >The technique of role-playing "the other side" is not rare.
>
> So I guess tonight must be your turn to be the man in bed, huh
Lennie?
>
> SR

Steve,

Unnecessary cheap shot ... and inappropriate considering that
there *could* be kids reading this stuff.

(You know what they cay "converts are the most zealous") ... since
Ed and a few others gave me the good advice to "tone it down,"
I'm a convert ... it's not my business if you like Len or not, but let's
at least keep the vendetta free of sexual inuendo and insults, OK?

Thanks for listening and 73,
Carl - wa6vse

280. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 14:21:00 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5tbknhna1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36272

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020303024830.21231.00000912@mb-mv.aol.com...
> In article <3c80f33f$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> >Do you have to practice at being such an ignoramus, Larry, or is it
genetic?
> >As usual, you enjoy being miserable and looking at something from the
worst
> >possible angle to put your own miserable reflection upon it. What I am
> >talking about are the idiots that *USE PATRIOTISM* as some kind of
yardstick
> >to judge other people. Kind of like using whether someone is the same
> >religion or not.
> >
> >Kind of like you do with CW.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> How, pray tell, do you think I *should* judge non-patriotic Americans?
> This is one of the few countries in the world where freedom, liberty,
> and equality of opportunity are guaranteed to each and every citizen.
> It is one of a very small handful where true ethnic and cultural diversity
> are the norm -- not the exception. It is the only country with the
generosity
> of spirit to export our concepts of freedom and liberty to other nations
> who suffer under the oppressive rule of tyrannical dictators. We
sacrifice
> the lives of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines to give others a
> chance to live as we do, and get little thanks and hardly no appreciation
> for our trouble. Other nations would rather foment hatred of us for our
> wealth and lifestyle, rather than foster the freedom which could bring it
into
> their own lives. Yes, Kim -- I DO use patriotism as a yardstick to
> "judge" other people. If you're an American, and enjoy the way of life
> that being an American brings to you -- then you'd damn well better
> be patriotic as all heck -- or you will have a problem with me!
>
> Military veterans like myself have sacrificed the best and most
> productive part of our lives to ensure that the rest of our countrymen
> can continue to enjoy the benefits of life as Americans. Hundreds
> of thousands of U.S. veterans have given their very lives to this
> cause. I appreciate this sacrifice, I honor those who made it, and I

> value the patriotic fervor that inspired it. There is a perfection of
> liberty enjoyed by Americans that exists in few other places on the
> face of this planet -- made possible by patriotic American military
> personnel and all of the hard-working, courageous, self-sacrificing
> citizens who have supported them through the years. We have
> defeated the oppression of Nazism, Fascism, and Communism
> in Europe and Japan, and will defeat the threat of terrorism anywhere
> it is found -- but only if all Americans stand together and freely express
> their patriotic fervor without fear, compromise, or apology.
>
> I have no doubt that if our country were attacked again in a manner
> which put us back in a global war, you would gladly go to a
> wartime defense factory, pick up your rivet gun, and work just
> as hard to help defeat our potential oppressors as Rosie the Riveter
> did during WWII. So please think twice before you criticize
> people who "judge" others on the basis of patriotism. Here in
> the USA, that's the best yardstick to use!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry,

Three cheers...I agree with EVERY word you have said in
the post above. I will only add the following...

In addition to Larry's comment, where else are those that
oppose American ideals and principles allowed a totally
open forum to express their anti-American hatrid. Indeed,
the same dedicated American military have defended the right
of the naysayers to express their opposing comments and/or
their anti-American tripe.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

281. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 14:40:31 UTC
From: RVMJ <RVMJ@Safety-&-Arming.Clara.co.uk>
Message-ID: <2ec48u0vshboa214p72ijvbdea1mqr7st5@4ax.com>
Source record: 36274
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

QrizB wrote:

>The Anus wrote:
>
>>Stupid Boy. I have been top posting since coming on the Internet
>>in 1994. Merely looking at my postings will satisfy
>>your meaningless challenge.
>
>Well, Google can't find any message posted by an author called "Radio
>Ham" before 1998.
>
>I suggest you're not being entirely truthful.

Ask Radio Ham what name he used to post under in the time frame he
mentioned. I bet you won't get an answer.

In the small number of his messages posted in 1995, all replies to
other postings were either bottom-posted or had his answers
interleaved with the remarks he was addressing. Interesting, what?

--
from
RVMJ
Remove Safety-&-Arming before e-mailing

282. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 14:48:19 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5td73qsq1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36275

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020302160937.03941.00000492@mb-ck.aol.com...
> In article <20020302064800.26453.00001185@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
(W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >
> >>Neither I nor any other non-insider
> >>knows what is said, communicated between the FCC and
> >>organizations in private...yet all organizations insist the public
> >>should believe them.
> >
> >Sure you know what is communicated, Len. The law requires that a
> >summary of any Ex Parte communication be filed into the public record.
Such
> >summary is required to contain the essence of what was presented. Both
the
> >ARRL and NCI Ex Parte presentations were summarized in great detail.
>
> One may argue the "summary" and "essence" but that is still a
> subjective viewpoint when there is no confirmation to the exact
> presentation from a third party.
>
> Skeptics have justifiable fuel for suspicion from several areas. As
> an example, take the minutes of the IWG-6 concerning Agenda Items
> 1.7.1 through 1.7.3. The September 2001 minutes were not posted
> until FOUR MONTHS LATER. The January 24, 2002 meeting minutes
> were not posted until March 1, 2002. The "scribe" for IWG-6 is allied
> with the ARRL.

WHO has the "ownership" of making sure notes are published? That woiuld
seem to be the FCC. If YOU have a complaint as to timliness of
meeting minutes, perhaps you need to direct that complaint to the proper
entity responsible.

> The first indication of the USA FCC preliminary position on Agenda
> Item 1.7.1, the most important one for amateur radio in that it has
> the basic changes to S25, has not been supplied to the public
> until 30 November 2001. That document is one of a series that
> contains a collection of different Informal Working Groups'
> recommendations as they have been (presumed) completed. That
> document was not referenced by either the ARRL nor NCI; an
> official of NCI made a vague reference to it. I supplied the exact
> reference and mentioned that the IARU "takes credit" for originating

> the removal of the morse code test as a requirement by
> adminstrations.

Ditto my prior comment. Neither NCI nor ARRL have official
responsibility to publish the notes/,eetings, etc.

> The public may view the USA-FCC Preliminary Views and Draft on
> 1.7.1 in a document released 21 February 2002 which may be
> accessed through the FCC IB WRC-2003 pages under "US
> Preliminary Views" link page. The titles of the document links
> specifically state the Agenda Item covered. The Agenda Items
> specifically for amateur radio at WRC-03 are 1.7.1, 1.7.2, 1.7.3.
>
> The document concerning 1.7.1 gives a synopsis of the code test
> issue history beginning with WARC-1995 through all the World
> Radio Conferences, culminating with recommendation for WRC-03
> and the Recommendations of ITU Working Group 8A. "Credit" for
> the formulation of it is again given to the IARU but there are some
> changes in this preliminary view relative to the one released on
> 30 November 2001. There is no publicly-released information on
> how those changes were enacted nor of the parties various actions
> in regards to those changes.

As before, take you gripe to the feds.

> What appears in publicly accessible information is that each
> organization "is working hard and dilligently toward seeking the
> best solution for amateur radio" or words to that effect. Such
> phrasing is very, very ambiguous with rather obvious self-serving
> attributions (normally classified as "spin" or "propaganda" but
> such definitions cannot be used without invoking organization
> wrath).

Wraith from who? ...other than you Len?

> No specifics were given, only standard boilerplate
> assurances of honest, dilligence, and hard work.

Which, you are free to belive or not.

> An honest reply to public queries of organization staffers would
> have been to mention the specific document and sources of
> information. I'll give NCI executive director Carl Stevenson credit
> for being honest about not knowing the exact document title of
> my query but he did know the approximate date of release. The
> only other replies did not yield anything of value, only the usual
> offended psyches' psychological wailing of terrible wounds
> received in message wars.

Your problem, again, seems to be more with the federal
process than anything else.

> Okay, now this member of the public has given other members
> of the public a rather specific clue on what the Preliminary USA-
> FCC views are concerning 1.7 et al. That seems to be far more
> specific than I've seen from any other organization (except NCI)
> concerning amateur radio. Why does it take an unlicensed-in-
> amateur-radio person to show where the exact information is
> located?

Maybe no one else cared enough to want to see it.

> >That one was a bit too convoluted for me, Len. Of course ARRL tries to
> >present
> >its best side to amateur radio and the organizations it deals with. I see
it
> >up close and personal and I have never seen evidence of fabrication.
>
> The ARRL constantly promotes itself in every media output it
> controls. It's "news" reports what the ARRL does with considerable
> selective editing to de-emphasize what other organizations are
> doing, sometimes in outright omission of such facts. Such selective
> editing is called "spin" or "propaganda."

Those are the current buzzwords used whenever someone disagrees
with the position taken. On Madison Avenue its called marketing.
Should Ford offer its competitors equivalent "reporting" when
Ford advertises what it is doing in development?

> Words such as "spin" or "propaganda" are common in definitions
> in political arenas, accepted as true descriptors by the public.

The opposing side always plays the "spin" or "propaganda"
card in reaction to what it doesn't like to hear. Playing those cards
is "spin" itself.

> Loyalty to an organization causes organization staffers to exhibit
> much outrage that spin or propaganda ever happens, followed by
> a vigorous denial. Denial of existance in light of obvious evidence
> is ludicrous.

I won't denie "spin" at all. More that it is the organization's
right to report things as it sees fit to best foster the position
of the organization.

> >> The longest-lived one is RCA (the club,
> >>not the corporation), founded in 1909, the first ever radio-
> >>interest organization in the world and still in existance.
> >>Does the ARRL acknowledge it exists today?
> >
> >Not that I know of. And that is whose fault? There are a number of
> >organizations that ARRL has worked with over the time I have been there,
> >ranging from the FCC to the Red Cross to the W5YI Group. If you are a
member
> >of RCA and feel that they should develop a cooperative relationship with
> >ARRL, approach them, and suggest their prez' call ARRL's prez' and see

what
> >common ground can be found.
>
> I am not a member of the Radio Club of America.
> I raised that name as an example of "selective editing" and expected
> some misdirection. Got it. There is NO issue, no issue raised, just
> a mention of the first-ever radio interest club in the world. The RCA
> has many radio amateurs as members, was active in early amateur
> radio in the USA, and exhibits an interest in the entire field of radio,
> not just amateurism.

Who cares, so what. It isn't the role or responsibility of ARRL
to promote or report on the history of every club that exists
or existed.

> As part of its own self-promotion, the ARRL selectively omits
> mention of other radio organizations. That is a common tool
> in spinning.

As part of the car club I belong to, we do NOT mention other
clubs that might compete for our members. WHY should we?

> >I will let your fear of brainwashing speak for itself as to the validity
of
> >your views, Len. A good place to close...
>
> Misdirection is a common tactic in messaging. I have no "fear of
> brainwashing." I know the techniques, can recognize the tactics,
> am quite used to spinners and propagandists outrage at being
> "outed."

No outrage at all. Indeed, for you to EXPECT every public
report by any organization to not be positioned in the best light
for that organization is pretty simplistic.

> I have presented places to look and names of documents for others
> to view. They may look for themselves and judge for themselves,
> come to their own decisions, their own opinions. Is that "validation"
> enough?

I await the responses.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

283. Compenstaion for amatuer radio operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 14:57:12 UTC
From: Steve Adell - KF2TI <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a5tdl1$m3a$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36276

Per Riley Hollingsworth,

If I were a volunteer during an emergency/disaster (flood, hurricane, snow, etc) and I was given food and shelter during the event..THAT IS PERFECTLY ACCEPTABLE and does not violate Part 97.113 (b)

If I am providing communications for the NYC Marathon and I am given a shirt/jacket/hat, etc. used to identify me as part of the staff or for public identification purposes and if I am provided with food during the duties of providing communications...THAT IS PERFECTLY ACCEPTABLE and does not violate Part 97.113 (b)

If I am allowed reimbursement of direct expenses during the course of providing communications for such activities, provided it is not above or beyond the actual expenditures, including mileage for charitable work, in accordance with IRS regulations, ...THAT IS PERFECTLY ACCEPTABLE and does not violate Part 97.113 (b)

If I run a repeater and solicit donations from users to help maintain said equipment...THAT IS PERFECTLY ACCEPTABLE and does not violate Part 97.113 (b)

If it is a club repeater, requiring the paying of dues, in part to maintain the repeater but also to run the organization sponsoring the repeater...THAT IS PERFECTLY ACCEPTABLE and does not violate Part 97.113 (b)

If I voluntarily include additional funds when sending a QSL card to another party...THAT IS PERFECTLY ACCEPTABLE and does not violate Part 97.113 (b)

HOWEVER....

If I were a volunteer during an emergency/disaster and charged a daily fee for providing communications service...THAT IS IN DIRECT VIOLATION OF Part 97.113(b)and is subject to loss of license and /or criminal proceedings.

If I am providing communications at the NYC Marathon and require a monetary fee for every piece of traffic I handle...THAT IS IN DIRECT VIOLATION OF Part 97.113(b)and is subject to loss of license and /or criminal proceedings.

If I insist that in order to provide communications for such events, I insist on a per diem...THAT IS IN DIRECT VIOLATION OF Part 97.113(b)and is subject to loss of license and /or criminal proceedings.

If, in order to make the DX contact, I insist on a monetary exchange before hand...THAT IS IN DIRECT VIOLATION OF Part 97.113(b)and is subject to loss of license and /or criminal proceedings.

If, after the contact, in order to receive a QSL card, I insist that a monetary exchange be done or the card won't be sent..THAT IS IN DIRECT VIOLATION OF Part 97.113(b)and is subject to loss of license and /or criminal proceedings, as long as it involves US amateur only making the demands.

If I run a repeater and insist that a monetary exchange be done before access is allowed...THAT IS IN DIRECT VIOLATION OF Part 97.113(b)and is subject to loss of license and /or criminal proceedings.

If I run a special event station sending NTS messages and require a fee to do so...THAT IS IN DIRECT VIOLATION OF Part 97.113(b)and is subject to loss of license and /or criminal proceedings.

Note that sending a couple of $$$ or IRC's with a qsl card (voluntarily) is perfectly legal under the rules.

If doubts or questions still remain, it is suggested that the person(s) involve contact Riley Hollingsworth himself

In the part 5 years, the FCC has prosecuted 2 people for direct violations of this rule. None had anything to do with DX, QSL cards, Emergency communications or repeater operations. In both instances, it was people charging for sending NTS messages.

Just an FYI

284. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 15:10:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303101042.21826.00000240@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 36280

In article <20020302132027.26494.00001289@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>I disagree with you; it is not
>best to try to use word association to pass the tests.

Agreed.

> It isn't even the easiest way.

That depends on the person. For many people, it's easier to learn the concepts, but for others it's easier to simply memorize enough of the Q-A pair to recognize the right answer without really understanding it.

Fun facts: The pre-restructuring Tech has been passed by at least one preschooler. The pre-restructuring Extra has been passed by some preteens - one as young as 8. In most cases they passed on the first try - code and theory!

73 de Jim, N2EY

285. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 15:10:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303101043.21826.00000242@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 36277

In article <20020227075013.26502.00000802@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
Kim wrote:

>>>I don't operate the CW--we have loads of other folks around.
>
>>Hmm - first you say it's not relaible because of lack of operators, then
>>there are loads of other folks around...
>
>I estimate about 20% of hams have useable proficiency in Morse code.

I would say it's much higher.

>That is
>about 125,000 folks, a number I could reasonably term "a load."
>
Very funny.

>However, unless there are at least 5 hams available, odd are that none will
>be
>useabily proficient in Morse code. I would not deem that very reliable.

Depends which hams you choose. Random samples are not the rule.

73 de Jim, N2EY

286. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 15:10:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303101043.21826.00000241@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 36281

In article <3c79280c_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
>news:3C791113.F8627980@worldnet.att.net...
>>
>>
>> CAM wrote:
>>
>> > Dick Carroll wrote:
>> > >
>> > > CAM wrote:
>> > > > What Kim is saying is that there is a usually fleeting window of
>opportunity
>> > > > where CW gets through and SSB doesn't.
>> > >
>> > > That is incorrect. Many times the "window" lasts hours, ...
>> >
>> > Dick, if the doctor told you that you had hours to live, you would
>> > consider that "fleeting". "Fleeting" means "transitory". Would it
>> > sound better to you if I said there is a transitory window of
>> > opportunity where CW gets through and SSB doesn't?
>>
>> You're ignorance is showing again, Genius. When a radio op is in the
>> process of passing urgent communications and the band dies so that
>> SSB can't do the job, and CW still can, the time remaining to pass the
>traffic
>> on CW is almost always far more than enough, before the band totally
>tanks-
>> if indeed it happens on that particular occasion that it actually goes
>completely
>> dead so that CWwon't get through, either. It certainly isn't "fleeting".
>> Sometimes it doesn't go that dead at all.
>>
>
>Can ya give me just one--that's all I'm asking for, just one--example of CW
>communication during a disaster or emergency in these days?

Hurricane Floyd, 1999.

Go to google, look up the first post in the thread "Hurricanes and Emergencies"
posted on 10/10/99 by KT4ST. His county was evacuated in that storm. He was
there, see what he wrote.

If you are really interested and not just blowing smoke, that is.

>I'll even make
>it easy for you, does the Hurricane Net use CW communication for
>anything--other than H&W?

Why doesn't H&W count?

>I have always heard of CW being this great tool
>for emergencies, but never have heard of an example of it.

Look up the post, above.

>I *know* that
>there is a CW traffic net; but most traffic these days is contrived for the
>benefit of having a net (net messages back and forth, etc.).

There is a whole network of NTS CW traffic nets, from section to region to
area.
A reasonable person would not say that most of that traffic is "contrived"
unless
they had actually monitored the various nets and messages passed.

NTS nets are all over 80 CW in the evenings.

73 de Jim, N2EY

287. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 15:10:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303101044.21826.00000243@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 36278

In article <a5lmeu010as@enews3.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
>news:3C7E4EB2.E32AA759@worldnet.att.net...
>> The answer should be so obvious that it isn't even needed, at all.
>> As you well know, this isn't about me. It's about all those future hams
>> who will NOT be learning to use radio's most basic mode.
>
>Walking and bicycling are basic modes of transportation, yet skill in
>neither is required for a driver's license.

True - because the potential danger to others from walkers and cyclists
is pretty low. Sidewalks are provided for walkers, too.

>This just shows were some hams
>are technologically, and where they're likely to stay.

What's wrong with walking and bike riding? They conserve natural
resources, reduce pollution, and are healthy exercise. If there's
anything wrong with those modes of transportation, it's that too
few Americans use them. Lack of exercise is directly linked to
many of the top causes of death in the USA.

73 de Jim, N2EY

288. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 15:10:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303101045.21826.00000244@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 36279

In article <3c81155c_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
>news:MPG.16e9d56034df8eab9896a2@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
>> In article <dXLf8.179$gc.144503@monger.newsread.com>,
>> kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net says...
>>
>> > Using radio's most basic mode.... (since you didn't state amateur
>radio's
>> > most basic mode) So how come 911 dispatchers, firefighters, law
>enforcement,
>> > ambulance jockeys, and many other services who very well may come up
>with an
>> > alternate means of communicating when conventional modes fail aren't
>> > required to learn it? If there is definitely a case where the need for
>a
>> > message to get through is more important than most we will ever do,
>publice
>> > service frequency occupants would have to be a prime example?
>> >
>> > If morse code is so important, why aren't they required?
>>
>> Simply because that for the job that they do, CW isn't required. You're
>> talking about local communications on VHF frequencies. It's hard to see
>> any kind of advantage that CW would have over voice in those situations.
>> However, it's not hard to see the potential advantage of CW in emergency
>> communications between stations at large distances.
>
>Sure it is ... PARTICULARLY since that's NOT the type of service
>that the emergency management folks WANT.
>
>They couldn't care LESS about NTS-like "radiograms", etc. They
>want tactical voice and data communications ... not Morse.

Carl, considering the way you've described Morse/CW on this NG
and elsewhere, I doubt very much that anyone asking about the
mode would get an objective presentation.

For a description of the use of Morse in a recent emergency situation,
go to google and dig up the first post in the thread "Hurricanes and
Emergencies". Posted 10/10/99 by KT4ST.
>
>The entire argument that "Morse is essential to emergency
>communications" is SO bogus that it's ridiculous, thus it

>doesn't hold water as "justification" for continued Morse testing.

I would describe it this way:

"What is the probability that a ham will be in an emergency situation where Morse/CW is the ONLY available mode that will work? Is that probability high enough to justify mandatory testing of ALL hams as a precondition for a license?"

Those are the pertinent questions.

73 de Jim, N2EY

289. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 15:12:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C823D5C.55572450@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36282

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> I don't say "bomb" on an airliner and I don't stick my finger in my pocket
> at the 7-11 and say "give me the money. Ergo I have nothing to fear of the
> feds.

A guy was stopped for not signaling a lane change. He was on his way to
pay $5000 cash for a motorcycle. The cops took his $5000 and wouldn't
give it back. We all have something to fear from the RICO laws.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

290. Re: Posting of new club websites?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 15:12:58 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a5tf3f$u2u$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36284

"me" <cust8857@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:f16cb6cc.0203022150.7368033f@posting.google.com...
> Gentlemen,
>
> Could someone please educate me on the ethical and legal views
> involved in posting my club's new web site?

What could be the issue? If your club has
a web site that anyone can access, then publishing
(i.e. telling others about it) is neither illegal nor
unethical? If anyone thinks otherwise, I'm
open to listen.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

291. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 15:16:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C823E57.D4397E07@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36283

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I must agree. Ham radio seems to be fairly stable at the moment,
> from a standpoint of numbers of licensees. However, after the
> final chapter of dumbing-down is written, and the 5 WPM code test
> goes away, the chaos on the HF phone bands will be so bad that
> it won't be resolved by any amount of "refarming" of spectrum. At
> that point, any remaining "old timers" will give up in disgust, and
> the CW/Digital sub-bands will be given over to phone band
> expansion out of sheer demand -- or rather outcry from the whiners
> who can't get a word in edgewise on HF and want the ARRL/FCC
> to do something about it. Ultimately, the FCC will tire of managing
> this mess, and either totally deregulate the amateur HF allocations,
> or merely pull the rug out from under our feet, sell everything above
> 500 MHz to the highest bidder, and leave us with deregulated, CB-like
> chaos on HF and fill-in-the-application-blank licensed repeater
> monkeys. OH, right -- there will be all those eager new CW users
> who were "sold" on the value of that mode. Right.

Are you willing to pick a year by which all of this will have happened
and lay a substantial money bet on it?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

292. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 15:19:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C823EFC.2135F3A3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36286

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> ... therefore a lack of knowledge of one of our simplest,
> most durable, and most effective operating modes does, indeed,
> cause a general "dumbing down" of radio amateurs.

Larry, you still have not explained how a person can be dumbed down
simply by meeting the requirements for an amateur radio license.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

293. Re: ARRL Newsgroup?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 15:22:36 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <0drg8.20366$A23.2966421599@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 36285

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:jXLf8.184$gc.144458@monger.newsread.com...
> I was thinking about this the other day, but I wonder if there would be
any
> interest in a rec.radio.amateur.arrl newsgroup or maybe even something
like
> rec.radio.amateur.arrl.discussion?
>
> Whaddaya think?
>
> I am not aware of how someone gets a newsgroup started but willing to
learn.
> I would also love to see a alt. or rec.6meter or something similar as well
> as other bands.
>
> Ryan KC8PMX

Ryan, I'd rather not see the name "ARRL" on any newsgroup not initiated and moderated by the ARRL. There's already enough ARRL bashing out there. And I believe that there are some SIG reflectors on the members only side of the ARRL.org site. The ARRL also has a number of weekly reports and newsletters that are available via e-mail.

As far as 6M goes, there are already 6M reflectors out there. I subscribe to a daily summary for one of them. If you search AC6V.com for reflectors you'll find them.

Brian

294. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 15:24:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C824012.54C480B7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36287

```
Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Dick and I aren't going to show
> tacit approval of her deliberate attempt to undermine the good opinion
> the public has of the ARS through her ill-conceived call sign. My only
> question is -- why do YOU?

Because Kim doesn't make Ed beat her up?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

295. Re: Code Is Dead

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 15:34:26 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <6org8.20371$Vg3.2967346332@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 36288

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020301235526.21807.00000515@mb-mq.aol.com...
> In article <410b6521.0202282049.72906c94@posting.google.com>,
> leadpipe@pittnet.com (Leadpipe) writes:
>
> >
> >I cannot wait till the code requirement is dropped completely from ARS
> >so that I can follow in the footsteps of my mentors. Those "20WPM
> >Extras" and other code pushing scum that are icons of Amateur Radio
> >legend have given us underlings a good education on how to act on HF
> >by putting these practices on display on 3898, and 14313 and other
> >pompous sections of those elitist bands. I have learned much from them
> >about radio protocall that I was able to put to immediate use on CB
> >through the years. I as a no code tech that passed his advanced, and
> >almost passed the extra written when I tested for my license will be
> >looking forward to talking with all my dear friends on HF while I use
> >fowl language, discuss the intricacies of trailer trash, tell cat
> >killing stories, and work the actions of my firearms, as I have heard
> >all of you fine examples do for years. I salute you in your pursuit of
> >Amateur Radio excellence, and hope to join you soon in your unholy
> >endeavors. Even now I am laying my evil plans, and it will give me
> >another use for the best CB I ever owned. A Yaesu FT-100! Two meters,
> >440, 6 meters, and CB at 100 watts all in one box. Life is good!
>
> There you have it, folks! A perfect example of the value of the code
> testing requirements as a "LID filter." In his own poor attempt at a
> troll, Leadpipe has proven the value of the PCTA philosophy by having
> been "filtered out" of HF by one of the best secondary attributes of
> code testing! And when he does finally get his codeless HF privileges,
> I hope you enjoy his on-the-air antics, for I'm sure that was the one
> part of his message about which he was totally serious!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry, attention.

This is obviously a troll, saying exactly the right things to get you going.
How gullible you are.

As I said before the rule making, "What I fear most about restructuring is a
lack of enforcement, and what I fear most about maintaining the status quo
is a lack of enforcement." Code never has been a barrier to poor ham
behavior, at least it hasn't worked in your case.

Meanwhile, we are supposed to have enforcement once again in the name of Riley Hollingsworth.

As you were.

Brian

296. Re: Watch out Cecil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 15:36:07 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Hprg8.20375$Di3.2967445725@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 36289

```
"K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:79e47b493f5c55c202cf1d634d08abae.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> Dick Carroll is hot on your tail, and Mr. Hare is no slouch either!
>
> Top 10 Users Feb 2002
>
> [452] CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> 13.1%
> [435] Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> 12.6%
> [430] W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> 12.5%
> [279] W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> 8.1%
> [200] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 5.8%
> [154] Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> 4.5%
> [128] Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> 3.7%
> [114] Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> 3.3%
> [112] Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> 3.2%
> [110] Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> 3.2%
>
>
> --
> Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG
```

How many of these guys have day jobs?

297. Re: Watch out Cecil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 15:43:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8244BC.4476EB7D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36290

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote:
> > [452] CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> 13.1%
>
> How many of these guys have day jobs?

I'm retired.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

298. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 16:18:35 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c824edc_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36292

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020303001004.20570.00000192@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <3c810654_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>
> >> But why be sarcastic here? The facts are correct, are they not?
> >
> >The facts are (AFAIK) *technically* correct .. that wasn't my point
> >(read on ...)
> >
> >> The point I was trying to make is this:
> >>
> >> Ed keeps mentioning the "4 page study guide" story, but doesn't
> >> mention the vast difference in privileges granted.
> >
> >The point that I was trying to make is "times change" and that
> >the mentality of the past is no longer suited to today's world
> >in terms of promoting a healthy future for the ARS.
>
> Which "mentality of the past"?

I'll take them one at a time, then add one or two of
my own ...

>The mentality that ham radio is G-rated
> and suitable for every member of the family?

No issue here ... I agree completely.

>The mentality that hams
> are more than users of manufactured gear?

No issue here ... I agree completely.

> The mentality of making getting started easy, but
> reserving full privileges for those who have
> gained some knowledge and proficiency?

Here I have some issues ...

I don't think that the mentality of many, many OTs
is one of "making getting started easy" ... my experience
in discussing the issue, reports/complaints from newcomers,
etc. is that many, many OTs ("long time hams") actually
```

want to make it hard(er) for newcomers. It's as Ed and
others have observed ... they seem to remember the "tests
that they took" as being much more rigorous than they
actually were, view any changes as "dumbing down," and
resent that newcomers are not subject to the same set of
limitations and restrictions that they faced as newcomers.
(In short, they can't/won't accept that times change and ham
radio needs to change with it in order to remain attractive
in the face of all of the other things competing for people's
interest and discretionary time.)

I'm NOT saying that rank beginners should have FULL
privileges ... just that they should have enough, with
sensible, justifiable limits based on their demonstrated
level of technical knowledge, that the ARS is, in fact,
interesting and they don't feel like they are being treated
as 2nd class citizens who are reviled and looked down on
by "their superiors." You claim not to have seen much of
the latter, but I have seen it personally (even experienced
it from folks like Dick and Larry, but I'm thick-skinned and
I don't pay attention to their insults) ... I'm much more concerned
about the degree to which this happens to others as they
enter our ranks as newbies ...

> See what I mean?
> >
> >"Complaining" about liberalizations in outdated technical
> >restrictions vs. tests is not the answer.
>
> I agree! I wasn't complaining - I was comparing.

OK ... if I was overly sensitive, I'm sorry ... but at first
read it certainly appeared that you were bemoaning
the fact that newcomers today get more liberal privs
than "back in the good old days when the Novice was
75W input, rock-bound, 1 year to upgrade or you're out.

(Remember, I missed a LOT of your discussion with
Richard P. where you indicate you spent a lot of time
discussing what would constitute an attractive set of
requirements and privs for a more "meaningful" entry
level license ....)

> >Recognizing that the ARS needs to modernize constantly
> >to remain interesting to potential newcomers and to remain
> >competitive technologically with other alternatives that
> >compete for people's interest and discretionary time is
> >something that MUST occur ...
>
> That all depends on what you mean by "modernize". Is
> there no room for both the old and the new?

Nobody is trying to "ban Morse useage" ... I think you know
that.

There is "room for the old" in terms of what people
choose to use ...

There is NOT room for the old in terms of: "It's always been
this way, we've always used ____ and we don't want no
stinking ____ taking up space in the bands;"
"We have to make it really hard to get a license so that people
'prove their dedication and worth' and to make sure that we
are not 'over-run by the dreaded CBers';"
etc.

> >> Fact is, we really don't have an effective entry-level license
today.
> >
> >I don't TOTALLY buy that ...
>
> >let me list a few comments in "bullet point" form:
> >
> >* It is IMHO *very* arguable that without the no code license,
> >which has become the de facto entry point into ham radio,
> >and the newcomers that have become hams via that route,
> >that our numbers would likely have plummeted SERIOUSLY
> >over the past 10 years.
>
> That's only speculation. There are entire NGs devoted to alternative
> historic timelines, like "what if Hitler had focused on giving
Doenitz
> all the U-boats he needed instead of wasting resources on debacles
> like the Bismarck and Turpitz?" Interesting but unprovable and a
moot
> point.

I think if one looks at where the growth in licensees came from
and the huge sucess of the NCT, it's a very plausible supposition.
Yes, one could argue "what if" 'till the cows come home, but I
believe that my scenario is the most likely outcome, had the FCC
not instituted the NCT when they did ...

> >* The main problem in terms of "an effective entry-level
> >license" IMHO is that we are still stuck, for the relatively
> >short-term, at least, with most of the newcomers being
> >relegated to VHF/UHF because of the Morse test
> >requirement for HF access.
>
> You miss some important points:
>
> - Passing the 5 wpm code test gets a Tech minimal HF privs. It
takes
> 5 wpm and another written test to get more than a bit of 10 and tiny
slices

> of 3 other bands.
> - The 5 wpm CSCE is only good for a year.

IMHO, the 5 wpm code test is a bigger barrier than the
additional written elements to get to General (at least
more distasteful to many, and doing something you don't
find interesting, don't like, and don't really want to do is
almost always more diffficult that doing something that you
find interesting and you want to do ...)

> Both these can be fixed. See below.
> >
> >* Once the Morse test is eliminated, it would seem to
> >make sense to adjust the Tech test to cover HF principles
> >and grant newcomers much broader HF privs ...
>
> Why not do it now? The current license structure is a patched-up
> version of what was started in 1951 and last seriously revised on
1968.
> Talk about needing modernization!

Without the 5 wpm code, Techs can't operate below 30 MHz
without putting the US in violation of the ITU Radio Regs ... the
FCC won't do that ... also, since it was structured as a VHF/UHF
only license class, the tech written doesn't cover HF principles
adequately, if at all.

> > or maybe
> >it would make sense to "merge" the tech and general
> >classes ...
>
> Without further testing?

NO ... NCI and the NCVECs both agreed that there should
be no "freebie" upgrades where required test elements were
waived. I still feel the same way ...

However, the tech test (sans code) could be "fixed" to
cover the basics of HF and in a post-WRC regulatory
environment techs could be given much more meaningful
HF privs to make it more attractive, get them "socialized"
on the air with some interaction with more experienced
HF hams, and not make them feel like they are 2nd class
citizens, relegated to "the ghetto" ... of course we'll have
to incorporate a "How to ignore the jerks who will tell you
you're not a 'real ham'." section in the study guide :-(

> > the only problem with such a merger would be
> >that it might make the step from "unlicensed" to "licensed"
> >unnecessarily large ...
>
> The step is already too big. That's one of the problems,

irrespective
> of code testing.

Wow ... I hope you have your asbestos suit handy ... I'm
sure that the idea of making it easier for anyone to get
a ham license with HF privs will result in a lot of railing
about how YOU want to "dumb down ham radio and
turn it into CB."

> >> > > >(remember the "No lids, kids, or space kadets" guy? A real
> >> > > >"welcome to ham radio" if I ever heard one ...}
> >> > > >(not!)
> >
> >> For one thing, they guy is remembered because he was so unusual.
He
> >> stuck out like a sore thumb. Also had a big signal.
> >>
> >> His gripe was that prior to 1953 it took an Advanced/Class A
license,
> >> or
> >> an Extra, to operate 'phone on 20 or 75. Everybody else had to
use
> >> what
> >> bits of 160 were available, or the ham bands above 25 MHz. 40 had
no
> >> phone segment and 15 wasn't a ham band yet.
> >>
> >> Then, without an NPRM, RM or anything else, in late 1952 FCC
opens all
> >> privs to all hams except Novices and Techs. All of a sudden ol'
Mike
> >> has lotsa new company.
> >
> >Ah, so I was correct in perceiving him as a "cranky olde fart" who
> >resented sharing "his" "sandbox" with newcomers who he perceived
> >were not as "superior" as he imagined himself to be ...
>
> He was a guy who saw what he'd worked hard for being given away for
> much less - and with NO reason being given.

So, he was a guy with a "dog in the manger" chip on his
shoulder (as I suspected).

Do you REALLY believe that ANY reason would have
satisfied him and made him behave more civily to
newbies? (I doubt it ... I just think he didn't WANT any
newbies coming in to "clutter up 'his' bands.") There's
still a lot of that today, despite your assertion that YOU
don't see much of it ...

> Of course the way he did it was very counterproductive.
> >

> >That's why I mentioned him ... because I perceived him as
> >a good example of EXACTLY THE WORST attitude that
> >hams should show to newcomers.
>
> How about the attitude that calls other hams names like "cranky old
> fart" because of a disagreement? Is that what we want newcomers to
see?

Sorry ... I can't think of a more adequately, accurately descriptive
term for folks with the sort of anti-newbie attitudes that that guy
(and quite a few here) and others I've seen/heard in action over
the years exude ... if you can suggest alternative terminology that
is adequately, accurately descriptive, I'll consider adopting it ...
:-)

Besides, the newcomers RAPIDLY recognize the cranky olde fartz
and view them as same ... without any need for "coaching" from me
or other long-time hams who are willing to accept them into the fold.

> I was a newcomer in 1967, when "incentive licensing" was getting
started. I
> recall lots of hams being mad about losing "their" privileges. Most
of them
> thought that Generals had always had all amateur privs in the USA.
Their
> attitude was much like ol' Mike's.

Yes, the FCC got a couple of petitions last year, asking that
old "Class A" and Generals be "restored their God-given rights"
by getting a freebie Extra ... both were denied as "old news".

> >> But not with using the written tests to do the same thing. One
> >> man's "reasonable and relevant" is another's "hoop". Why is a
Tech
> >> Plus
> >> competent to run AM on 6 meters but not 10 meters? Why is a Tech
Plus
> >> competent to run 1500 W PEP on VHF/UHF but only a fraction of
that
> >> on HF, even though the RF exposure hazard is less on HF/MF?
> >
> >Those are good points ... with which I agree. You know that
> >I think the Tech test is inadequate for 1500W ... but you seem
> >in some sense to disagree. I agree FULLY that there is no
> >distinction between the level of technical knowledge required
> >to use "mode x" on VHF/UHF vs. HF ... in fact, in some
> >respects, it is "easier to stay out of trouble" at HF ...
particularly
> >with homebrew gear, because the technical requirements for
> >stable, clean gear are somewhat easier to meet at HF, due
> >to circuit parasitics, layout, etc. being less critical that at the
> >higher frequencies ...

>
> But the FCC disagrees, and has disagreed for decades. Odd, isn't it?

The Tech test used to be (and was when I took it) the SAME written
test as General (I'm sure you know this). When they changed things
to where the Tech was a lesser written test, they should have changed
power limits, IMHO ... however, there is a question of "How do you
enforce that?" My answer would be that posession of a rig or amp
capable of producing more than the legal output for the
class/frequency
would be prima facia evidence of a violation. The power limit should
be high enough to cover most common "barefoot" rigs, but well below
1500W ...

> >> > That's
> >> > part of the problem ... you can't keep ham radio "like it was
40 years
> >> > ago" and expect it to be vital, heathy, and viable for the long
haul.
> >> > EVERYTHING changes and hams need to accept change as well.
> >>
> >> Only if the change is for the better. Many changes are NOT for
the
> >> better. The mantra that "change must be accepted" as if all
change
> >> is inevitable and good is simply bogus.
> >
> >Change IS inevitable in a technically-oriented pursuit ... to
ignore
> >it and not figure out how to make use of new developments can
> >only result in stagnation and irrelevance as the rest of the world
> >passes by ...
>
> Sure - but that does not mean the old stuff has to go, or that the
bases
> and purposes of the service are any different.

The only old things that I'm suggesting "have to go" are BAD
ATTITUDES.
Don't make a red herring about "old stuff (CW, as an example) having
to go" ... that's NOT what I'm saying and I think you know that.

Again, what needs to go are narrow-minded, elitist, bad attitudes,
which discriminate against newcomers unreasonable (and revile
them publicly both here and often on the air), which reject and
fight irrationally against technical innovation, etc.

> What remains to be done in the USA? Is it not perfectly clear
> what the FCC wants to do?

I think that the FCC wants to promote a healthy, progressive
ARS that will meet is educational, public service, and emergency

disaster communications objectives into the future.

> Do you really think that S25.5 has any chance of lasting past WRC
2003,

Nope ...

> or that there will be any code testing left soon after that?

Once the requirement is removed from the ITU Radio Regs,
I think that MOST countries will rapidly (at least in terms of
"government speed") eliminate Morse testing from their
national regulations.

> Many countries are
> already moving to 5 wpm only - if they haven't already.

True .. and it is generally being viewed as "an interim measure"
pending the ability to completely eliminate Morse testing after
WRC-03.

> >Once that is accomplished,
> >I will have more time to focus on how other aspects of licensing
> >and testing can be improved ...
>
> The time to consider a new license structure is now, so that a
> consensus can be built. FCC will not want to do it piecemeal.

The FCC will prefere to deal with the elimination of Morse testing
and "consequential changes to other parts of its rules" in a
consolidated proceeding ... I would agree with that. However,
absent a clear "consensus" on "other issues" (that makes sense
to the FCC), I believe that they would entertain a "standalone"
Petition for Rulemaking on just the issue of eliminating the Morse
element, since that's a pretty simple matter administratively and
the "other issues" could well be more complicated and time-consuming.

> If we wait, they will table the whole mess for several years.

There is no guarantee that the FCC will be prepared to devote
the resources to a(nother) major revamp of Part 97 license
classes and test requirements, period. They may find that
merely eliminating the Morse requirement (and maybe giving
some HF privs to Techs) is all that they're prepared to tackle,
since they spent 2 years on "restructuring" just a couple of years
ago ... actually, they might do something like this ...
(pure speculation, of course) ... give Tech current General HF
band privs, with a slight revision to the Tech test, expand General
band privs to current Advanced, and leave Extra as it is (of course.)

Whether the tech has/is qualified for 1500W could be open to
debate ...

> >OK ... good point ... one doesn't HAVE to do it all at one sitting.
> >However, the number of questions isn't, IMHO, the defining factor
> >in the difficulty of the test(s) ... as Ed has pointed out, there's
a
> >hell of a difference between the 4 page study guide he used and
> >the current one, which if I recall correctly runs about 250 pages!
>
> 200 - but that includes the entire Q&A pool, and detailed
explanations of
> the theory behind them.

It's still a lot more material to study ... at least in terms of
"intimidation
factor," compared to a 4 page study guide.

> I can easily write 5-10 pages on Ohm's Law for DC circuits. The old
LM devotes
> perhaps one small question to it. Yet Novices were expected to know
it and how
> to use it.

Yet, Ed and Cecil indicate that it basically "got them through"
to a license back in those days. (even if it didn't cover all of
the material in as much detail as todays' sutdy guides ...)

> >(Then another one of ?how_how_many_pages? to make the
> >move from Tech to General???)
>
> At least another 100.
>
> >I simply can't understand, given the MUCH larger amount of
> >material one has to cover, how anyone can claim that the
> >tests are "easier" or have been "dumbed down."
> >(Not saying that you are saying that ... but rather that quite
> >a few make that complaint.)
>
> It's the METHOD.

That is, IMHO, a religious argument ... and the FCC
has set up the VE program, which gives MANY, MANY,
more testing opportunities, which is a GOOD thing,
and has given us the freedom to modernize and define
the tests by submitting questions to the VEC-QPC ...

> Here's a summary of the ideas Rich Plourde and I worked up.
>
> Underlying concepts:
>
> First, nobody should lose existing privileges

I would agree with this with the possible exception of
1500W for current techs, absent a better techical test.
(yes, many will disagree with me on this, but I believe

my arguments, while they may be politically unpopular
with some, are technically sound)

> Second, FCC isn't going to accept lots of license classes, so we
> stick with 3 classes

Agreed ... in fact, most countries have only 2 classes ...
at this time, from what I've seen, they're more or less
as follows:

something that's more or less equal to Novice/Tech/Tech+
level, with restrictions on power and/or frequency

something that's like General+Extra in our new system
(in other words full privs)

Do we really *need* 3 classes in a post-Morse-test
era? I'm not yet convinced that we do ... and I'm open
to hearing pro/con arguments for both 2 and 3 class
systems ...

> Third, the privileges should match the tests taken.

AGREED!!!

> For clarity, let's call the new classes First, Second and Third to
avoid
> confusion with the existing 51-year-old names. (The names aren't
> critical).
>
> Third Class is entry level. Easy to get - a Novice for the 21st
century.
> Simplified written test, focusing on the basics, mostly rules,
operating
> procedures and safety. Allowed power levels kept low to avoid
needing lots of
> questions on RF exposure - say, 100-150 W on HF/MF and 25-50 W on
VHF/UHF. Wide
> selections and modes and access to parts of all HF/MF bands -
probably all of
> 160 and the WARC bands. Third Classers can't be VEs, club trustees,
repeater
> control ops, etc - all to simplify the written. Callsigns are all
six character
> (like WA3IYC)

Wait a minute ... I don't think I want to change my callsign ... I've
had it for so long it's like a 2nd name ... :-)
>
> Second Class adds more power (400 W or so) and more subbands.
Written test is
> more comprehensive - about half and half rules and theory. Also
allowed to be

> VEs, trustees, etc. Callsigns are five or six characters (W6BXC,
WA3IYC) One
> years as Third Class required experience

Now YOU're advocating power limits ... :-) I have no problem with
that.
However, I *DO* have a problem with the "1 year experience as 3rd
class" thing ... if someone passes the test, they are qualified for a
license
of whatever class that test is for ... I don't care if they've never
been on
the air once ... if they pass the test, they deserve the license. I
also
believe that the FCC would have problems with this in legal terms as
a form of discriimination against otherwise qualified individuals.
>
> First Class is full privileges. Test is mostly theory, with rules to
match full
> privs.
> Calls signs are four, five or six characters. One year as Second
Class required
> experience.

Again, I *DO* have a problem with the "1 year experience as 2nd
class" thing ... if someone passes the test, they are qualified for a
license
of whatever class that test is for ... I don't care if they've never
been on
the air once ... if they pass the test, they deserve the license. I
also
believe that the FCC would have problems with this in legal terms as
a form of discriimination against otherwise qualified individuals.

PLEASE NOTE that as an Extra, "I've got mine" and would "map"
to what you call First Class ... so I have nothing personally to gain
by objecting to this "time in grade, have to wait a year before you
can upgrade" thing ... I find it objectionable because it is another
artificial barrier to progression by qualified individuals and will
tend to discourage the most capable newcomers.

> Bands are divided into subbands by mode type - CW, digital, analog
phone/image.
> Typical division 35/15/50% of a band

Wait a minute ... now you're trying to carve out a 35% set-aside for
"CW ONLY" ???? And only allowing 15% for digital???? I DON'T THINK
SO!!! That is TOTALLY unreasonable and inconsistent with the
realities
and the needs for the future. Since CW requires ~0.1 the bandwidth of
SSB, your proposed "split" would indicate approximately (35*10)=350
CW users for every 50 SSB users ... that is TOTALLY ridiculous and
unreasonable.

I would say "CW is still allowed EVERYWHERE it is allowed today, but
it certainly doesn't deserve an INCREASED status over what it has now,
either." The lower parts of the bands (now
CW/narrowband_digital_modes)
could remain that way.

The "phone bands" should NOT be expanded, but should allow the
use of wider bandwidth digital techniques (digital voice, imaging, and
higher speed data, for example) in addition to SSB/SSTV.

> Existing Novices and Techs get Third Class, existing Generals and
Advanceds get
> Second Class, and existing Extras get First. Existing hams do not
lose high
> power privs as long as they retain old license documents.

The mapping from the existing classes to the proposed ones is OK
with me .... it seems perfectly reasonable ...

I guess, with time, the power issue would "sort itself out" through
attrition to the point where it would be OK ... and while they're
allowed, I doubt that many existing Techs actually run 1500W ...

There is ONE "fly" in the ointment ... many Tech/Tech+ may be
repeater control ops/trustees ... I know I was as a Tech+ ... now
you're talking about taking something away from some folks.
Cover it in the test and allow it ... it's not "rocket science."

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPIJMype+N6+q84HiEQKLwACgoJMZZN7Uo7JJxe5NNrTQQEAin10An2ES
oS+zP/EdccN0z4X79aOHPhmI
=CcYY
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

299. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 16:32:14 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c825216_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36294

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020303024829.21231.00000910@mb-mv.aol.com...
> In article <3c8107c7_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Congratulations on being open-minded, Larry ... I was going to
respond
> >to Cecil's "antidote" quip by stating that Ed's antidote was
technical
> >knowledge.
> >
> >I'm SO glad that we've finally convinced you that technical
knowledge
> >IS THE antidote to dumbing down (and Morse proficency or lack
thereof
> >has nothing to with "being dumbed down.")
> >
> >Carl - wa6vse
>
> Carl:
>
> The way I see it, there are two parts to being a ham. One is basic,
> useful operating skill, and the other is the technical knowledge
that
> permits one to "operate" in the first place. I don't separate one
from
> the other, therefore a lack of knowledge of one of our simplest,
> most durable, and most effective operating modes does, indeed,
> cause a general "dumbing down" of radio amateurs.

Since you're obviously referring to Morse prowess, "Horsefeathers!"
(However, I have to admit that you've polished the words in one of
your "Morse myth mantra function keys" ... :-)

> You are absolutely correct that technical knowledge does not depend
> on Morse code skill -- but being a completely capable amateur
> communicator does.

Horsefeathers!!!

> The plain truth is that those who haven't been
> bothered to gain useful Morse proficiency simply don't understand
```

> where the PCTA is coming from.

You mean that they are looking to the future, instead of the
past? Maybe that's why they "... don't understand where the
PCTA is coming from ..." ???

> Therefore, IMHO, they are not qualified to judge the value of
> code testing as a licensing requirement.

Right, the fox ALWAYS wants to be in charge of guarding
the henhouse ... sorry, I'm not buying it (and, at one time, I was
FAR more Morse proficient than I could manage today, so I
DO have practical experience from which to make a judgement.)

> Those code-proficient hams who also possess high technical skill
> yet claim that code testing isn't necessary to keep the mode alive
> are merely electing to stay out of a political shooting match.

I don't buy that at all ... just as one example, I firmly believe that
Ed firmly believes that Morse will survive without Morse testing
welfare state support. I also believe that.

However, I ALSO agree with Ed that you and Dick and other PCTAs
who rail about how Morse can't stand on its own merits without the
coercion of a mandatory pass/fail, can't get an HF license without it
Morse test, and how those who aren't interested in learning and
using Morse are "dumbed down" ARE YOUR OWN WORST ENEMIES.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPIJQC5e+N6+q84HiEQJ2OwCg8E5upaIxqon5xeoE24CoTjjhW24An3vY
Eu5/94SycixXP4NiL71OuiR5
=BDhC
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

300. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 16:35:54 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Khsg8.20387$eH4.2973077707@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 36293

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C8226CB.7073380B@earthlink.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C7C5E28.C8455DB@earthlink.net...
> > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > > Sure, that sounds -exactly- like something smug Dave would say.
> > > > Meanwhile, I, an undeserving Tech, worked them by the thousands.
Get
> > over
> > > > it.
> > >
> > > It was exactly something Dave *did* say. There wasn't any smugness to
> > > it. It was plain observation. Even a blind pig finds some acorns.
> >
> > Sure, Dave, pick on blind pigs. Do you want to go double or nothing and
> > make fun of blind hams while you're on a roll?
>
> Are there blind hams out looking for acorns?

You tell me. Since blind pigs weren't the topic, only you can tell us where
your point is going.

> > > > >You didn't address my reply to your statement of
> > > > > my views toward those holding Tech Plus tickets.
> > > >
> > > > No need to. Your reply indicated that Tech Plusses can be every bit
the
> > > > DXer that you are. Right?
> > >
> > > Sure they can, Brian and I've never said otherwise.
> >
> > > > Let me bring you back to speed. We had a Frenchman on here and he
> > verified
> > > > that you were working out of band Frenchmen on 6 meters. I
mentioned
> > that I
> > > > used to work FR6DX all the time on 10 meters.
> > >
> > > ...and you expected me to remember that you used to work FR6DX on ten?
> > > Sheesh.
> >
> > No, I expect nothing from you.
>

> Your replies indicate otherwise.

Your replies indicate a certain smugness that you deny.

> > But lets see if your memory gets any better.
> > Did you go ahead and confirm those out of band contacts? I hope that >
you at
> > least printed the exact frequency and not just "6M" so they wouldn't
have
> > the balls to submit them to the ARRL for credit. But hey, for a
> > greenstamp...
>
> Drop a line to WA8JOC and make inquiry.

Why? Did you abdicate all responsibility for your QSLing?

> I did not make out QSLs for
> QSOs. My cards may have indicated an actual frequency since QSL labels
> were printed from my logs. The implication from your "greenstamp"
> comment is that we were somehow raking in the dough on QSLing. I went
> out of pocket some $1000 on QSLing.

Not bad for over 22 years of hamming. But if you can't affor it you might
want to find a different hobby.

> > > > > What you call snobbishness, others
> > > > > would call experience.
> > > > >
> > > > Dave, I'm not the only one on rrap whose commented on your smugness,
and
> > not
> > > > just about DX. Why piss on my DX fun? Is that the mark of
experience?
> > >
> > > If I've only got you and Kim to worry about I don't think I'll toss
and
> > > turn much over the issue of smugness.
> > >
> > You wouldn't anyway, it's a trait that smug people have.
>
> Can you tell us about the traits which those people who have chips on
> their shoulders have?

Help me out here.

> > You can have all the DX fun you
> > > can muster.
> > >
> > You probably thought that I needed your permission. Thanks Dave.
>
> It was a suggestion. If it offends you, then DON'T have all the DX fun
> you can muster. Either result makes little difference in my life.

> > > > > I do just fine on this side of the pileup, thanks. Nailed a 5R8
on 6m
> > > > > the other day
> > > > >
> > > > Do they have 6m privileges?
> > > >
> > > Drop the licensing authorities a line and make an inquiry. I'm sure
> > > they'll be happy to hear from you.
> > >
> > They'd be even happier to hear you're not luring their folks out of
band.
>
> So, to be sure that I understand you, the fact that I got on the air
> made me guilty of luring folks outside their band segments? Wowser,
> that is some power I have.

When the word spreads that you'll work them out of band, then follow it up
with a QSL card???
If anyone's in the market for something illegal, its not hard to find out
who the bootlegger or dealer is.

> > OH2BH "nonsense???" I guess you have no memory after all.
>
> It would appear that you are correct.

Sometimes. Standby. ;)

> > All I was saying was that if one wealthy ham like Marty...
>
> I've seen this part of the movie. This is where I told you that Martti
> is not wealthy and that he was not VP of Nokia--that he was a salesman
> for Nokia.

I never saw that, and it wasn't the point anyway.

> > can get the Axis of
> > Evil/North Koreans to allow amateur radio, what could a group (like the
> > ARRL) do to promote amateur radio there? You're the one who shanghai'd
that
> > theme and tried to convince us that the VP of Nokia lived in the low
rent
> > district. His income wasn't even the point, but you made it so, because
you
> > needed to put me down. Can't have anyone else on here commenting on DX.
> > That's your exclusive domain.
>
> All I'd ask is that if someone does care to comment on DX, he has his
> facts straight. I don't have a need to put you down. The chip on your
> shoulder puts you down. You could have easily thanked me for the
> correction. Instead, you attempted to argue the point with someone who
> knows the man. Any who have a real interest in the matter are likely to
> find the record of our exchange in Google.

Dave, I think it was Hans who said that Marty was the VP Nokia. If you did make a correction, fine. It wasn't the point, but only makes the point I made stronger. Allow me to restate: "If a non-wealthy ham can have such an influence..."

Meanwhile, did you ever have a comment about how a large, influential organizations such as the ARRL, RSGB, or any other national organization might be able to influence some of these countries to open up to amateur radio?

That was the thrust of my comment prior to you and/or Steve misdirecting it.

> > As far as selling QSLs for fun and profit, Steve/KF2TI recently made
> > statement about "charging for a contact." The reason that he made the
> > mistake is because thats pretty much what it is.
>
> That's your story and you're sticking with it.
>
> > The brain has to be
> > retrained so that the words that come out are in agreement with Part 97.
> > Not always easy to do when it goes against common practice, and thus it
> > comes out wrong.
>
> If you believe what you've just written, allow me to suggest that you
> have no idea of what common practice in QSLing is.

True. I'd rather use the buro than take people's money. Except for the countries w/o buro's, of course. I've even bypassed the ARRL outgoing buro and mailed piles of cards directly to Box 88 to speed up the process for the former USSR.

> > Holy Cow! Is your QTH by itself or do you live in a subdivision?
>
> Subdivision? The nearest would be about 25 miles away. We have a plot
> of land up on a ridge. I have a couple of neighbors, one at the foot of
> my drive and one across the road. They're each about a hundred yards
> away. The rest of the area is woods and pasture land.

Sounds fantastic. I'm tempted to turn in my life insurance for cash value and purchase a plot of land in south eastern Ohio to spend my weekends. A 60 foot tower is my little dream. That's one solution. Another is to go mobile to public parks and state forests and do "field day" on big contest weekends. I've got a nice deep cycle battery. Paper logs aren't a problem for "hunt and pounce" that I'd be using.

> > I can't even hear the clear channel stations on AM sometimes because of
all
> > the buzzing noise.
>
> I did find some noise interfering with reception on MW and on 80m. It
> turned out to be fluorescent lighting in my barn. Bypass caps and a
> brute force line filter fixed that. I also found that a smaller, indoor
> loop didn't work well since it largely heard the noise from my

> computers.

Last night was relatively quiet. I listend to the AM broadcast band for an hour before turning in.

I've put two of the the mfj split ferrite kits on one of the computers and I still get racket on my portable shortwave. That's six of them. My work laptop is quiet except when booting up, but I won't use it except for work. Perhaps I need to trade off my old 300mhz machine for an older laptop.

I've spotted an MFJ or AEA Loop at the other end of the division. I suspect that no one else knows what it is. I'm tempted to put up something small like the MFJ 1796 bushytail antenna on my deck and see what happens.

> > Besides its a restricted development (which ones
> > aren't???). You need a minimum 5 acres "estate" around here to build a lone
> > house. Anyway, I intend to get up in the attic tomorrow and see what's
> > there to work with.
>
> That is one of the sad things about modern life. You are prevented from
> doing things you'd like because of the lack of alternatives to the CC&R
> nonsense which swept the nation.

Yeah, they slap the CCR's on befor the first dozer cut is made.

My first priority was to get my children in the Pickerington school district, one of only three school districts in central Ohio to meet federal guidelines. Then I bought one of the least expensive houses for sale here, which is 1/3 again what my home was in Illinois, minus one bedroom and 400 square feet. And my mortgage is only 1% higher. Thank God I only took a $5K cut in pay to boost the economy.

Brian/N0iMD

301. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 17:12:37 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c825bb7_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36295

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020303101044.21826.00000243@mb-cc.aol.com...
> In article <a5lmeu010as@enews3.newsguy.com>, "Krell"
<krell1215@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> >news:3C7E4EB2.E32AA759@worldnet.att.net...
> >> The answer should be so obvious that it isn't even needed, at
all.
> >> As you well know, this isn't about me. It's about all those
future hams
> >> who will NOT be learning to use radio's most basic mode.
> >
> >Walking and bicycling are basic modes of transportation, yet skill
in
> >neither is required for a driver's license.
>
> True - because the potential danger to others from walkers and
cyclists
> is pretty low. Sidewalks are provided for walkers, too.

And there is no danger posed to Morse-proficient hams (or
the public in general) by non-Morse-proficient hams ... except
perhaps the "danger" that Morse enthusiasts will have to pro-
actively recruit new Morse enthusiasts instead of relying on the
"Morse welfare state" of mandatory Morse proficiency testing ...

> What's wrong with walking and bike riding? They conserve natural
> resources, reduce pollution, and are healthy exercise. If there's
> anything wrong with those modes of transportation, it's that too
> few Americans use them. Lack of exercise is directly linked to
> many of the top causes of death in the USA.

There's nothing wrong with walking or bike riding ... but they
are not required elements of a drivers' license test ... neither
is there anything wrong with Morse usage (by choice), but
likewise, Morse proficiency no longer has a place as a required
element of amateur tests (except for the legal requirement of
S25.5, for now)

And how is lack of Morse proficency related in any way to
any of the top causes of death? (or any other significant
```

negative factor for either the public at large, or even the
much smaller subset thereof that the ham community
represents, for that matter?)

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPIJZfpe+N6+q84HiEQLBhgCfQtTUEBp/NC98Kk+2c949yhSzxt4An2I3
UC0ZgATwaXqq4BzBj5Pj67GQ
=+KBP
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

302. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 17:25:03 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c825eb2_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36296

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020303101045.21826.00000244@mb-cc.aol.com...
> In article <3c81155c_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>
> >"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> >news:MPG.16e9d56034df8eab9896a2@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> >> However, it's not hard to see the potential advantage of CW in
emergency
> >> communications between stations at large distances.
> >
> >Sure it is ... PARTICULARLY since that's NOT the type of service
> >that the emergency management folks WANT.
> >
> >They couldn't care LESS about NTS-like "radiograms", etc. They
> >want tactical voice and data communications ... not Morse.
>
> Carl, considering the way you've described Morse/CW on this NG
> and elsewhere, I doubt very much that anyone asking about the
> mode would get an objective presentation.

I'm merely stating the facts, based on years of dealing with
emergency management folks through ARES/RACES ...
They DON'T want Morse radiograms ... they want/need what
I've said ... tactical voice and data communications.

> For a description of the use of Morse in a recent emergency
situation,
> go to google and dig up the first post in the thread "Hurricanes and

> Emergencies". Posted 10/10/99 by KT4ST.

First, if the most recent you can come up with dates to 1999,
that in itself is evidence that Morse usage in emergencies is
rare indeed.

Secondly, while I don't have the time to dig through google
archives of ancient history, I would strongly suspect that,
as is virtually always the case, any use of Morse was a matter
of operator choice, rather than operational necessity. If it was,
in fact, "the only mode available," that indicates a lack of good
planning and preparation.

> >The entire argument that "Morse is essential to emergency
> >communications" is SO bogus that it's ridiculous, thus it
> >doesn't hold water as "justification" for continued Morse testing.
>
> I would describe it this way:
>
> "What is the probability that a ham will be in an emergency
situation where
> Morse/CW is the ONLY available mode that will work?

With reasonable planning and preparation, "VANISHINGLY SMALL."

> Is that probability high enough to justify mandatory testing of ALL
> hams as a precondition for a license?"

Certainly not!!!!!

> Those are the pertinent questions.

I agree ... and I've provided sound, rational answers to both.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPIJcape+N6+q84HiEQKk3ACfT4f7gC7o2+qFNdeZaElu2eXeFKMAnRSW
PW0OR+gXcKWRVoNCcD42J/ms
=2UYK
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

303. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 17:35:25 UTC
From: Snowbat <snowbat@geocities.com>
Message-ID: <j9m48ug77m828hmag74889qimtcsgodl10@4ax.com>
Source record: 36297
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Radio Ham wrote in message

<3c81e64a_3@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>:
>Snowbat <snowbat@geocities.com> wrote in message
>news:42138ukdc5hgrc1cpqu49vltqth81rgb21@4ax.com...
>> PROVE IT! Please provide Message IDs of at any 5 Usenet posts in any
>> single month of your choice prior to 1997 by different authors that
>> feature 'top posting' to establish it was a convention. Can you do
>> it? I think not.

>Stupid Boy. I have been top posting since coming on the Internet
>in 1994. Merely looking at my postings will satisfy
>your meaningless challenge.

Which part of 'by different authors' do you not understand?

If you are unable to back up your claim, should readers conclude you
are a superficial and lazy git with no integrity?

304. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 17:45:44 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c82639c_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36300

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020303101042.21826.00000240@mb-cc.aol.com...
>
> Fun facts: The pre-restructuring Tech has been passed by at least
one
> preschooler. The pre-restructuring Extra has been passed by some
> preteens - one as young as 8. In most cases they passed on the first
try -
> code and theory!

First, let's admit that they are the exceptions, not the rule.

Second, let's admit that there are a certain number of true
child prodigies in the population who COULD actually learn
the fundamentals at those ages ... alternatively, there are
always what are sometimes referred to as "idiot savants,"
who have incredible memorization/association skills, but
are otherwise no more intelligent (often less so) than "normal"
people. Both of these categories are such miniscule portions
of the population that the can reasonably be ignored in terms
of judging whether a testing system has reasonable integrity
or not.

Finally, let's also recognize the fact that virtually all (completely
all?) of these (precocious in one way or another) youngsters
are the offspring of licensed hams who have coached and
coddled them all along the way ...
(however, they are STILL a VERY small abberation from the
norm)

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPIJhRJe+N6+q84HiEQIz/gCcCRaR92SKaWQoX07K8Cz6FSMSy9cAnjPp
hatFbO7PfXRHsB/Wv7Ma0plB
=XEM+
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

305. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 17:48:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303124829.03173.00001665@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 36298

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 3/3/2002 9:12 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C823D5C.55572450@IEEE.org>

>A guy was stopped for not signaling a lane change. He was on his way to
>pay $5000 cash for a motorcycle. The cops took his $5000 and wouldn't
>give it back. We all have something to fear from the RICO laws.

RICO has nothing to do with preventing another WTC, Cecil...not even in
your logic.

Steve

306. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 17:50:15 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303125015.17460.00001489@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 36299

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>and they don't feel like they are being treated
>as 2nd class citizens who are reviled and looked down on
>by "their superiors." You claim not to have seen much of
>the latter, but I have seen it personally (even experienced
>it from folks like Dick and Larry, but I'm thick-skinned and
>I don't pay attention to their insults) ... I'm much more concerned
>about the degree to which this happens to others as they
>enter our ranks as newbies ...

Outside of rrap, I have seen relatively little of it. We had a bit of that sort of thing show up on one of the QRP lists, but the other old timers spoke up and it stopped.

When I was first licensed, I knew I was a rank beginner, but I didn't run into any 2nd-class citizen treatment. To the contrary, the old timers forgave my faux pas and helped me along. We still have a lot of that today. I am sure there were hams who would have taken out their resentment against me because the Novice license was so dumbed down, but without the internet, I managed never to run across them.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

307. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 17:56:11 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303125611.17460.00001490@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 36301

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>OK ... if I was overly sensitive, I'm sorry ... but at first
>read it certainly appeared that you were bemoaning
>the fact that newcomers today get more liberal privs
>than "back in the good old days when the Novice was
>75W input, rock-bound, 1 year to upgrade or you're out.

He brought it up as a counterpoint to my noting that the Novice exam was passable after reading a 4-page study guide, to explain why a more comprehensive entry exam is justified.

>There is NOT room for the old in terms of: "It's always been
>this way, we've always used ____ and we don't want no
>stinking ____ taking up space in the bands;"

I have seen little of tha attitude, Carl. Even those who support a code test have not been opposed to the use of digital modes in ham bands.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

308. Re: Watch out Cecil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 17:56:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303125656.17460.00001491@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 36302

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>> [430] W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> 12.5%

>How many of these guys have day jobs?

I do.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

309. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 18:01:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303130104.03173.00001666@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 36303

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>Date: 3/3/2002 10:35 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Khsg8.20387$eH4.2973077707@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>

>> I did not make out QSLs for
>> QSOs. My cards may have indicated an actual frequency since QSL labels
>> were printed from my logs. The implication from your "greenstamp"
>> comment is that we were somehow raking in the dough on QSLing. I went
>> out of pocket some $1000 on QSLing.
>
>Not bad for over 22 years of hamming. But if you can't affor it you might
>want to find a different hobby.

I have been a Ham for 30 years this October, BP...I can't afford to drop a grand on QSL's...Does that mean I have to find a new hobby too? Most of the other Hams I have known for a "long time" can't drop a grand on QSL's, either.

What does one's longevity in Amateur Radio have to do with one's ability to afford QSL cards? Does the local bank have some sort of "QSL Account", kinda like Christmas accounts? Musta missed THAT one!

>> So, to be sure that I understand you, the fact that I got on the air
>> made me guilty of luring folks outside their band segments? Wowser,
>> that is some power I have.
>
>When the word spreads that you'll work them out of band, then follow it up
>with a QSL card???
>If anyone's in the market for something illegal, its not hard to find out
>who the bootlegger or dealer is.

It's called "cross band", Putz. Was very popular when the Brits had 70mHz privileges but no 50...They'd listen for us on 50, we'd listen for them on 70. Both statons are "legal".

>That was the thrust of my comment prior to you and/or Steve misdirecting it.

You misdirect yourself, Brian, with outrageous rants and infammatory accusations. You don't need anyone's help.

>True. I'd rather use the buro than take people's money. Except for the
>countries w/o buro's, of course. I've even bypassed the ARRL outgoing buro
>and mailed piles of cards directly to Box 88 to speed up the process for the
>former USSR.

In most cases, a single "greenback" is acutally a savings for them...especially some of the European countries where the dollar trades high.

German postage, for example, is almost 2 1/2 times higher than what it is in the United States.

73

Steve, K4YZ

310. Morse as an "essential element" in emergencies (new thread title)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 18:02:03 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c826781_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36308

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020303101043.21826.00000241@mb-cc.aol.com...
> In article <3c79280c_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >I *know* that
> >there is a CW traffic net; but most traffic these days is contrived
for the
> >benefit of having a net (net messages back and forth, etc.).
>
> There is a whole network of NTS CW traffic nets, from section to
region to
> area.
> A reasonable person would not say that most of that traffic is
"contrived"
> unless they had actually monitored the various nets and messages
passed.

I would assert (YMMV :-) that I am a reasonable person.

I *have* not only monitored NTS traffic nets, but have *participated*.

I *did* find a large preponderance of the messages passed to be
contrived as a means of "keeping the net going" ... in other words,
"the net" has taken on a life of its own and become a passtime for
those who participate, and they "do what it takes" to perpetuate its
existence so they'll "have something to do."

> NTS nets are all over 80 CW in the evenings.

So? HF voice and even VHF versions of the NTS nets
exist as well ... and the vast majority of the messages there
are contrived as well.

PLEASE NOTE: I am NOT objecting to people participating
in this activity "if it rocks their boat" ... I am NOT saying "it
should be stopped."

ALL that I'm saying is that it is NOT an "essential element of
emergency preparedness," as the very nature of the NTS and
the "radiogram" message format on which it is based are simply
NOT what the emergency management folks (who are, in effect,
our "clients") want/need in today's world.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPIJkuZe+N6+q84HiEQI6ewCeIRM59UJwxk2vTE079Z+uJKB2x2MAniSo
CInl366SdZGbelb5Lc2qn276
=cBn7
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

311. Re: Posting of new club websites?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 18:04:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303130413.17460.00001492@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 36304

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>"me" <cust8857@hotmail.com> wrote:

>> Could someone please educate me on the ethical and legal views
>> involved in posting my club's new web site?
>
>What could be the issue? If your club has
>a web site that anyone can access, then publishing
>(i.e. telling others about it) is neither illegal nor
>unethical? If anyone thinks otherwise, I'm
>open to listen.

I think he was asking if posting information about a club web site would be unwelcome SPAM on this newsgroup.

It would probably be more suitable a post for rec.radio.amateur.misc, but that forum really has degraded into an insult fest. I haven't been there in quite some time. However, unless there is a policy twist to the club web site, .policy is probably not the place for such announcements.

Keep in mind that rrax is a worldwide newsgroup. If the club web page contains only information of interest to local hams, it really doesn't need worldwide exposure. If it has information that many hams can use, irrespective of where they live, I think a post about it on rram would be quite appropriate to the charter of the newsgroup.

Do note that some webmasters post information about their sites on a regular basis. For the most part, doing so does not endear them to the people they are trying to reach. I personally make a point not to make any use of sites whose webmasters post to all of the amateur newsgroups every couple of weeks.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

312. Re: Len's issues with NCI and ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 18:06:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303130614.03173.00001667@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 36305

>Subject: Len's issues with NCI and ARRL
>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>Date: 3/3/2002 8:13 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3c823124_2@news7.fast.net>

>As far as NCI goes, I can't fathom why you would have had a
>problem in joining if you've really tried to do so..

Therein lies the problem now...Did he or didn't he? We only ahve his "word" he did, and we have had a very long and continuous period of time to see what Lennie's word is worth.

>....so I don't
>understand why you and you alone haven't been successful.

You don't?

>If you wish to become a member of NCI, I would state without
>reservation that I can think of no reason that you should not
>be able to do so ... there is no "conspiracy" to "keep Len out
>of NCI."

It could be that schitzo-thingie going on within him, Carl. The one side who WANTS to join NCI, but the other side who is self destructive and helps to make him look foolish. Not that he needs any help.

73

Steve, K4YZ

313. Re: ARRL Newsgroup?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 18:07:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303130702.17460.00001493@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 36307

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>Ryan, I'd rather not see the name "ARRL" on any newsgroup not initiated and
>moderated by the ARRL. There's already enough ARRL bashing out there. And
>I believe that there are some SIG reflectors on the members only side of the
>ARRL.org site. The ARRL also has a number of weekly reports and newsletters
>that are available via e-mail.

I forget which site (yahoo?), but there is an ARRL email reflector. I
subscribed to it, but haven't seen any traffic for weeks.

Besides, if ARRL is going to be discussed, bashing or no, squirreling that
discussion away into its own newsgroup or discussion forum is probably not the
best approach to take.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

314. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 18:07:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C826638.6CF5A4E4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 36306

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C8226CB.7073380B@earthlink.net...
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C7C5E28.C8455DB@earthlink.net...
> > > > Brian P Burke wrote:

> > > > It was exactly something Dave *did* say. There wasn't any smugness to
> > > > it. It was plain observation. Even a blind pig finds some acorns.
> > >
> > > Sure, Dave, pick on blind pigs. Do you want to go double or nothing and
> > > make fun of blind hams while you're on a roll?
> >
> > Are there blind hams out looking for acorns?
>
> You tell me. Since blind pigs weren't the topic, only you can tell us where
> your point is going.

I don't recall the old saying about blind hams finding acorns. The only
one I knew was about blind pigs. You brought up blind hams. Did you
have a point?

>
> > > > > >You didn't address my reply to your statement of
> > > > > > my views toward those holding Tech Plus tickets.
> > > > >
> > > > > No need to. Your reply indicated that Tech Plusses can be every bit
> the
> > > > > DXer that you are. Right?
> > > >
> > > > Sure they can, Brian and I've never said otherwise.
> > >
> > > > > Let me bring you back to speed. We had a Frenchman on here and he
> > > verified
> > > > > that you were working out of band Frenchmen on 6 meters. I
> mentioned
> > > that I
> > > > > used to work FR6DX all the time on 10 meters.
> > > >
> > > > ...and you expected me to remember that you used to work FR6DX on ten?
> > > > Sheesh.
> > >

> > > No, I expect nothing from you.
> >
> > Your replies indicate otherwise.
>
> Your replies indicate a certain smugness that you deny.

I'm really close to giving up on you again, Brian. You bring up a tale of an FR6 you used to QSO. I told you that I didn't recall that. It was of little significance to me then. It is of little significance to me now. It isn't as if it'll show up as a Jeopardy clue.

> > > But lets see if your memory gets any better.
> > > Did you go ahead and confirm those out of band contacts? I hope that >
> you at
> > > least printed the exact frequency and not just "6M" so they wouldn't
> have
> > > the balls to submit them to the ARRL for credit. But hey, for a
> > > greenstamp...
> >
> > Drop a line to WA8JOC and make inquiry.
>
> Why? Did you abdicate all responsibility for your QSLing?

Yeah, like many DXers whose QSO totals are numbered in the tens of thousands for each operation, I had nothing to do with QSLing other than sending logs to WA8JOC. Notify the QSLing police.

> > I did not make out QSLs for
> > QSOs. My cards may have indicated an actual frequency since QSL labels
> > were printed from my logs. The implication from your "greenstamp"
> > comment is that we were somehow raking in the dough on QSLing. I went
> > out of pocket some $1000 on QSLing.
>
> Not bad for over 22 years of hamming. But if you can't affor it you might
> want to find a different hobby.

That was for operation from Guinea-Bissau. I was active there from Feb. 1988 through early Sept. 1989. It was one illustration of just how wealthy I became from QSLing proceeds. How about this one? I didn't have to QSL anyone at all. I just didn't think there was much purpose to getting on the air from a rare spot, making all of QSOs and then not confirming the contacts.

Those who QSL'd direct with stamps, IRCs or a buck got a card direct. Many from the eastern bloc didn't have IRCs but included mint stamps from their country. They also got direct cards. Others, including U.S. ops who sent a card direct but without an SASE, got a bureau reply.

> > > > If I've only got you and Kim to worry about I don't think I'll toss
> and
> > > > turn much over the issue of smugness.
> > >

> > > You wouldn't anyway, it's a trait that smug people have.
> >
> > Can you tell us about the traits which those people who have chips on
> > their shoulders have?
>
> Help me out here.

You're on your own.

> > > You can have all the DX fun you
> > > > can muster.
> > >
> > > You probably thought that I needed your permission. Thanks Dave.
> >
> > It was a suggestion. If it offends you, then DON'T have all the DX fun
> > you can muster. Either result makes little difference in my life.
>
> > > > > > I do just fine on this side of the pileup, thanks. Nailed a 5R8
> on 6m
> > > > > > the other day
> > > > > >
> > > > > Do they have 6m privileges?
> > > > >
> > > > Drop the licensing authorities a line and make an inquiry. I'm sure
> > > > they'll be happy to hear from you.
> > >
> > > They'd be even happier to hear you're not luring their folks out of
> band.
> >
> > So, to be sure that I understand you, the fact that I got on the air
> > made me guilty of luring folks outside their band segments? Wowser,
> > that is some power I have.
>
> When the word spreads that you'll work them out of band, then follow it up
> with a QSL card???
> If anyone's in the market for something illegal, its not hard to find out
> who the bootlegger or dealer is.

I wasn't out of band nor did I have any knowledge that they were. Do
you know the permitted 6m band allocation is in each country? Do you go
through your logs, looking for actual frequency and compare logs to a
country's 6m frequency allocation. If you do, you'd be called
obsessive-compulsive by medical folks.

> > > OH2BH "nonsense???" I guess you have no memory after all.
> >
> > It would appear that you are correct.
>
> Sometimes. Standby. ;)
>
> > > All I was saying was that if one wealthy ham like Marty...

> >
> > I've seen this part of the movie. This is where I told you that Martti
> > is not wealthy and that he was not VP of Nokia--that he was a salesman
> > for Nokia.
>
> I never saw that, and it wasn't the point anyway.

Try Google if your curiousity gets the best of you.

> > > can get the Axis of
> > > Evil/North Koreans to allow amateur radio, what could a group (like the
> > > ARRL) do to promote amateur radio there? You're the one who shanghai'd
> that
> > > theme and tried to convince us that the VP of Nokia lived in the low
> rent
> > > district. His income wasn't even the point, but you made it so, because
> you
> > > needed to put me down. Can't have anyone else on here commenting on DX.
> > > That's your exclusive domain.
> >
> > All I'd ask is that if someone does care to comment on DX, he has his
> > facts straight. I don't have a need to put you down. The chip on your
> > shoulder puts you down. You could have easily thanked me for the
> > correction. Instead, you attempted to argue the point with someone who
> > knows the man. Any who have a real interest in the matter are likely to
> > find the record of our exchange in Google.
>
> Dave, I think it was Hans who said that Marty was the VP Nokia. If you did
> make a correction, fine. It wasn't the point, but only makes the point I
> made stronger. Allow me to restate: "If a non-wealthy ham can have such an
> influence..."

Other non-wealthy hams have traveled to North Korea and have obtained
permission to operate. There are still no North Koreans hams. There
are still no radio amateurs other than foreigners in many countries.

>
> Meanwhile, did you ever have a comment about how a large, influential
> organizations such as the ARRL, RSGB, or any other national organization
> might be able to influence some of these countries to open up to amateur
> radio?

There's only so much that such an organization can do. If a country's
government if opposed to or is not warmly receptive to amateur radio
licensing, what could the ARRL do about that even with massive amounts
of money? If a country has amateur licensing but still has few or none
of its nationals licensed (Guinea-Bissau - 0, Botswana -several,
Tanzania - 0), what can the ARRL do to change the situation. The IARU
sent a good deal of study material, some handbooks and some basic 20m
transceiver kits to the Botswana Amateur Radio Society. The society
held licensing classes and had a functional club station with good
antennas. No locals ever became hams. No local ever even completed the

widely advertised (broadcast radio, newspaper, bulletin boards)
classes.
The governments of some countries are totally phobic of 2-way radio.
They associate it with lack of control or with spying. North Korea has
long been one of those places.

> That was the thrust of my comment prior to you and/or Steve misdirecting it.

Is that because you didn't have your facts straight and you went on a
tangent arguing those facts? If so, you've given us much power over
you. I guess we have the power to cloud men's minds.

> > If you believe what you've just written, allow me to suggest that you
> > have no idea of what common practice in QSLing is.
>
> True. I'd rather use the buro than take people's money. Except for the
> countries w/o buro's, of course. I've even bypassed the ARRL outgoing buro
> and mailed piles of cards directly to Box 88 to speed up the process for the
> former USSR.

The way to get a QSL card from some rare stations is to follow the
directions given by the op. I had numbers those who worked me QSL
directly to my home call. They only received QSLs because I had my
permanent address in those days changed to that of my QSL manager.
Bureau QSLing is slow. Not everyone wants to wait for up to several
years to confirm a QSO. As you pointed out, not all countries have
bureaus. In Botswana, we sorted incoming cards every month or two.
Cards were not forwarded to ops since we had no budget for that. They
had to pick up QSLs from BARS. There are times that we received large
numbers of QSLs for ops who had left the country and provided no
forwarding address. Can you guess where these cards ended up?

>
> > > Holy Cow! Is your QTH by itself or do you live in a subdivision?
> >
> > Subdivision? The nearest would be about 25 miles away. We have a plot
> > of land up on a ridge. I have a couple of neighbors, one at the foot of
> > my drive and one across the road. They're each about a hundred yards
> > away. The rest of the area is woods and pasture land.
>
> Sounds fantastic. I'm tempted to turn in my life insurance for cash value
> and purchase a plot of land in south eastern Ohio to spend my weekends. A
> 60 foot tower is my little dream. That's one solution.

That's the BIG dream for many folks. It is a good idea. I'm sure you
can find a spot high enough to give you nose bleed for not much loot.
My VHF enthusiast friends in Hinton, West Virginia had a little wooden
shack on top of a mountain across the New River. It was equipped with a
generator and a kerosene heater. They spent many weekends there since
there was no way to work anyone except locals in town.

> Another is to go
> mobile to public parks and state forests and do "field day" on big contest
> weekends. I've got a nice deep cycle battery. Paper logs aren't a problem
> for "hunt and pounce" that I'd be using.

The antennas won't be as good though. I bought an old Grid 386, a pile
of batteries and an AC supply for peanuts at a hamfest some years back.
It is perfect for Field Day activity. Log-EQF doesn't know it is
operating on an old, slow computer.

> > > I can't even hear the clear channel stations on AM sometimes because of
> all
> > > the buzzing noise.
> >
> > I did find some noise interfering with reception on MW and on 80m. It
> > turned out to be fluorescent lighting in my barn. Bypass caps and a
> > brute force line filter fixed that. I also found that a smaller, indoor
> > loop didn't work well since it largely heard the noise from my
> > computers.
>
> Last night was relatively quiet. I listend to the AM broadcast band for an
> hour before turning in.
>
> I've put two of the the mfj split ferrite kits on one of the computers and I
> still get racket on my portable shortwave. That's six of them. My work
> laptop is quiet except when booting up, but I won't use it except for work.
> Perhaps I need to trade off my old 300mhz machine for an older laptop.

I found that most of the crud emanating from my computer here in the
shack came from the monitor. A monitor extension cable and ferrites at
both the monitor and the computer helped greatly. It is a pain but
there are tempesting sprays available. You can take your monitor out of
the case and spray the interior of the case with the stuff. There'll
still be some residual noise because of the large glass area. It isn't
much fun to read through copper screen.

> I've spotted an MFJ or AEA Loop at the other end of the division. I suspect
> that no one else knows what it is. I'm tempted to put up something small
> like the MFJ 1796 bushytail antenna on my deck and see what happens.

You could try hanging a bird feeder from it but it'll probably catch
fire.

>
> > > Besides its a restricted development (which ones
> > > aren't???). You need a minimum 5 acres "estate" around here to build a
> lone
> > > house. Anyway, I intend to get up in the attic tomorrow and see what's
> > > there to work with.
> >
> > That is one of the sad things about modern life. You are prevented from
> > doing things you'd like because of the lack of alternatives to the CC&R
> > nonsense which swept the nation.

>
> Yeah, they slap the CCR's on befor the first dozer cut is made.
>
> My first priority was to get my children in the Pickerington school
> district, one of only three school districts in central Ohio to meet federal
> guidelines. Then I bought one of the least expensive houses for sale here,
> which is 1/3 again what my home was in Illinois, minus one bedroom and 400
> square feet. And my mortgage is only 1% higher. Thank God I only took a
> $5K cut in pay to boost the economy.

We're about two hours east of you SE of Wheeling. The houses are much cheaper, the property tax is unbelievably low and so is the cost of living. Of course there aren't many jobs but that isn't what I was looking for. I live out in the county where there is no zoning. There are more dairy and beef cattle out here than people.

Dave K8MN

315. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 18:12:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303131243.17460.00001494@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 36309

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY):

>>I estimate about 20% of hams have useable proficiency in Morse code.

>I would say it's much higher.

I was including all licensed hams in my WAG. This includes no-code techs (and their equivalents in other countries), inactive hams who haven't touched their rig in years (and are renewing for whatever reason), no-code techs, etc.

All things considered, I think that 20% might be a bit high. The Japanese no-code hams skew that number way down.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

316. Re: Watch out Cecil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 18:13:32 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c826a35_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36314

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:Hprg8.20375$Di3.2967445725@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com...
> "K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
> news:79e47b493f5c55c202cf1d634d08abae.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > Dick Carroll is hot on your tail, and Mr. Hare is no slouch either!
> >
> > Top 10 Users Feb 2002
> >
> > [452] CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> 13.1%
> > [435] Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> 12.6%
> > [430] W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> 12.5%
> > [279] W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> 8.1%
> > [200] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 5.8%
> > [154] Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> 4.5%
> > [128] Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> 3.7%
> > [114] Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> 3.3%
> > [112] Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> 3.2%
> > [110] Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> 3.2%
> >
> >
> > --
> > Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG
>
> How many of these guys have day jobs?

I believe that Cecil and Dick are retired ... Jim, N2EY, I'm not sure of.

I think Len may be retired, or working as a consultant perhaps ... I'm
not sure.

AFAIK, everyone else "has a day job" ...

I have a "day and night job" myself ... with my day often running from
0600-1800 EST as I juggle issues between colleagues in Europe,
here, and on the US west coast ... Monday I have a 2+ hour conf.
call with Hong Kong at starting at 1900 EST ...

Then I have responsibiities in IEEE and NCI ...

I just don't see how I can raise my standing in the rankings
with the workload I presently have :-)

Carl - wa6vse

317. Re: Morse as an "essential element" in emergencies (new thread title)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 18:16:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303131627.17460.00001495@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 36310

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net:

>I *did* find a large preponderance of the messages passed to be
>contrived as a means of "keeping the net going" ... in other words,
>"the net" has taken on a life of its own and become a passtime for
>those who participate, and they "do what it takes" to perpetuate its
>existence so they'll "have something to do."

And a good thing that is, because unless there is something to do, that net will not be available when needed or would be staffed by people who had little practice handling formal traffic.

>ALL that I'm saying is that it is NOT an "essential element of
>emergency preparedness," as the very nature of the NTS and
>the "radiogram" message format on which it is based are simply
>NOT what the emergency management folks (who are, in effect,
>our "clients") want/need in today's world.

The NTS is very much part of emergency preparedness. On a local basis, tactical communication is what is generally needed, but much of the emergency communications in and out of disaster areas consists of formal message handling. The health and welfare traffic is almost all handled through the NTS.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

318. Re: Len's issues with NCI and ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 18:18:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303131833.17460.00001496@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 36312

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)

> Therein lies the problem now...Did he or didn't he?

Carl had explained to Len what he thinks may have gone awry when Len tried to join NCI. Carl then reassured him that his membership would be most welcome. Len still did a subsequent post that his membership in NCI has been rejected.

FWIW.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

319. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 18:18:59 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16ec0816866bf64d9896a4@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36311

In article <3c825eb2_2@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net says...

> I'm merely stating the facts, based on years of dealing with
> emergency management folks through ARES/RACES ...
> They DON'T want Morse radiograms ... they want/need what
> I've said ... tactical voice and data communications.

No, you're merely *ignoring* the facts. It's already been stated that CW was used for traffic to and from FEMA, GEMA, and SOC during Hurricne Floyd. You need to disprove this before your off-the-cuff assertion would have any weight.

> First, if the most recent you can come up with dates to 1999,
> that in itself is evidence that Morse usage in emergencies is
> rare indeed.

Major hurricanes are relatively rare occurences. At least, "rare" according to your defining of something that last happened two years ago as "rare". What I don't understand is why you are now dictating what modes should and should not be used in emergencies. I thought NCI didn't favor or disfavor one mode over another.

Again, your agenda is showing.

> Secondly, while I don't have the time to dig through google
> archives of ancient history, I would strongly suspect that,
> as is virtually always the case, any use of Morse was a matter
> of operator choice, rather than operational necessity. If it was,
> in fact, "the only mode available," that indicates a lack of good
> planning and preparation.

Well, I'm sure that the people involved are sorry that they didn't activate that special ionosphere-charging satellite to enhance propagation at will.

joshua houk
ac7ri

320. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 18:20:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303132058.17460.00001497@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 36313

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>Second, let's admit that there are a certain number of true
>child prodigies in the population who COULD actually learn
>the fundamentals at those ages ... alternatively, there are
>always what are sometimes referred to as "idiot savants,"
>who have incredible memorization/association skills, but
>are otherwise no more intelligent (often less so) than "normal"
>people. Both of these categories are such miniscule portions
>of the population that the can reasonably be ignored in terms
>of judging whether a testing system has reasonable integrity
>or not.

Cecil tells us that he memorized the study guides and passed the exams in 1951.

There have always been people who can memorize; most hams today could not get by on rote memorization alone.

Very few people become hams because they don't want to learn anything. The fear is, IMHO, unfounded.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

321. Re: Morse as an "essential element" in emergencies (new thread title)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 18:26:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303132658.03185.00001393@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 36315

>Subject: Morse as an "essential element" in emergencies (new thread title)
>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>Date: 3/3/2002 12:02 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3c826781_1@news7.fast.net>

>I *did* find a large preponderance of the messages passed to be
>contrived as a means of "keeping the net going" ... in other words,
>"the net" has taken on a life of its own and become a passtime for
>those who participate, and they "do what it takes" to perpetuate its
>existence so they'll "have something to do."

Hmmmm....doing something just for the sake of staying proficient in it's
own use.....?!?!

Isn't that called "PRACTICE"...?!?!?

>ALL that I'm saying is that it is NOT an "essential element of
>emergency preparedness," as the very nature of the NTS and
>the "radiogram" message format on which it is based are simply
>NOT what the emergency management folks (who are, in effect,
>our "clients") want/need in today's world.

Then WHY, Carl, do all the "big guys" keep signing on to ARRL's MoU's for
providing the service? ARC, FEMA, DoS, DoD, Salvation Army, ...etc etc etc...?

Would the world fall apart if tomorrow they threw a disaster and Amateur
Radio didn't come? Of course not...but it WOULD significantly increase the
workload of incident managers and recovery workers without them.

73

Steve, K4YZ

322. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 18:37:42 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c826ffc_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36317

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16ec0816866bf64d9896a4@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <3c825eb2_2@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net
says...
>
> > I'm merely stating the facts, based on years of dealing with
> > emergency management folks through ARES/RACES ...
> > They DON'T want Morse radiograms ... they want/need what
> > I've said ... tactical voice and data communications.
>
> No, you're merely *ignoring* the facts. It's already been stated
that CW
> was used for traffic to and from FEMA, GEMA, and SOC during Hurricne

> Floyd. You need to disprove this before your off-the-cuff assertion
would
> have any weight.

I've not disputed that Morse is occasionally used ... what I
have pointed out, however, is that it is virtually always a
matter of operator choice and not "necessity." That is a
subtle, but important, distinction in terms of the "Morse is
necessary" argument.

> > First, if the most recent you can come up with dates to 1999,
> > that in itself is evidence that Morse usage in emergencies is
> > rare indeed.
>
> Major hurricanes are relatively rare occurences. At least, "rare"
> according to your defining of something that last happened two years
ago

Last time I checked, 2002-1999 = three ... but that's a minor
point.

Again, I would assert that, if the most recent you can come up
with dates to 1999, that in itself is evidence that Morse usage
in emergencies is rare indeed.

> as "rare". What I don't understand is why you are now dictating what

> modes should and should not be used in emergencies. I thought NCI
didn't
> favor or disfavor one mode over another.

I am not "dictating what modes should and should not be used in
emergencies" ... however, I do have many years of experience
with what types of communications services our "clients" the
emergency management types, Red Cross, Salvation Army, etc.
want and need and I can categorically state again that Morse
radiograms are NOT something that they have use for to any
extent at all.

> Again, your agenda is showing.

No, I'm simply stating facts based on direct, extensive experience.

> > Secondly, while I don't have the time to dig through google
> > archives of ancient history, I would strongly suspect that,
> > as is virtually always the case, any use of Morse was a matter
> > of operator choice, rather than operational necessity. If it was,
> > in fact, "the only mode available," that indicates a lack of good
> > planning and preparation.
>
> Well, I'm sure that the people involved are sorry that they didn't
> activate that special ionosphere-charging satellite to enhance
> propagation at will.
^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
What a pile of crap! Again, if Morse was, in fact, "the only mode
available," that indicates a lack of good planning and preparation.
(and that has nothing to do with your assinine comment about
"special ionosphere-charging satellite(s)" ...)

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPIJtF5e+N6+q84HiEQKwfwCfVXagCytYPBQXnHTg6cfTJfWtOLsAn2Re
iTTTHlrt6uoeZBW/90VL9nBB
=np/8
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

323. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 18:47:10 UTC
From: Andy Lake <andy.lakeSPAMFREE@bt.com>
Message-ID: <3C826FAE.E7219AF2@bt.com>
Source record: 36316
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Radio Ham wrote:
>
> Top posting is one Internet convention, and makes sense
> if you have been following a thread, for you get to the
> latest contribution immediately, and then only need
> to refer to the previous stuff if your memory is poor.

What - you remember "2000 postings a day"?
Cool.

> Bottom posting is another convention which results
> in postings being ignored because the new comment is off
> the screen, and when you've got of the order of
> 2000 postings per day in different newsgroups, you ain't got
> time to page down.

Then try a newsreader with single-key read!
(Most decent ones have it.. Even this clunky old Netscrape.)

73
Andy

324. CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 18:48:51 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c8272b0_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36318

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020303125611.17460.00001490@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >There is NOT room for the old in terms of: "It's always been
> >this way, we've always used ____ and we don't want no
> >stinking ____ taking up space in the bands;"
>
> I have seen little of tha attitude, Carl. Even those who support a
code test
> have not been opposed to the use of digital modes in ham bands.

I've personally seen, and know a lot of others who have also seen,
a lot of it ...

And what of Jim's proposal to set aside 35% of the HF bands
for "CW ONLY," 15% for digital, and 50% for SSB ?????

Sorry, but that pig has no wings ...

1st CW can go virtually anywhere now.
2nd, CW usage (considering relative bandwidths) doesn't
need or justify such a setaside.
And finally, that would be a major, crippling loss for the
digital modes ... perhaps something that some CW
enthusiasts would like, but NOT a good thing for the
future.

As I said, leaving CW/narrowband_data as they are
would be FAR preferable (and more realistic) than
Jim's 35/15/50 proposal.

While I don't support restricting CW usage, I would
NEVER support such a setaside, either.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPIJv65e+N6+q84HiEQK9awCgsSdD/etqChS2eIm/DE90V/OP0eEAoJdP
dT/cPmuSPMFcTGlphDiveW/K
=eT9O
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

325. Re: Len's issues with NCI and ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 18:59:52 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c827556_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36320

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020303130614.03173.00001667@mb-cv.aol.com...
> >Subject: Len's issues with NCI and ARRL
> >From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
> >Date: 3/3/2002 8:13 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3c823124_2@news7.fast.net>
>
> >As far as NCI goes, I can't fathom why you would have had a
> >problem in joining if you've really tried to do so..
>
> Therein lies the problem now...Did he or didn't he? We only
ahve his
> "word" he did, and we have had a very long and continuous period of
time to see
> what Lennie's word is worth.

I do not, nor did I have, any reason to doubt Len's word ... I
only stated that I don't understand why he's had a problem.

> >....so I don't
> >understand why you and you alone haven't been successful.
>
> You don't?

No, I don't ... I said what I meant and meant what I said.
Please don't "read between the lines" in ways that might
be interpreted as "putting words in MY mouth."

> >If you wish to become a member of NCI, I would state without
> >reservation that I can think of no reason that you should not
> >be able to do so ... there is no "conspiracy" to "keep Len out
> >of NCI."

[snipped some Steve comments WRT Len's stability that
I felt were gratuitous insults that lent nothing to the substance
of the thread]

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPIJynpe+N6+q84HiEQKlqwCgqd/WVJtlrk3MyEy4Tmd7JgDZKbMAoIX3
dJXufXF8ljl8Yj6mjmRRdmD1

```
=dxIA
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

326. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 19:04:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8273B6.3F2B254@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36319

Joshua Houk wrote:
> It's already been stated that CW
> was used for traffic to and from FEMA, GEMA, and SOC during Hurricne
> Floyd. You need to disprove this before your off-the-cuff assertion would
> have any weight.

If other hams choose to use a different mode, can they get the
same job done? In other words, is there anything that CW can
normally do during an emergency that other modes cannot do?

The argument sometimes reminds me of the guy who looked for his
lost keys under the street light (instead of where he lost them)
because the light was better.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

327. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 19:11:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C82756A.6120FEAB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36323

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> >From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >Date: 3/3/2002 9:12 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3C823D5C.55572450@IEEE.org>
>
> >A guy was stopped for not signaling a lane change. He was on his way to
> >pay $5000 cash for a motorcycle. The cops took his $5000 and wouldn't
> >give it back. We all have something to fear from the RICO laws.
>
> RICO has nothing to do with preventing another WTC, Cecil...not even in
> your logic.

If you think that, Steve, I feel sorry for your individual rights.
In the name of drug enforcement, the feds can seize the assets of
an innocent citizen. In the name of fighting terrorism, the feds
can seize the assets of an innocent citizen. "Law and Order" got
in a dig the other night. "Anyone willing to trade freedom for
security is likely to lose both." I know, it's an old saying, but
it was comforting to hear it on a brand new episode of "Law and
Order".

If an innocent Middle Eastern man is found carrying $10k in cash,
guess what would happen? Of course, you don't have to worry, because
you don't look Middle Eastern. But your time may be coming.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

328. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 19:11:50 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16ec1477ef856c549896a5@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36321

In article <3c826ffc_1@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net says...

> "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:MPG.16ec0816866bf64d9896a4@netnews.worldnet.att.net...

> > No, you're merely *ignoring* the facts. It's already been stated
> > that CW was used for traffic to and from FEMA, GEMA, and SOC during
> > Hurricne Floyd. You need to disprove this before your off-the-cuff
> > assertion would have any weight.
>
> I've not disputed that Morse is occasionally used ... what I
> have pointed out, however, is that it is virtually always a
> matter of operator choice and not "necessity." That is a
> subtle, but important, distinction in terms of the "Morse is
> necessary" argument.

No, Carl, we're talking about what emergency agencies *want*. That's what you were discussing. Don't change the subject just because you were wrong.

Again, CW was used in traffic between emergency agencies, including FEMA, GEMA, and SOC. Obviously, they want it, else they'd never have used it. Capiche?

> > Major hurricanes are relatively rare occurences. At least, "rare"
> > according to your defining of something that last happened two years
> ago
>
> Last time I checked, 2002-1999 = three ... but that's a minor
> point.

Hurricane Floyd impacted the US from September 14th through September 18th, 1999. I won't insult you by doing the math for you (unlike your petulant snipe towards me), but that works out to be closer to two years than three.

> Again, I would assert that, if the most recent you can come up
> with dates to 1999, that in itself is evidence that Morse usage
> in emergencies is rare indeed.

Again, major hurricanes are rare occurrences. By the same logic that you use in re morse, that means we shouldn't suggest that people be prepared for hurricanes either, neh?

> > as "rare". What I don't understand is why you are now dictating what
> > modes should and should not be used in emergencies. I thought NCI
> > didn't favor or disfavor one mode over another.

>
> I am not "dictating what modes should and should not be used in
> emergencies" ... however, I do have many years of experience
> with what types of communications services our "clients" the
> emergency management types, Red Cross, Salvation Army, etc.
> want and need and I can categorically state again that Morse
> radiograms are NOT something that they have use for to any
> extent at all.

There's already a post readily disproving this, so I won't bother with
the retread.

> > Well, I'm sure that the people involved are sorry that they didn't
> > activate that special ionosphere-charging satellite to enhance
> > propagation at will.
> ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
> What a pile of crap! Again, if Morse was, in fact, "the only mode
> available," that indicates a lack of good planning and preparation.
> (and that has nothing to do with your assinine comment about
> "special ionosphere-charging satellite(s)" ...)

Frankly, I'd personally learn more about propagation and signal to noise
ratios before I started shoveling "crap" assertions towards anyone.

joshua houk
ac7ri

329. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 19:15:12 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16ec15552d446e439896a6@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36322

In article <3C8273B6.3F2B254@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...

> If other hams choose to use a different mode, can they get the
> same job done? In other words, is there anything that CW can
> normally do during an emergency that other modes cannot do?

If you look at KF4ST's post on the use of CW during Hurricane Floyd,
he stated that conditions required the use of CW.

> The argument sometimes reminds me of the guy who looked for his
> lost keys under the street light (instead of where he lost them)
> because the light was better.

But probably not in the way you imagine...

joshua houk
ac7ri

330. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 19:18:18 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c8279cd_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36326

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16ec1477ef856c549896a5@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <3c826ffc_1@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net
says...
>
> > "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:MPG.16ec0816866bf64d9896a4@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
>
> > > No, you're merely *ignoring* the facts. It's already been stated
> > > that CW was used for traffic to and from FEMA, GEMA, and SOC
during
> > > Hurricne Floyd. You need to disprove this before your
off-the-cuff
> > > assertion would have any weight.
> >
> > I've not disputed that Morse is occasionally used ... what I
> > have pointed out, however, is that it is virtually always a
> > matter of operator choice and not "necessity." That is a
> > subtle, but important, distinction in terms of the "Morse is
> > necessary" argument.
>
> No, Carl, we're talking about what emergency agencies *want*. That's
what
> you were discussing. Don't change the subject just because you were
> wrong.
>
> Again, CW was used in traffic between emergency agencies, including
FEMA,
> GEMA, and SOC. Obviously, they want it, else they'd never have used
it.
> Capiche?

If, due to operator preference (or lack of preparedness to
use other modes) CW was all they were offered, of course
they'd "take it" even if it wasn't their first preference ...
>
> > > Major hurricanes are relatively rare occurences. At least,
"rare"
> > > according to your defining of something that last happened two
years
> > ago
> >
```

> > Last time I checked, 2002-1999 = three ... but that's a minor
> > point.
>
> Hurricane Floyd impacted the US from September 14th through
September
> 18th, 1999. I won't insult you by doing the math for you (unlike
your
> petulant snipe towards me), but that works out to be closer to two
years
> than three.

You're right, of course on the timing ... I realized after I'd hit
the "send" button that Floyd would have been a fall storm.

> > Again, I would assert that, if the most recent you can come up
> > with dates to 1999, that in itself is evidence that Morse usage
> > in emergencies is rare indeed.
>
> Again, major hurricanes are rare occurrences. By the same logic that
you
> use in re morse, that means we shouldn't suggest that people be
prepared
> for hurricanes either, neh?

Not at all ... what I'm suggesting is that hams should be prepared
to be able to offer the most useful services in ALL emergency
situations ... and that "the most useful services" are what the
agencies served would prefer/find most useful ... in my experience
of many years tactical voice (VHF/UHF for local and HF SSB for
long ranges, along with computer to computer transfer of moderately
large data sets, such as lists of supplies needed, damage/casualty
reports, etc. which can be sent FAR more rapidly, efficently, and
accurately than via Morse radiograms ...)

> > > as "rare". What I don't understand is why you are now dictating
what
> > > modes should and should not be used in emergencies. I thought
NCI
> > > didn't favor or disfavor one mode over another.
> >
> > I am not "dictating what modes should and should not be used in
> > emergencies" ... however, I do have many years of experience
> > with what types of communications services our "clients" the
> > emergency management types, Red Cross, Salvation Army, etc.
> > want and need and I can categorically state again that Morse
> > radiograms are NOT something that they have use for to any
> > extent at all.
>
> There's already a post readily disproving this, so I won't bother
with
> the retread.

Based on my years of experience in emergency communications,
I disagree.

> > > Well, I'm sure that the people involved are sorry that they
didn't
> > > activate that special ionosphere-charging satellite to enhance
> > > propagation at will.
> > ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
> > What a pile of crap! Again, if Morse was, in fact, "the only mode
> > available," that indicates a lack of good planning and
preparation.
> > (and that has nothing to do with your assinine comment about
> > "special ionosphere-charging satellite(s)" ...)
>
> Frankly, I'd personally learn more about propagation and signal to
noise
> ratios before I started shoveling "crap" assertions towards anyone.

Frankly, as one who has designed HF voice and data networks
for the governments of entire countries, as well as for the US
military, I can confidently state that I have a rather thorough
understanding of the topic.

How many years of direct engineering experience do YOU
have in such areas???

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPIJ245e+N6+q84HiEQKUTQCguI/BTiNgRxUsH4kFoOr+mTQrWb8AoIMy
eYFpyEW6p/8mduW3fy1BXnIU
=NOjD
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

331. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 19:22:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8277F8.B703B4A1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36324

Joshua Houk wrote:
>
> In article <3C8273B6.3F2B254@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...
>
> > If other hams choose to use a different mode, can they get the
> > same job done? In other words, is there anything that CW can
> > normally do during an emergency that other modes cannot do?
>
> If you look at KF4ST's post on the use of CW during Hurricane Floyd,
> he stated that conditions required the use of CW.

Lots of statements are made on this newsgroup. Some are true and some
are false. Exactly what conditions required the use of CW? Minimum
equipment? Minimum power consumption? S/N ratio? Was CW transmission
done using a keyboard? If I, personally, had to transfer a lot of
data in a short period of time to a fast CW operator on the other
end, there would be no question - I would use a keyboard and double
my throughput.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

332. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 19:25:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8278A3.D1C8FC14@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36325

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> While I don't support restricting CW usage, I would
> NEVER support such a setaside, either.

How about the lower 25 kHz of the major bands which are
already primarily CW?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

333. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 21:02:02 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a5u2r306fb@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 36328

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020303101044.21826.00000243@mb-cc.aol.com...
> True - because the potential danger to others from walkers and cyclists
> is pretty low. Sidewalks are provided for walkers, too.

True, but not on the freeway.

> >This just shows were some hams
> >are technologically, and where they're likely to stay.
>
> What's wrong with walking and bike riding? They conserve natural
> resources, reduce pollution, and are healthy exercise. If there's
> anything wrong with those modes of transportation, it's that too
> few Americans use them. Lack of exercise is directly linked to
> many of the top causes of death in the USA.

I never said that there's anything wrong with bicycling or walking, but if
you have a one hour commute to work every day, which mode of transportation
would you want to use?

334. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 21:09:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303160958.21422.00000324@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 36327

In article <3C8273B6.3F2B254@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Joshua Houk wrote:
>> It's already been stated that CW
>> was used for traffic to and from FEMA, GEMA, and SOC during Hurricne
>> Floyd. You need to disprove this before your off-the-cuff assertion would
>> have any weight.
>
>If other hams choose to use a different mode, can they get the
>same job done?

Sometimes yes, sometimes no.

>In other words, is there anything that CW can
>normally do during an emergency that other modes cannot do?

Absolutely YES. Whether that means EVERY ham MUST be tested on its use as
a condition of licensing is a completely different question.
>
>The argument sometimes reminds me of the guy who looked for his
>lost keys under the street light (instead of where he lost them)
>because the light was better.

Yup. The folks who insist on using an inefficient mode (voice) for jobs
where more efficient modes (PSK31, PACTOR, CW, to name just a few)
exist and could be used are like that guy.

73 de Jim, N2EY

335. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 21:21:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8293E2.D91AACAB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36329

Krell wrote:
> I never said that there's anything wrong with bicycling or walking, but if
> you have a one hour commute to work every day, which mode of transportation
> would you want to use?

Helicopter.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

336. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 21:24:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C82948F.61857E7A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36330

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >In other words, is there anything that CW can
> >normally do during an emergency that other modes cannot do?
>
> Absolutely YES. Whether that means EVERY ham MUST be tested on its use as
> a condition of licensing is a completely different question.

Is there anything I can accomplish at 13wpm or would I just be
in the way of the higher speed operators?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

337. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 22:35:34 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gsewzll.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 36331

On Sun, 3 Mar 2002 16:02:02 -0500, Krell wrote:

>I never said that there's anything wrong with bicycling or walking, but if
>you have a one hour commute to work every day, which mode of transportation
>would you want to use?

Private electric railcar, with me as the operator. Two hours a day
pf train driving sounds good to me....

===> Stand Clear of the Closing Doors <===

Phil Kane -- K2ASP - Beaverton, Oregon
PNW Milepost 754 ---Tillamook District

338. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-03 23:34:20 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c82b68e_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36332

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C8278A3.D1C8FC14@IEEE.org...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > While I don't support restricting CW usage, I would
> > NEVER support such a setaside, either.
>
> How about the lower 25 kHz of the major bands which are
> already primarily CW?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

I think Cecil is trying to snare me here ... to see if I am
consistent ...

A couple of years ago, I made a statement that I could
support a "CW Preserve" (CW ONLY) in the lower 25 kHz
of the HF bands as a compromise with the PCTA folks.
(Without removing/restricting CW usage from what's allowed
now ... which is virtually everywhere ...)

This was intended as a reassurance that neither I nor
NCI was seeking to eliminate Morse *usage*, just Morse
testing.

As I recall, the offer never met with any acceptance from
the PCTA group.

I personally could STILL support a LIMITED CW only area
like the bottom 25 kHz of the major bands, but NOT the
35% of the bands "CW ONLY", 15% digital, 50% phone
that Jim, N2EY proposed ...

While I am firm in my committment to not seek to restrict CW
usage (which is virtually all frequencies), I also will not allow
such an outrageous spectrum grab for CW at the expense of
digital modes which now SHARE the lower parts of the bands
on an equal regulatory basis with CW to go unchallenged.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3
```

```
iQA/AwUBPIKysZe+N6+q84HiEQKBewCg/BVF+uIF4zTLdOoowhiglyPGu64AoOdr
p9yNlrrebiEICdAbl/G2gvuR
=Ftvd
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

339. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 00:04:02 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C82B9F3.27A9DAE5@adelphia.net>
Source record: 36333

That idea must have escaped while I was looking the other way!

35 percent of a band devoted to CW is pretty outrageous. Considering that CW has a smaller BW requirement, it is like setting aside *most* of the band for CW.

I don't think it accounts for the increasing popularity of the digital modes like psk31 either.

What exactly is the rationale for such a chunk of a band being set aside for this.

- Mike -

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C8278A3.D1C8FC14@IEEE.org...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > While I don't support restricting CW usage, I would
> > > NEVER support such a setaside, either.
> >
> > How about the lower 25 kHz of the major bands which are
> > already primarily CW?
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> I think Cecil is trying to snare me here ... to see if I am
> consistent ...
>
> A couple of years ago, I made a statement that I could
> support a "CW Preserve" (CW ONLY) in the lower 25 kHz
> of the HF bands as a compromise with the PCTA folks.
> (Without removing/restricting CW usage from what's allowed
> now ... which is virtually everywhere ...)
>
> This was intended as a reassurance that neither I nor
> NCI was seeking to eliminate Morse *usage*, just Morse
> testing.
>
> As I recall, the offer never met with any acceptance from
> the PCTA group.
>

> I personally could STILL support a LIMITED CW only area
> like the bottom 25 kHz of the major bands, but NOT the
> 35% of the bands "CW ONLY", 15% digital, 50% phone
> that Jim, N2EY proposed ...
>
> While I am firm in my committment to not seek to restrict CW
> usage (which is virtually all frequencies), I also will not allow
> such an outrageous spectrum grab for CW at the expense of
> digital modes which now SHARE the lower parts of the bands
> on an equal regulatory basis with CW to go unchallenged.
>
> Carl - wa6vse
>
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
> Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3
>
> iQA/AwUBPIKysZe+N6+q84HiEQKBewCg/BVF+uIF4zTLdOoowhiglyPGu64AoOdr
> p9yNlrrebiEICdAbl/G2gvuR
> =Ftvd
> -----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

340. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 00:05:39 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303190539.03177.00001612@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 36334

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>> How about the lower 25 kHz of the major bands which are
>> already primarily CW?

>I think Cecil is trying to snare me here ... to see if I am
>consistent ...

>A couple of years ago, I made a statement that I could
>support a "CW Preserve" (CW ONLY) in the lower 25 kHz
>of the HF bands as a compromise with the PCTA folks.

I don't think Cecil was trying to snare you at all, Carl. I think he was trying to find out if you feel the same way you did when you said that a couple of years ago -- if he remembers it at all.

If my memory serves, a couple of years before that, I had asked the same question and at that time, your response was a very firm "no."

My views have evolved since our first fight, Carl; I am sure yours have, too. Maybe even because of some of the disagreements we have had. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

341. Re: Len's issues with NCI and ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 00:21:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303192140.17487.00001610@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 36335

>Subject: Re: Len's issues with NCI and ARRL
>From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
>Date: 3/3/2002 12:18 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020303131833.17460.00001496@mb-cr.aol.com>

>
>Carl had explained to Len what he thinks may have gone awry when Len tried to
>join NCI. Carl then reassured him that his membership would be most welcome.
>Len still did a subsequent post that his membership in NCI has been rejected.

I know...I saw...I saw Carl try to explain, very effectively I might add,
how those early "applications" failed, yet the problem was fixed.

It was then in Lennie's court to simply re-apply and be done with it, but
rather than take advantage of the fix (or express gratitude for the effort and
explanation) he went into his usual Lennierant about failure.

Seems to me that MOST of Lennie's posts are, when considered on thier
merits, about failure.

73

Steve, K4YZ

342. Re: Watch out Cecil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 01:48:44 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <0oAg8.20793$Pe1.3023921339@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 36336

```
"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3c826a35_2@news7.fast.net...
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> news:Hprg8.20375$Di3.2967445725@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com...
> > "K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
> > news:79e47b493f5c55c202cf1d634d08abae.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > > Dick Carroll is hot on your tail, and Mr. Hare is no slouch either!
> > >
> > > Top 10 Users Feb 2002
> > >
> > > [452] CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> 13.1%
> > > [435] Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> 12.6%
> > > [430] W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> 12.5%
> > > [279] W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> 8.1%
> > > [200] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 5.8%
> > > [154] Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> 4.5%
> > > [128] Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> 3.7%
> > > [114] Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> 3.3%
> > > [112] Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> 3.2%
> > > [110] Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> 3.2%
> > >
> > >
> > > --
> > > Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG
> >
> > How many of these guys have day jobs?
>
> I believe that Cecil and Dick are retired ... Jim, N2EY, I'm not sure of.
>
> I think Len may be retired, or working as a consultant perhaps ... I'm
> not sure.
>
> AFAIK, everyone else "has a day job" ...
>
> I have a "day and night job" myself ... with my day often running from
> 0600-1800 EST as I juggle issues between colleagues in Europe,
> here, and on the US west coast ... Monday I have a 2+ hour conf.
> call with Hong Kong at starting at 1900 EST ...
>
> Then I have responsibiities in IEEE and NCI ...
>
> I just don't see how I can raise my standing in the rankings
> with the workload I presently have :-)
>
```

> Carl - wa6vse

Carl, perhaps in 2027 when I retire...

You sound like you have a too full schedule. You need to delegate.

Brian

343. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 02:14:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303211404.20827.00000336@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 36337

In article <3c824edc_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020303001004.20570.00000192@mb-fz.aol.com...
>> In article <3c810654_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>> For clarity, let's call the new classes First, Second and Third to
>avoid
>> confusion with the existing 51-year-old names. (The names aren't
>> critical).
>>
>> Third Class is entry level. Easy to get - a Novice for the 21st
>century.
>> Simplified written test, focusing on the basics, mostly rules,
>operating
>> procedures and safety. Allowed power levels kept low to avoid
>needing lots of
>> questions on RF exposure - say, 100-150 W on HF/MF and 25-50 W on
>VHF/UHF. Wide
>> selections and modes and access to parts of all HF/MF bands -
>probably all of
>> 160 and the WARC bands. Third Classers can't be VEs, club trustees,
>repeater
>> control ops, etc - all to simplify the written. Callsigns are all
>six character
>> (like WA3IYC)
>
>Wait a minute ... I don't think I want to change my callsign ... I've
>had it for so long it's like a 2nd name ... :-)

Nobody would have to change their existing call. The six-character thing
applies
only to new licensees.

>> Second Class adds more power (400 W or so) and more subbands.
>Written test is
>> more comprehensive - about half and half rules and theory. Also
>allowed to be
>> VEs, trustees, etc. Callsigns are five or six characters (W6BXC,
>WA3IYC) One
>> years as Third Class required experience
>
>Now YOU're advocating power limits ... :-)

I always have. Nothing new there. 75 watt Novice, remember? ;-)

> I have no problem with that.
>However, I *DO* have a problem with the "1 year experience as 3rd
>class" thing ... if someone passes the test, they are qualified for a
>license
>of whatever class that test is for ... I don't care if they've never
>been on
>the air once ... if they pass the test, they deserve the license.

I think experience is part of the qualification. Just my opinion.

> I *also*
>believe that the FCC would have problems with this in legal terms as
>a form of discriimination against otherwise qualified individuals.

Why? How is it discriminatory to require some experience?

The main problem I see is that it requires newer hams to keep going back to
VE sessions. More work for them and the VEs and the FCC. Probably a dead duck
on that account alone.

>> First Class is full privileges. Test is mostly theory, with rules to
>match full
>> privs.
>> Calls signs are four, five or six characters. One year as Second
>Class required
>> experience.
>
>Again, I *DO* have a problem with the "1 year experience as 2nd
>class" thing ... if someone passes the test, they are qualified for a
>license
>of whatever class that test is for ... I don't care if they've never
>been on
>the air once ... if they pass the test, they deserve the license. I
>*also*
>believe that the FCC would have problems with this in legal terms as
>a form of discriimination against otherwise qualified individuals.

Same answer as above.

>PLEASE NOTE that as an Extra, "I've got mine" and would "map"
>to what you call First Class ... so I have nothing personally to gain
>by objecting to this "time in grade, have to wait a year before you
>can upgrade" thing ...

I've been an Extra for 32 years, Carl.

>I find it objectionable because it is another
>artificial barrier to progression by qualified individuals and will
>tend to discourage the most capable newcomers.

I say experience is part of the qualications.
>
>> Bands are divided into subbands by mode type - CW, digital, analog

>phone/image.
>> Typical division 35/15/50% of a band
>
>Wait a minute ... now you're trying to carve out a 35% set-aside for
>"CW ONLY" ????

Sure - why not?

>And only allowing 15% for digital????

Yep. Why not?

The PSK31 folks say that mode is only 50 Hz wide. Cecil drools over PACTOR II, saying it's about as wide as CW but much faster. Plus dynamic allocation of frequencies and all that.

Plus HF digital isn't all that common on the ham bands compared to CW or SSB.

>I DON'T THINK
>SO!!! That is TOTALLY unreasonable and inconsistent with the
>realities
>and the needs for the future.

Ah, I see."Nobody wants to ban CW", huh? Just take away the usable spectrum for the mode a little at a time until the CW folks have nowhere to go.

>Since CW requires ~0.1 the bandwidth of
>SSB, your proposed "split" would indicate approximately (35*10)=350
>CW users for every 50 SSB users ... that is TOTALLY ridiculous and
>unreasonable.

Why? Should we reward the users of wider modes by giving them more spectrum?
>
>I would say "CW is still allowed EVERYWHERE it is allowed today, but
>it certainly doesn't deserve an INCREASED status over what it has now,
>either." The lower parts of the bands (now
>CW/narrowband_digital_modes)
>could remain that way.

I'm looking to the future. Those rules are from when there were only a few digital modes, and when all hams could be expected to understand CW. That won't be the case in the future. Gotta accept change, Carl.
>
>The "phone bands" should NOT be expanded, but should allow the
>use of wider bandwidth digital techniques (digital voice, imaging, and
>higher speed data, for example) in addition to SSB/SSTV.

Why? That would only add to the QRM. Let the digital segment be where all that stuff resides. Digital modes are robust and spectrum efficient, are they not?

If 15% isn't enough, then go for 1/3 CW, 1/6 digital, 1/2 phone/image.

I see a double standard. On the one hand you don't want any "setasides" for CW, but at the same time you don't want to widen the 'phone bands. Makes no sense to me.

I say give each mode type its own backyard. If it's OK to fence in the phone/image folks, then it's OK to fence in the digital folks too.

>> Existing Novices and Techs get Third Class, existing Generals and
>Advanceds get
>> Second Class, and existing Extras get First. Existing hams do not
>lose high
>> power privs as long as they retain old license documents.
>
>The mapping from the existing classes to the proposed ones is OK
>with me .... it seems perfectly reasonable ...

Nobody loses.

>I guess, with time, the power issue would "sort itself out" through
>attrition to the point where it would be OK ... and while they're
>allowed, I doubt that many existing Techs actually run 1500W ...

Exactly.
>
>There is ONE "fly" in the ointment ... many Tech/Tech+ may be
>repeater control ops/trustees ... I know I was as a Tech+ ... now
>you're talking about taking something away from some folks.

No - their old license documents would allow them to remain control ops. Just like an old CSCE allows a "Tech with HF" to stay on HF, even though the license says "Technician".

>Cover it in the test and allow it ... it's not "rocket science."

Not to you or me, but to a newcomer it's another thing to learn. The whole point of Third Class is a simple test.

btw, their isn't much "science" to rockets. They are mostly engineering. Wehrner Von Braun and many of his crew detested the term "rocket scientist". I recall he was quoted as saying:

"Scientists dream of doing great things. Engineers do them".

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

344. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 02:14:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020303211411.20827.00000337@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 36338

wa6vse-shack@fast.net writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>wa6vse-shack@fast.net writes:

>> >> But why be sarcastic here? The facts are correct, are they not?

>> >The facts are (AFAIK) *technically* correct .. that wasn't my point
>> >(read on ...)

>> >> The point I was trying to make is this:

>> >> Ed keeps mentioning the "4 page study guide" story, but doesn't
>> >> mention the vast difference in privileges granted.

>> >The point that I was trying to make is "times change" and that
>> >the mentality of the past is no longer suited to today's world
>> >in terms of promoting a healthy future for the ARS.

>> Which "mentality of the past"?

>I'll take them one at a time, then add one or two of my own ...

>>The mentality that ham radio is G-rated
>> and suitable for every member of the family?
>
>No issue here ... I agree completely.

Some hams think such stuff is "old-fashioned". Look at
some of the vanity calls folks request. Or some of the
conversations on the 'phone bands.
>
>>The mentality that hams
>> are more than users of manufactured gear?
>
>No issue here ... I agree completely.

Yet how many hams, even those with lots of
"technical proficiency", build their own gear? Even from
a kit?

I would venture to say that the percentage of hams using CW/Morse on
the air is far greater than the percentage using homebrew equipment on
the air. Yet I read arguments that the technical stuff is justified because
hams
MAY build something, but the Morse test isn't. Seems like a double standard.
>
>> The mentality of making getting started easy, but

>> reserving full privileges for those who have
>> gained some knowledge and proficiency?
>
>Here I have some issues ...
>
>I don't think that the mentality of many, many OTs
>is one of "making getting started easy" ...

Who are these unnamed people?

> my experience
>in discussing the issue, reports/complaints from newcomers,
>etc. is that many, many OTs ("long time hams") actually
>want to make it hard(er) for newcomers.

I think you misunderstand.

>It's as Ed and
>others have observed ... they seem to remember the "tests
>that they took" as being much more rigorous than they
>actually were, view any changes as "dumbing down," and
>resent that newcomers are not subject to the same set of
>limitations and restrictions that they faced as newcomers.

Since we don't actually have the old tests, it's impossible to tell
how tough they really were.

The issue of "dumbing down" is not about what it takes for newcomers to
get started, but what it takes for more/full privileges. The requirements for
full privileges used to be more rigorous than they are now - and I'm not just
talking about the code tests.

>(In short, they can't/won't accept that times change and ham
>radio needs to change with it in order to remain attractive
>in the face of all of the other things competing for people's
>interest and discretionary time.)

Like newsgroups?
>
>I'm NOT saying that rank beginners should have FULL
>privileges ... just that they should have enough, with
>sensible, justifiable limits based on their demonstrated
>level of technical knowledge, that the ARS is, in fact,
>interesting and they don't feel like they are being treated
>as 2nd class citizens who are reviled and looked down on
>by "their superiors."

Sure. But what constitutes adequate knowledge for full privileges?
How is it demonstrated?

>You claim not to have seen much of
>the latter, but I have seen it personally (even experienced
>it from folks like Dick and Larry, but I'm thick-skinned and

>I don't pay attention to their insults) ... I'm much more concerned
>about the degree to which this happens to others as they
>enter our ranks as newbies ...
>
Outside this NG and perhaps rra.misc I have almost never seen it. Not where
I've
lived, anyway.

>> See what I mean?
>> >
>> >"Complaining" about liberalizations in outdated technical
>> >restrictions vs. tests is not the answer.
>>
>> I agree! I wasn't complaining - I was comparing.
>
>OK ... if I was overly sensitive, I'm sorry ... but at first
>read it certainly appeared that you were bemoaning
>the fact that newcomers today get more liberal privs
>than "back in the good old days when the Novice was
>75W input, rock-bound, 1 year to upgrade or you're out.

Sorry if I wasn't clear.
>
>(Remember, I missed a LOT of your discussion with
>Richard P. where you indicate you spent a lot of time
>discussing what would constitute an attractive set of
>requirements and privs for a more "meaningful" entry
>level license ....)

Summarized already.
>
>> >Recognizing that the ARS needs to modernize constantly
>> >to remain interesting to potential newcomers and to remain
>> >competitive technologically with other alternatives that
>> >compete for people's interest and discretionary time is
>> >something that MUST occur ...
>>
>> That all depends on what you mean by "modernize". Is
>> there no room for both the old and the new?
>
>Nobody is trying to "ban Morse useage" ... I think you know
>that.

From what I have read on this NG the past several years, I am convinced
that some folks want Morse/CW use to end. Not just the test - the mode
itself.
>
>There is "room for the old" in terms of what people
>choose to use ...
>
>There is NOT room for the old in terms of: "It's always been

>this way, we've always used ____ and we don't want no
>stinking ____ taking up space in the bands;"

I agree!

>"We have to make it really hard to get a license so that people
>'prove their dedication and worth' and to make sure that we
>are not 'over-run by the dreaded CBers';"
>etc.

We do have to be careful that what happened on 27 MHz does not
happen to the ARS. Some would say it has already happened.

>> >> Fact is, we really don't have an effective entry-level license
>today.
>> >
>> >I don't TOTALLY buy that ...
>>
>> >let me list a few comments in "bullet point" form:

>> >* The main problem in terms of "an effective entry-level
>> >license" IMHO is that we are still stuck, for the relatively
>> >short-term, at least, with most of the newcomers being
>> >relegated to VHF/UHF because of the Morse test
>> >requirement for HF access.
>>
>> You miss some important points:
>>
>> - Passing the 5 wpm code test gets a Tech minimal HF privs. It
>takes
>> 5 wpm and another written test to get more than a bit of 10 and tiny
>slices
>> of 3 other bands.
>> - The 5 wpm CSCE is only good for a year.
>
>IMHO, the 5 wpm code test is a bigger barrier than the
>additional written elements to get to General (at least
>more distasteful to many, and doing something you don't
>find interesting, don't like, and don't really want to do is
>almost always more diffficult that doing something that you
>find interesting and you want to do ...)

I think you are projecting your own like and dislikes on others. If the
written test is so easy, why are there any Tech Pluses left on the database
at all? It's been almost two years.

And my point is still valid - I think we would attract far more new hams if
a simple written and 5 wpm gave more privs than the current Tech-with-HF.

>> Both these can be fixed. See below.
>> >
>> >* Once the Morse test is eliminated, it would seem to
>> >make sense to adjust the Tech test to cover HF principles

>> >and grant newcomers much broader HF privs ...
>>
>> Why not do it now? The current license structure is a patched-up
>> version of what was started in 1951 and last seriously revised on
>1968.
>> Talk about needing modernization!
>
>Without the 5 wpm code, Techs can't operate below 30 MHz
>without putting the US in violation of the ITU Radio Regs ... the
>FCC won't do that ... also, since it was structured as a VHF/UHF
>only license class, the tech written doesn't cover HF principles
>adequately, if at all.

You misunderstand. Redo the entry level written to focus on the basics.
Those who pass it get VHF/UHF. those who pass it and 5 wpm get
HF too. If/when S25.5 goes away, all of them get HF.
>
>> > or maybe
>> >it would make sense to "merge" the tech and general
>> >classes ...
>>
>> Without further testing?
>
>NO ... NCI and the NCVECs both agreed that there should
>be no "freebie" upgrades where required test elements were
>waived. I still feel the same way ...

Some would say you want to make it hard for newcomers to get
what you have.
>
>However, the tech test (sans code) could be "fixed" to
>cover the basics of HF and in a post-WRC regulatory
>environment techs could be given much more meaningful
>HF privs to make it more attractive, get them "socialized"
>on the air with some interaction with more experienced
>HF hams, and not make them feel like they are 2nd class
>citizens, relegated to "the ghetto" ...

What "ghetto"?

>> > the only problem with such a merger would be
>> >that it might make the step from "unlicensed" to "licensed"
>> >unnecessarily large ...
>>
>> The step is already too big. That's one of the problems,
>irrespective
>> of code testing.
>
>Wow ... I hope you have your asbestos suit handy ... I'm
>sure that the idea of making it easier for anyone to get
>a ham license with HF privs will result in a lot of railing

>about how YOU want to "dumb down ham radio and
>turn it into CB."

I've posted this idea many times and nobody has gotten nasty about it. Note
that I am not talking about full privs. I'm talking about limited but
meaningful
and useful access to about half of what current Generals get on HF. That's a
LOT more than a Tech Plus or Novice gets today, but a lot less than a
General.
>
>> >> > > >(remember the "No lids, kids, or space kadets" guy? A real
>> >> > > >"welcome to ham radio" if I ever heard one ...}
>> >> > > >(not!)
>> >
>> >> For one thing, they guy is remembered because he was so unusual.
>He
>> >> stuck out like a sore thumb. Also had a big signal.
>> >>
>> >> His gripe was that prior to 1953 it took an Advanced/Class A
>license,
>> >> or
>> >> an Extra, to operate 'phone on 20 or 75. Everybody else had to
>use
>> >> what
>> >> bits of 160 were available, or the ham bands above 25 MHz. 40 had
>no
>> >> phone segment and 15 wasn't a ham band yet.
>> >>
>> >> Then, without an NPRM, RM or anything else, in late 1952 FCC
>opens all
>> >> privs to all hams except Novices and Techs. All of a sudden ol'
>Mike
>> >> has lotsa new company.
>> >
>> >Ah, so I was correct in perceiving him as a "cranky olde fart" who
>> >resented sharing "his" "sandbox" with newcomers who he perceived
>> >were not as "superior" as he imagined himself to be ...
>>
>> He was a guy who saw what he'd worked hard for being given away for
>> much less - and with NO reason being given.
>
>So, he was a guy with a "dog in the manger" chip on his
>shoulder (as I suspected).

I have no idea what "dog in the manger" means.

However, he sounds a lot like those who say

"NO ......there should be no "freebie" upgrades where
required test elements were waived."

>Do you REALLY believe that ANY reason would have
>satisfied him and made him behave more civily to
>newbies? (I doubt it ... I just think he didn't WANT any
>newbies coming in to "clutter up 'his' bands.")

I didn't know him, and neither did you. Fact is, he saw the requirements
for full privileges dramatically lowered by the FCC for no given reason.

How would YOU react if the FCC said tomorrow that they were giving ALL
privileges
to Generals, Advanceds, Extras and pre-Mar 21 1987 Tech Pluses? And upgrading
all Novices to Tech-with-HF? No need to take any tests or even attend a VE
session,
just go to it. Only benefit of those higher class licenses would be vanity
calls. Would
you be happy and content if the FCC did that?

>There's
>still a lot of that today, despite your assertion that YOU
>don't see much of it ...

I only know what I see. When the boss of the local multiclub FD effort is a
Tech, and
everybody from newcomers to 50-year-Extras has NO problem working with him, I'd
say we have a pretty decent bunch.
>
>> Of course the way he did it was very counterproductive.
>> >
>> >That's why I mentioned him ... because I perceived him as
>> >a good example of EXACTLY THE WORST attitude that
>> >hams should show to newcomers.
>>
>> How about the attitude that calls other hams names like "cranky old
>> fart" because of a disagreement? Is that what we want newcomers to
>see?
>
>Sorry ...

It's not me you have to apologize to.

> I can't think of a more adequately, accurately descriptive
>term for folks with the sort of anti-newbie attitudes that that guy
>(and quite a few here) and others I've seen/heard in action over
>the years exude ... if you can suggest alternative terminology that
>is adequately, accurately descriptive, I'll consider adopting it ...
>:-)

Simple. How about "guy who can't accept change"? Or "the kind of guy who
is mad because you got a better deal than he did".

>> I was a newcomer in 1967, when "incentive licensing" was getting
>started. I
>> recall lots of hams being mad about losing "their" privileges. Most
>of them

>> thought that Generals had always had all amateur privs in the USA.
>Their
>> attitude was much like ol' Mike's.
>
>Yes, the FCC got a couple of petitions last year, asking that
>old "Class A" and Generals be "restored their God-given rights"
>by getting a freebie Extra ... both were denied as "old news".

So we have the same sort of attitude on both sides of the fence. Mike was mad because the FCC did a giveaway and the other folks were mad because the FCC did a take-back.

Me, I just went and got the Extra in 1970.
>
>> >> But not with using the written tests to do the same thing. One
>> >> man's "reasonable and relevant" is another's "hoop". Why is a
>Tech
>> >> Plus
>> >> competent to run AM on 6 meters but not 10 meters? Why is a Tech
>Plus
>> >> competent to run 1500 W PEP on VHF/UHF but only a fraction of
>that
>> >> on HF, even though the RF exposure hazard is less on HF/MF?
>> >
>> >Those are good points ... with which I agree. You know that
>> >I think the Tech test is inadequate for 1500W ... but you seem
>> >in some sense to disagree. I agree FULLY that there is no
>> >distinction between the level of technical knowledge required
>> >to use "mode x" on VHF/UHF vs. HF ... in fact, in some
>> >respects, it is "easier to stay out of trouble" at HF ...
>particularly
>> >with homebrew gear, because the technical requirements for
>> >stable, clean gear are somewhat easier to meet at HF, due
>> >to circuit parasitics, layout, etc. being less critical that at the
>> >higher frequencies ...
>>
>> But the FCC disagrees, and has disagreed for decades. Odd, isn't it?
>
>The Tech test used to be (and was when I took it) the SAME written
>test as General (I'm sure you know this).

From 1951 until March 21, 1987.

>When they changed things
>to where the Tech was a lesser written test, they should have changed
>power limits, IMHO ...

Why? did they take out anything that was power-related? What they took out was mostly the HF stuff related to the General ticket.

> however, there is a question of "How do you
>enforce that?" My answer would be that posession of a rig or amp

>capable of producing more than the legal output for the
>class/frequency
>would be prima facia evidence of a violation.

How do you enforce that? There is no ban on nonhams owning ham rigs. The FCC can't even enforce the rules on 27 MHz - you think they're going to enforce something
like not allowing some hams to own amplifiers? No way!

> The power limit should
>be high enough to cover most common "barefoot" rigs, but well below
>1500W ...

For entry level, sure - because doing so does two things:
- simplifies the written test
- gives an incentive to upgrade

>> >> > That's
>> >> > part of the problem ... you can't keep ham radio "like it was
>40 years
>> >> > ago" and expect it to be vital, heathy, and viable for the long
>haul.
>> >> > EVERYTHING changes and hams need to accept change as well.
>> >>
>> >> Only if the change is for the better. Many changes are NOT for
>the
>> >> better. The mantra that "change must be accepted" as if all
>change
>> >> is inevitable and good is simply bogus.
>> >
>> >Change IS inevitable in a technically-oriented pursuit ... to
>ignore
>> >it and not figure out how to make use of new developments can
>> >only result in stagnation and irrelevance as the rest of the world
>> >passes by ...
>>
>> Sure - but that does not mean the old stuff has to go, or that the
>bases
>> and purposes of the service are any different.
>
>The only old things that I'm suggesting "have to go" are BAD
>ATTITUDES.

I agree! Including attitudes that call other hams names....

>Don't make a red herring about "old stuff (CW, as an example) having
>to go" ... that's NOT what I'm saying and I think you know that.

I've read almost all of your posts here since late 1997, Carl. It will take more than a few simple denials to convince me.
>
>Again, what needs to go are narrow-minded, elitist, bad attitudes,

>which discriminate against newcomers unreasonable (and revile
>them publicly both here and often on the air), which reject and
>fight irrationally against technical innovation, etc.

I agree!

Also, what needs to go are narrow-minded, elitist, bad attitudes,
which discriminate against old timers unreasonably (and revile
them publicly both here and often on the air), which reject and
fight irrationally against reasonable requirements.
>
>> What remains to be done in the USA? Is it not perfectly clear
>> what the FCC wants to do?
>
>I think that the FCC wants to promote a healthy, progressive
>ARS that will meet is educational, public service, and emergency
>disaster communications objectives into the future.

Doesn't answer the question. What remains to be done to end code testing
in the USA? It should be clear to anyone willing to read the R&O to 98-143
that the FCC wants code testing to go away. The ONLY thing keeping the
5 wpm test is S25.5. FCC's actions for over a decade show they aren't
going to change their mind. There is absolutely NOTHING in the R&O to
indicate the FCC won't just dump Element 1 as soon as they can.
>
>> Do you really think that S25.5 has any chance of lasting past WRC
>2003,
>
>Nope ...
>
>> or that there will be any code testing left soon after that?
>
>Once the requirement is removed from the ITU Radio Regs,
>I think that MOST countries will rapidly (at least in terms of
>"government speed") eliminate Morse testing from their
>national regulations.

Exactly. The only delay will be the usual processing stuff. I would not
be at all surprised if the FCC simply did an "executive order" or some
such thing waiving Element 1 as soon as S25.5 goes.
>
>> Many countries are
>> already moving to 5 wpm only - if they haven't already.
>
>True .. and it is generally being viewed as "an interim measure"
>pending the ability to completely eliminate Morse testing after
>WRC-03.

There ya go.
>
>> >Once that is accomplished,
>> >I will have more time to focus on how other aspects of licensing

>> >and testing can be improved ...
>>
>> The time to consider a new license structure is now, so that a
>> consensus can be built. FCC will not want to do it piecemeal.
>
>The FCC will prefere to deal with the elimination of Morse testing
>and "consequential changes to other parts of its rules" in a
>consolidated proceeding ... I would agree with that.

Then the thing to focus on is having a plan ready to go.

>However,
>absent a clear "consensus" on "other issues" (that makes sense
>to the FCC), I believe that they would entertain a "standalone"
>Petition for Rulemaking on just the issue of eliminating the Morse
>element, since that's a pretty simple matter administratively and
>the "other issues" could well be more complicated and time-consuming.

Which simply wastes time. WRC 2003 is over a year away, and ratification
of whatever happens even further off.

Imagine if the FCC were presented a joint proposal that would fix a lot of
problems at once AND had widespread ARS community support.

>> If we wait, they will table the whole mess for several years.
>
>There is no guarantee that the FCC will be prepared to devote
>the resources to a(nother) major revamp of Part 97 license
>classes and test requirements, period. They may find that
>merely eliminating the Morse requirement (and maybe giving
>some HF privs to Techs) is all that they're prepared to tackle,
>since they spent 2 years on "restructuring" just a couple of years
>ago ... actually, they might do something like this ...
>(pure speculation, of course) ... give Tech current General HF
>band privs, with a slight revision to the Tech test, expand General
>band privs to current Advanced, and leave Extra as it is (of course.)

Sure sounds like a "giveaway" to me! Like what you said NCVEC and
NCI were against!

>Whether the tech has/is qualified for 1500W could be open to
>debate ...
>
> >OK ... good point ... one doesn't HAVE to do it all at one sitting.
>> >However, the number of questions isn't, IMHO, the defining factor
>> >in the difficulty of the test(s) ... as Ed has pointed out, there's
>a
>> >hell of a difference between the 4 page study guide he used and
>> >the current one, which if I recall correctly runs about 250 pages!
>>
>> 200 - but that includes the entire Q&A pool, and detailed
>explanations of

>> the theory behind them.
>
>It's still a lot more material to study ... at least in terms of
>"intimidation
>factor," compared to a 4 page study guide.

That's the main point - reduce that intimidation factor. Imagine being able to hand a newcomer a ~50 page book that got them started, instead of a 200 page tome. Might get a lot more kids and family members involved.
>
>> I can easily write 5-10 pages on Ohm's Law for DC circuits. The old
>LM devotes
>> perhaps one small question to it. Yet Novices were expected to know
>it and how
>> to use it.
>
>Yet, Ed and Cecil indicate that it basically "got them through"
>to a license back in those days. (even if it didn't cover all of
>the material in as much detail as todays' sutdy guides ...)

As you know, Ed is one smart guy....

Cecil has told us many times he never posts seriously here.

Me, I had the 1966 LM, but I had to read the Handbook and lots of other stuff. Guess I'm the dummy of the group...
>
>> >(Then another one of ?how_how_many_pages? to make the
>> >move from Tech to General???)
>>
>> At least another 100.
>>
>> >I simply can't understand, given the MUCH larger amount of
>> >material one has to cover, how anyone can claim that the
>> >tests are "easier" or have been "dumbed down."
>> >(Not saying that you are saying that ... but rather that quite
>> >a few make that complaint.)
>>
>> It's the METHOD.
>
>That is, IMHO, a religious argument ...

Nope. Which test would you rather take for the SAME MATERIAL - one where all the possible Q&A were accessible for you to study, or one where they were a secret?

How about a test where you were not allowed to retest for a month vs. being able to retest right away?

>and the FCC
>has set up the VE program, which gives MANY, MANY,

>more testing opportunities, which is a GOOD thing,
>and has given us the freedom to modernize and define
>the tests by submitting questions to the VEC-QPC ...

The VE program exists to save money and FCC effort, nothing
less. Why pay FCC personnel to do what the VEs and QPC
folks do for free?

Back in the '70s the FCC would send out examiners if you could
guarantee them 10 people wanting tests.

>> First, nobody should lose existing privileges

>I would agree with this with the possible exception of
>1500W for current techs, absent a better techical test.
>(yes, many will disagree with me on this, but I believe
>my arguments, while they may be politically unpopular
>with some, are technically sound)

Name ONE documented case where a Tech has caused problems
running high power that would have been avoided by more testing.

>> Second, FCC isn't going to accept lots of license classes, so we
>> stick with 3 classes

>Agreed ... in fact, most countries have only 2 classes ...
>at this time, from what I've seen, they're more or less
>as follows:

>something that's more or less equal to Novice/Tech/Tech+
>level, with restrictions on power and/or frequency

>something that's like General+Extra in our new system
>(in other words full privs)

>Do we really *need* 3 classes in a post-Morse-test
>era? I'm not yet convinced that we do ... and I'm open
>to hearing pro/con arguments for both 2 and 3 class
>systems ...

3 classes lets us have an easy entry class and a truly meaningful
full privs class without having a huge step between entry and full privs.

Other countries do not allow nearly so much power as the USA.

>> Third, the privileges should match the tests taken.

>AGREED!!!

So there's the basics. More to come in a following post.

73 de Jim, N2EY

345. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 02:21:07 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <nSAg8.20850$T12.3027189812@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 36339

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020303130104.03173.00001666@mb-cv.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> >From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
> >Date: 3/3/2002 10:35 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <Khsg8.20387$eH4.2973077707@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
>
> >> I did not make out QSLs for
> >> QSOs. My cards may have indicated an actual frequency since QSL labels
> >> were printed from my logs. The implication from your "greenstamp"
> >> comment is that we were somehow raking in the dough on QSLing. I went
> >> out of pocket some $1000 on QSLing.
> >
> >Not bad for over 22 years of hamming. But if you can't affor it you
might
> >want to find a different hobby.
>
> I have been a Ham for 30 years this October, BP...I can't afford to
drop a
> grand on QSL's...Does that mean I have to find a new hobby too? Most of
the
> other Hams I have known for a "long time" can't drop a grand on QSL's,
either.

If you've DX'd, then I'm sure you've dropped a grand in 30 years. We'll
stand-by here waiting for Dave to tell you that you know nothing of DX.

> What does one's longevity in Amateur Radio have to do with one's
ability
> to afford QSL cards? Does the local bank have some sort of "QSL Account",
> kinda like Christmas accounts? Musta missed THAT one!

? Why don't you work on this one a little longer then get back to me.

> >> So, to be sure that I understand you, the fact that I got on the air
> >> made me guilty of luring folks outside their band segments? Wowser,
> >> that is some power I have.
> >
> >When the word spreads that you'll work them out of band, then follow it
up
> >with a QSL card???
> >If anyone's in the market for something illegal, its not hard to find out
> >who the bootlegger or dealer is.
>
> It's called "cross band", Putz. Was very popular when the Brits had

70mHz
> privileges but no 50...They'd listen for us on 50, we'd listen for them on
70.
> Both statons are "legal".

Welp, Steve, you're certainly ignorant of the situation that Dave found
hisself in. He wasn't crossbanding.

> >That was the thrust of my comment prior to you and/or Steve misdirecting
it.
>
> You misdirect yourself, Brian, with outrageous rants and infammatory

I misdirect myself?

> accusations. You don't need anyone's help.

I certainly don't need your help, and Dave was doing fine before you decided
to "help." I'm just waiting for Dick and Larry to chime in and make this a
three ringer.

> >True. I'd rather use the buro than take people's money. Except for the
> >countries w/o buro's, of course. I've even bypassed the ARRL outgoing
buro
> >and mailed piles of cards directly to Box 88 to speed up the process for
the
> >former USSR.
>
> In most cases, a single "greenback" is acutally a savings for
> them...especially some of the European countries where the dollar trades
high.
> German postage, for example, is almost 2 1/2 times higher than what it is
in
> the United States.

Steve, next time I need help computing how much money to take out of the
envelope, I'll be sure to ask you.

Brian/N0iMD

346. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 02:45:56 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c82dff7_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36340

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3C82B9F3.27A9DAE5@adelphia.net...
> That idea must have escaped while I was looking the other way!
>
> 35 percent of a band devoted to CW is pretty outrageous.

I agree completely.

> Considering that CW has a smaller BW requirement,

Yes, MUCH smaller ...

> it is like setting aside *most* of the band for CW.

Some CW enthusiasts seem to think that they outnumber
all of the users of all other modes ...

> I don't think it accounts for the increasing popularity of the digital
> modes like psk31 either.

It certainly doesn't ... that's why I would oppose it vigorously.
(I would also oppose phone band expansion for the same
reason ...)

> What exactly is the rationale for such a chunk of a band being set
> aside for this.

I guess it's wishful thinking on Jim's part ... as I said, I could still
personally go along with a very small chunk of CW ONLY (like the
bottom 25 kHz of the major bands as I had originally proposed
and Cecil mentioned), but NO WAY would I EVER go along with
setting aside 35% of the band ... that's ABSURD.

Carl - wa6vse

>
> - Mike -
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3C8278A3.D1C8FC14@IEEE.org...
> > > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > > While I don't support restricting CW usage, I would
> > > > NEVER support such a setaside, either.
> > >
> > > How about the lower 25 kHz of the major bands which are
> > > already primarily CW?

> > > --
> > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
> > I think Cecil is trying to snare me here ... to see if I am
> > consistent ...
> >
> > A couple of years ago, I made a statement that I could
> > support a "CW Preserve" (CW ONLY) in the lower 25 kHz
> > of the HF bands as a compromise with the PCTA folks.
> > (Without removing/restricting CW usage from what's allowed
> > now ... which is virtually everywhere ...)
> >
> > This was intended as a reassurance that neither I nor
> > NCI was seeking to eliminate Morse *usage*, just Morse
> > testing.
> >
> > As I recall, the offer never met with any acceptance from
> > the PCTA group.
> >
> > I personally could STILL support a LIMITED CW only area
> > like the bottom 25 kHz of the major bands, but NOT the
> > 35% of the bands "CW ONLY", 15% digital, 50% phone
> > that Jim, N2EY proposed ...
> >
> > While I am firm in my committment to not seek to restrict CW
> > usage (which is virtually all frequencies), I also will not allow
> > such an outrageous spectrum grab for CW at the expense of
> > digital modes which now SHARE the lower parts of the bands
> > on an equal regulatory basis with CW to go unchallenged.
> >
> > Carl - wa6vse

347. Re: Posting of new club websites?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 02:49:47 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0203040249020.6023-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 36396

On 2 Mar 2002, me wrote:
> Could someone please educate me on the ethical and legal views
>involved in posting my club's new web site?

You may get more exposure simply submitting its URL to the search engines.
People who want to find you will, and people who don't care probably don't read
these newsgroups either.

348. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 02:50:51 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c82e11c_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36341

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020303190539.03177.00001612@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >> How about the lower 25 kHz of the major bands which are
> >> already primarily CW?
>
> >I think Cecil is trying to snare me here ... to see if I am
> >consistent ...
>
> >A couple of years ago, I made a statement that I could
> >support a "CW Preserve" (CW ONLY) in the lower 25 kHz
> >of the HF bands as a compromise with the PCTA folks.
>
> I don't think Cecil was trying to snare you at all, Carl. I think
he was
> trying to find out if you feel the same way you did when you said
that a couple
> of years ago -- if he remembers it at all.
>
> If my memory serves, a couple of years before that, I had asked the
same
> question and at that time, your response was a very firm "no."

I honestly don't recall ever flatly refusing the bottom 25 kHz ... I
am
sure that a couple of years ago I did offer such a "Morse only
preserve"
as a gesture of compromise (again, not limiting Morse any more than
it is now, which is essentially not limited, but "adding" a Morse only
segment).

> My views have evolved since our first fight, Carl; I am sure yours
have, too.
> Maybe even because of some of the disagreements we have had. :-)

What to you think of Jim's suggestion that 35% of the bands be set
aside for Morse, 15% for digital, and 50% for phone?

As I've said, I think it's an outrageously ridiculous apportionment.

What do you think? Would YOU be willing to strangle the future
that much???

Carl - wa6vse
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPILhCJe+N6+q84HiEQK8bACg+slxFo3Eac8yTgpsu1hs9EvnVs0AoMT3
hRdollyyAZilE3PwjgK4Lf+2
=a9MV
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

349. Re: Morse as an "essential element" in emergencies (new thread title)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 03:07:02 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <a5uocm$1hln$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 36347

W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote:
>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net:
>>I *did* find a large preponderance of the messages passed to be
>>contrived as a means of "keeping the net going" ... in other words,
>>"the net" has taken on a life of its own and become a passtime for
>>those who participate, and they "do what it takes" to perpetuate its
>>existence so they'll "have something to do."
>
>And a good thing that is, because unless there is something to do, that net
>will not be available when needed or would be staffed by people who had little
>practice handling formal traffic.

Makes sense to me. Assuming hams would be effective at providing
message services in emergencies when they've had little practice at
doing so in non-emergency situations would be like assuming hams would
be effective at using IEEE 802.11 devices to provide Internet connectivity
or other data connectivity services in an emergency when they've had
little or no experience at doing this in non-emergency situations.
Unfortunately Part 97 rules make it hard to even "contrive" connectivity
that would simulate the real thing in the latter case, so hams might be
better off yielding to those who've been getting real-life experience
under Part 15 when the emergency happens.

>>ALL that I'm saying is that it is NOT an "essential element of
>>emergency preparedness," as the very nature of the NTS and
>>the "radiogram" message format on which it is based are simply
>>NOT what the emergency management folks (who are, in effect,
>>our "clients") want/need in today's world.

But it is something hams can get practice at, unlike the provision
of high-speed wireless data access to wired networks which hams are
precluded from providing outside of emergency situations in any usefully
realistic fashion under their rules. At least there are guys who know how
to deliver formal messages.

On a barely related topic, anyone want to bet on the outcome of RM-10371?
It seems to me that the ARRL argument that WECA hasn't justified the need
for more 5 GHz spectrum, while accurate in the narrow sense that WECA
presented no hard data of their own to justify it, is a bit weak when WECA
does have a market for 2.4 GHz devices which doubled to $1.2 billion in
2001, a year that was universally bad for sales of almost all other data
equipment, plus a European study which successfully justified allocation
of the same spectrum there they are asking for here. The other argument
is, of course, the potential for interference with the licensed services by
the Part 15 devices, but while the ARRL refers to "aggregate interference"

at 2.4 GHz to support this claim it has very little to work with since there is very little documented evidence that this has actually bothered many amateur operators (i.e. "aggregate interference" can't be much of a problem for amateurs since the complaints are mostly theoretical) but substantially more evidence that it is a problem for Part 15 users (i.e. they need more spectrum so they can spread out).

In my opinion the ARRL is facing the prospect of defending Amateur spectrum which Amateurs don't use much from Part 15 users who demonstrably use lots of it, based mostly on the assertion that the Part 15 devices would interfere with Part 97 users in the purely hypothetical event that Part 97 users actually used the spectrum. The public interest would better align with ARS interests if amateurs actually made extensive use of these bands, but they don't.

Of course the best use for these bands is probably the high speed data applications that the Part 15 devices support, but Part 97 and Metcalfe's Law conspire to make any amateur use of the technology really boring (as demonstrated by the fact that even amateurs doing community-service- and hobby-type stuff prefer to use the bands under Part 15). I hence still think these bands are of little use to amateurs under Part 97 with its current constraints on encryption of content and that, without changes to Part 97, the public interest is probably best served by allowing the use of the bands for applications which don't have these constraints.

I find this particularly unfortunate since I find a lot of the commercial outdoor use of Part 15 equipment to provide for-pay service in these bands a bit offensive but without an active base of non-commercial users with priority on those frequencies, like hams could be without the constraints, the guys who get paid for their service have no incentive to pay for their spectrum and will instead end up "owning" a lot of the free spectrum by default.

Dennis Ferguson

350. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 03:07:34 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c82e70b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36343

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020303083936.11714.00001255@mb-cq.aol.com...
> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >>Is this another "she made me beat her" sort of thing?
>
> >Cute trick, but no lobster for you. Kim started this thing with her
> >callsign, and it isn't going to end unless and until she either vacates
this
> newsgroup
> >or changes it. It's as simple as that.
>
> Yup, it is another "she made me beat her" sort of thing.
>
> In your holy crusade to protect everyone's morals, Larry, you are doing
some
> pretty unholy things.
>
> >Dick and I aren't going to show
> >tacit approval of her deliberate attempt to undermine the good opinion
> >the public has of the ARS through her ill-conceived call sign.
>
> By calling more of the public's attention to it. That is a pretty
illogical
> approach to take, Larry.
>
> >My only question is -- why do YOU?
>
> I have not approved or disapproved of her callsign, Larry. I do not feel
that I
> should be given the power to enforce unwritten laws by bullying other
people
> into either changing what they are doing or going away.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Larry's too stupid to understand that a huge waste of time is spent trying to make me feel in some way bad about my callsign. I like it. I have no bad feelings at all about it and laugh at people like him who do. So, if Larry wishes to waste so much time, that is his doing...

Kim W5TIT

351. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 03:10:15 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c82e7aa_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36344

I can't believe you guys actually condone someone scorning another because they don't have a flag on their vehicle. *THAT* is what I was talking about with my original statement that we now measure patriotism. I am sure you are not both talking about what I was originally talking about.

Kim W5TIT

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message news:a5tbknhna1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20020303024830.21231.00000912@mb-mv.aol.com...
> > In article <3c80f33f$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> > <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
> > >Do you have to practice at being such an ignoramus, Larry, or is it
> genetic?
> > >As usual, you enjoy being miserable and looking at something from the
> worst
> > >possible angle to put your own miserable reflection upon it. What I am
> > >talking about are the idiots that *USE PATRIOTISM* as some kind of
> yardstick
> > >to judge other people. Kind of like using whether someone is the same
> > >religion or not.
> > >
> > >Kind of like you do with CW.
> > >
> > >Kim W5TIT
> >
> > Kim:
> >
> > How, pray tell, do you think I *should* judge non-patriotic Americans?
> > This is one of the few countries in the world where freedom, liberty,
> > and equality of opportunity are guaranteed to each and every citizen.
> > It is one of a very small handful where true ethnic and cultural
diversity
> > are the norm -- not the exception. It is the only country with the
> generosity
> > of spirit to export our concepts of freedom and liberty to other nations
> > who suffer under the oppressive rule of tyrannical dictators. We
> sacrifice
> > the lives of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines to give others a
> > chance to live as we do, and get little thanks and hardly no
appreciation
> > for our trouble. Other nations would rather foment hatred of us for our
> > wealth and lifestyle, rather than foster the freedom which could bring

it
> into
> > their own lives. Yes, Kim -- I DO use patriotism as a yardstick to
> > "judge" other people. If you're an American, and enjoy the way of life
> > that being an American brings to you -- then you'd damn well better
> > be patriotic as all heck -- or you will have a problem with me!
> >
> > Military veterans like myself have sacrificed the best and most
> > productive part of our lives to ensure that the rest of our countrymen
> > can continue to enjoy the benefits of life as Americans. Hundreds
> > of thousands of U.S. veterans have given their very lives to this
> > cause. I appreciate this sacrifice, I honor those who made it, and I
> > value the patriotic fervor that inspired it. There is a perfection of
> > liberty enjoyed by Americans that exists in few other places on the
> > face of this planet -- made possible by patriotic American military
> > personnel and all of the hard-working, courageous, self-sacrificing
> > citizens who have supported them through the years. We have
> > defeated the oppression of Nazism, Fascism, and Communism
> > in Europe and Japan, and will defeat the threat of terrorism anywhere
> > it is found -- but only if all Americans stand together and freely
express
> > their patriotic fervor without fear, compromise, or apology.
> >
> > I have no doubt that if our country were attacked again in a manner
> > which put us back in a global war, you would gladly go to a
> > wartime defense factory, pick up your rivet gun, and work just
> > as hard to help defeat our potential oppressors as Rosie the Riveter
> > did during WWII. So please think twice before you criticize
> > people who "judge" others on the basis of patriotism. Here in
> > the USA, that's the best yardstick to use!
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> Larry,
>
> Three cheers...I agree with EVERY word you have said in
> the post above. I will only add the following...
>
> In addition to Larry's comment, where else are those that
> oppose American ideals and principles allowed a totally
> open forum to express their anti-American hatrid. Indeed,
> the same dedicated American military have defended the right
> of the naysayers to express their opposing comments and/or
> their anti-American tripe.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>

352. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 03:14:08 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c82e892_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36345

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C823D5C.55572450@IEEE.org...
> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> > I don't say "bomb" on an airliner and I don't stick my finger in my
pocket
> > at the 7-11 and say "give me the money. Ergo I have nothing to fear of
the
> > feds.
>
> A guy was stopped for not signaling a lane change. He was on his way to
> pay $5000 cash for a motorcycle. The cops took his $5000 and wouldn't
> give it back. We all have something to fear from the RICO laws.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Sheesh, check out the Presidential Records Act. I was listening to a report
on that on NPR today.

Kim W5TIT

353. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 03:16:10 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c82e911_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36346

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C8293E2.D91AACAB@IEEE.org...
> Krell wrote:
> > I never said that there's anything wrong with bicycling or walking, but
if
> > you have a one hour commute to work every day, which mode of
transportation
> > would you want to use?
>
> Helicopter.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Winning the Lottery. :)

Kim W5TIT

354. RE: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 03:16:33 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c82e728_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36342

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020303211404.20827.00000336@mb-mj.aol.com...
> In article <3c824edc_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>
> I think experience is part of the qualification. Just my opinion.

We disagree ... I believe that demonstrating technical
competence by passing the test is sufficient and artificial
waiting periods are nothing more than an elitist pile of
crap that discriminates against qualified newcomers.
You're trying to "make up for" the loss of the Morse
test by adding another unnecessary barrier, plain and
simple.

I think the FCC will agree with me ...

> > I *also*
> >believe that the FCC would have problems with this in legal terms
as
> >a form of discriimination against otherwise qualified individuals.
>
> Why? How is it discriminatory to require some experience?

Because it treats equally competent/qualified individuals
differently on the basis of an arbitrary requirement.
I think the FCC will agree with me ...

> >PLEASE NOTE that as an Extra, "I've got mine" and would "map"
> >to what you call First Class ... so I have nothing personally to
gain
> >by objecting to this "time in grade, have to wait a year before you
> >can upgrade" thing ...
>
> I've been an Extra for 32 years, Carl.

I've been an RF engineer for 32+ years ... don't expect
me to bow down to your "superiority."

> >> Bands are divided into subbands by mode type - CW, digital,
analog
> >phone/image.
> >> Typical division 35/15/50% of a band
> >
> >Wait a minute ... now you're trying to carve out a 35% set-aside

for
> >"CW ONLY" ????
>
> Sure - why not?

Because it's an outrageous proposal ... CW and other narrowband
modes have shared the lower parts of the HF bands for many, many
years. Now you want 35% EXCLUSIVELY for CW ... I DON'T THINK
SO!!!!!!!
I think the FCC will agree with me ...

>
> >And only allowing 15% for digital????
>
> Yep. Why not?

Because it's totally inadequate and you damned well know it.
You just want to stifle the growth of digital modes because you
know deep in your heart that Morse ultimately won't be as
attractive and you want to "lock down" enough turf "all for yourself."
I DON'T THINK SO!!!!!
I think the FCC will agree with me ...

> The PSK31 folks say that mode is only 50 Hz wide. Cecil drools over
PACTOR II,
> saying it's about as wide as CW but much faster. Plus dynamic
allocation of
> frequencies and all that.
>
> Plus HF digital isn't all that common on the ham bands compared to
CW or SSB.

It's growing a LOT faster than you'd like to admit ... you're AFRAID
that
Morse can't cut the mustard, that's all.

> >I DON'T THINK
> >SO!!! That is TOTALLY unreasonable and inconsistent with the
> >realities
> >and the needs for the future.
>
> Ah, I see."Nobody wants to ban CW", huh? Just take away the usable
spectrum
> for the mode a little at a time until the CW folks have nowhere to
go.

NOBODY is "taking ANYTHING away from" Morse ... I stated before
that I would not support ANY reduction in the amount of spectrum
where Morse is permitted in the HF bands. NONE, ZIP, NADA ...
now you want to take 35% EXCLUSIVELY for Morse????
I DON'T THINK SO!!!!!!

> >Since CW requires ~0.1 the bandwidth of
> >SSB, your proposed "split" would indicate approximately (35*10)=350
> >CW users for every 50 SSB users ... that is TOTALLY ridiculous and
> >unreasonable.
>
> Why? Should we reward the users of wider modes by giving them more
spectrum?

The way things are, Morse users have access to ALL of the HF spectrum
Phone users have access to only about 50% ... since there are
arguably
more phone users than Morse users, the situation would ALREADY be
WAY inbalanced in preferential treatment for Morse ... now you want
MORE???
I DON'T THINK SO!!!!!!
I think the FCC will agree with me ...

> >I would say "CW is still allowed EVERYWHERE it is allowed today,
but
> >it certainly doesn't deserve an INCREASED status over what it has
now,
> >either." The lower parts of the bands (now
> >CW/narrowband_digital_modes)
> >could remain that way.
>
> I'm looking to the future. Those rules are from when there were only
a few
> digital modes, and when all hams could be expected to understand CW.
That
> won't be the case in the future. Gotta accept change, Carl.

I am ... you aren't ... you must be smoking something funny if you
think that Morse deserves 35% EXCLUSIVE use of the HF bands.

> >The "phone bands" should NOT be expanded, but should allow the
> >use of wider bandwidth digital techniques (digital voice, imaging,
and
> >higher speed data, for example) in addition to SSB/SSTV.
>
> Why? That would only add to the QRM. Let the digital segment be
where
> all that stuff resides. Digital modes are robust and spectrum
efficient, are
> they not?
>
> If 15% isn't enough, then go for 1/3 CW, 1/6 digital, 1/2
phone/image.

You've apparently lost you mind ...

> I see a double standard. On the one hand you don't want any
"setasides" for
> CW, but at the same time you don't want to widen the 'phone bands.

> Makes no sense to me.

Makes perfect sense ... it's called "dynamic frequency allocation."
You want to use Morse, listen for a clear frequency and have at it.
You want to operate digital, your modem does the same thing.
(In the digital world, it's called CSMA-CA.)

> I say give each mode type its own backyard. If it's OK to fence in
the
> phone/image folks, then it's OK to fence in the digital folks too.

I can see how you'd like that, seeing as how your proposal would
grant Morse a HUGE, undeserved, unnecessary windfall at the
expense of everyone else. The more I think about it, the crazier
I think you must be to even have the cajones to even suggest such
a thing.

> >> Existing Novices and Techs get Third Class, existing Generals and
> >Advanceds get
> >> Second Class, and existing Extras get First. Existing hams do not
> >lose high
> >> power privs as long as they retain old license documents.
> >
> >The mapping from the existing classes to the proposed ones is OK
> >with me .... it seems perfectly reasonable ...
>
> Nobody loses.

Except that everyone but Morse enthusiasts gets royally screwed
under your absurd Morse setaside idea ...

You've apparently lost it man ... totally lost it ...

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPILm9Je+N6+q84HiEQLEnQCg6OCz5qkd2BzqVUdZ0TuvzOdd3bwAoK1/
ZeJAfquC6tqEoqpVmhPBTw33
=sbPh
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

355. Re: Morse as an "essential element" in emergencies (new thread title)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 03:22:57 UTC
From: arcweb@bnnorth.net
Message-ID: <3c82e700.19707607@news.bright.net>
Source record: 36348

On 03 Mar 2002 18:26:58 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:
> Then WHY, Carl, do all the "big guys" keep signing on to ARRL's MoU's for
>providing the service? ARC, FEMA, DoS, DoD, Salvation Army, ...etc etc etc...?
>
> Would the world fall apart if tomorrow they threw a disaster and Amateur
>Radio didn't come? Of course not...but it WOULD significantly increase the
>workload of incident managers and recovery workers without them.
>
>73
>
>Steve, K4YZ

I agree 100%, although I only have just recently recieved my technicians license, I am going forward with trying to get the code down, and go for my general. Too many are relying much to heavilly on the modern communications, i.e. cell phones, internet ect. Well NYC found out on 09-11 that cell phones aren't all that dependable, with all ythat happened the cells were jammed. Similar thing happened in WV during the flooding there last summer, due to the terrain, many areas cell phones simply did not work.

Thats why these nets exist, and the ones participating need to keep their skills sharpened. You can't expect a sniper to hit at 1000 yards if he only fires his gun when it is a matter of life or death, to keep his skills sharp he needs to fire often. Why do football players and baseball players go to training camps before the season starts? To get themselves in condition.

In the disasters I have traveled to, good communications was the key, it either made the releif operation run smoothly, or the lack of good communications made things a real mess.

73 de Keith

KC8TCQ
Vice President: REACT of Henry County
Executive Board Member: Henry County Chapter - American Red Cross
American Red Cross Disaster Services Logistics Specialist

356. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 03:34:29 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <9XBg8.20892$KK3.3034110097@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 36349

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C826638.6CF5A4E4@earthlink.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > > Sure, Dave, pick on blind pigs. Do you want to go double or nothing
and
> > > > make fun of blind hams while you're on a roll?
> > >
> > > Are there blind hams out looking for acorns?
> >
> > You tell me. Since blind pigs weren't the topic, only you can tell us
where
> > your point is going.
>
> I don't recall the old saying about blind hams finding acorns. The only
> one I knew was about blind pigs. You brought up blind hams. Did you
> have a point?

I don't recall the old saying about blind pigs. I do recall a saying about
a one-legged man in an ass kicking contest, but I'm not sure how it went.

So you didn't have a point?

> I'm really close to giving up on you again, Brian. You bring up a tale
> of an FR6 you used to QSO. I told you that I didn't recall that. It
> was of little significance to me then. It is of little significance to
> me now. It isn't as if it'll show up as a Jeopardy clue.

Dave, I don't know why it upset you so. Only you can answer that. If you
can't recall why it prompted you to say that I didn't know much about DX,
then we'll never know.

> Yeah, like many DXers whose QSO totals are numbered in the tens of
> thousands for each operation, I had nothing to do with QSLing other than
> sending logs to WA8JOC. Notify the QSLing police.

Why? Did you do something wrong?

> That was for operation from Guinea-Bissau. I was active there from Feb.
> 1988 through early Sept. 1989. It was one illustration of just how
> wealthy I became from QSLing proceeds. How about this one? I didn't
> have to QSL anyone at all. I just didn't think there was much purpose
> to getting on the air from a rare spot, making all of QSOs and then not
> confirming the contacts.

eQSL supposedly has the answer.

> Those who QSL'd direct with stamps, IRCs or a buck got a card direct.
> Many from the eastern bloc didn't have IRCs but included mint stamps
> from their country. They also got direct cards. Others, including U.S.
> ops who sent a card direct but without an SASE, got a bureau reply.

OK.

> > When the word spreads that you'll work them out of band, then follow it
up
> > with a QSL card???
> > If anyone's in the market for something illegal, its not hard to find
out
> > who the bootlegger or dealer is.
>
> I wasn't out of band nor did I have any knowledge that they were.

Now Dave, you know that's not true. Our French ham on here told us what the
French 6M authorization was. You simply chose to ignore it.

> Do
> you know the permitted 6m band allocation is in each country?

A good DXer knows what the 160M authorizations are. Why is it different for
6M? Are you aware that there's a different 6M calling freq in the Pacific?
There's a lot to know if you want to be a DXer.

> Do you go
> through your logs, looking for actual frequency and compare logs to a
> country's 6m frequency allocation. If you do, you'd be called
> obsessive-compulsive by medical folks.

A French ham verified that his countrymen were operating out of band. That
is good enough for me to at least check it out.
> > I never saw that, and it wasn't the point anyway.
>
> Try Google if your curiousity gets the best of you.

It wasn't the point, was it? No need to look it up.

> > Dave, I think it was Hans who said that Marty was the VP Nokia. If you
did
> > make a correction, fine. It wasn't the point, but only makes the point
I
> > made stronger. Allow me to restate: "If a non-wealthy ham can have
such an
> > influence..."
>
> Other non-wealthy hams have traveled to North Korea and have obtained
> permission to operate. There are still no North Koreans hams. There
> are still no radio amateurs other than foreigners in many countries.

Yes, I've noticed that only DXpeditions activate some populated countries,
where they could have their own people on the air. Yet they don't.

> > Meanwhile, did you ever have a comment about how a large, influential
> > organizations such as the ARRL, RSGB, or any other national organization
> > might be able to influence some of these countries to open up to amateur
> > radio?
>
> There's only so much that such an organization can do. If a country's
> government if opposed to or is not warmly receptive to amateur radio
> licensing, what could the ARRL do about that even with massive amounts
> of money? If a country has amateur licensing but still has few or none
> of its nationals licensed (Guinea-Bissau - 0, Botswana -several,
> Tanzania - 0), what can the ARRL do to change the situation. The IARU
> sent a good deal of study material, some handbooks and some basic 20m
> transceiver kits to the Botswana Amateur Radio Society. The society
> held licensing classes and had a functional club station with good
> antennas. No locals ever became hams. No local ever even completed the
> widely advertised (broadcast radio, newspaper, bulletin boards)
> classes.

Very sad. Thanks for your comment.

> The governments of some countries are totally phobic of 2-way radio.
> They associate it with lack of control or with spying. North Korea has
> long been one of those places.

Maybe George will help take down that wall. Like his Dad once said, "We
begin bombing the Evil Empire in 5 minutes."

> > That was the thrust of my comment prior to you and/or Steve misdirecting
it.
>
> Is that because you didn't have your facts straight and you went on a
> tangent arguing those facts? If so, you've given us much power over
> you. I guess we have the power to cloud men's minds.

Yes, lets talk about Marty some more. What rig is he running? Antennas?
How's he doing? Perhaps he's risen from mere salesman to VP by now? I wish
him the best of luck in his career.

> > > If you believe what you've just written, allow me to suggest that you
> > > have no idea of what common practice in QSLing is.
> >
> > True. I'd rather use the buro than take people's money. Except for the
> > countries w/o buro's, of course. I've even bypassed the ARRL outgoing
buro
> > and mailed piles of cards directly to Box 88 to speed up the process for
the
> > former USSR.
>
> The way to get a QSL card from some rare stations is to follow the
> directions given by the op. I had numbers those who worked me QSL
> directly to my home call. They only received QSLs because I had my
> permanent address in those days changed to that of my QSL manager.
> Bureau QSLing is slow. Not everyone wants to wait for up to several

> years to confirm a QSO. As you pointed out, not all countries have
> bureaus.

That's where direct becomes necessary. It's also where e-QSL would work
well, if only people would get beyond the money thing.

> In Botswana, we sorted incoming cards every month or two.
> Cards were not forwarded to ops since we had no budget for that. They
> had to pick up QSLs from BARS. There are times that we received large
> numbers of QSLs for ops who had left the country and provided no
> forwarding address. Can you guess where these cards ended up?

Yep, KH2D showed me that file. I almost had an accident in my pants.

> > Sounds fantastic. I'm tempted to turn in my life insurance for cash
value
> > and purchase a plot of land in south eastern Ohio to spend my weekends.
A
> > 60 foot tower is my little dream. That's one solution.
>
> That's the BIG dream for many folks. It is a good idea. I'm sure you
> can find a spot high enough to give you nose bleed for not much loot.
> My VHF enthusiast friends in Hinton, West Virginia had a little wooden
> shack on top of a mountain across the New River. It was equipped with a
> generator and a kerosene heater. They spent many weekends there since
> there was no way to work anyone except locals in town.

I've got a deep cycle battery and a kerosene heater. Now I need to find
that hilltop.
I was looking in the paper today. Some of the "hunting/recreational"
property starts at about $2k/acre. Most is more.

> > Another is to go
> > mobile to public parks and state forests and do "field day" on big
contest
> > weekends. I've got a nice deep cycle battery. Paper logs aren't a
problem
> > for "hunt and pounce" that I'd be using.
>
> The antennas won't be as good though. I bought an old Grid 386, a pile
> of batteries and an AC supply for peanuts at a hamfest some years back.
> It is perfect for Field Day activity. Log-EQF doesn't know it is
> operating on an old, slow computer.

That's a popular logger. My friend bundles it with his computer interface
kit. And I haven't heard of Grid since using the weather UTC, "Quick
Reaction Communications Terminal" The Grid interfaced with a Transworld
briefcase HF and a piece of comsec. The laptop is the least of my concerns
though. I need to get beyond mobile type antennas.

> > I've put two of the the mfj split ferrite kits on one of the computers
and I
> > still get racket on my portable shortwave. That's six of them. My work

> > laptop is quiet except when booting up, but I won't use it except for
work.
> > Perhaps I need to trade off my old 300mhz machine for an older laptop.
>
> I found that most of the crud emanating from my computer here in the
> shack came from the monitor. A monitor extension cable and ferrites at
> both the monitor and the computer helped greatly. It is a pain but
> there are tempesting sprays available. You can take your monitor out of
> the case and spray the interior of the case with the stuff. There'll
> still be some residual noise because of the large glass area. It isn't
> much fun to read through copper screen.

Like Yaesu did with the FT-747 plastic cased radio? Can you name the
product?

> > I've spotted an MFJ or AEA Loop at the other end of the division. I
suspect
> > that no one else knows what it is. I'm tempted to put up something
small
> > like the MFJ 1796 bushytail antenna on my deck and see what happens.
>
> You could try hanging a bird feeder from it but it'll probably catch
> fire.

There goes another scout project.

I'm certain that an attic dipole will interfere with everything else in the
house as well. So what. I don't watch TV or talk on the telephone much.
;))

> > My first priority was to get my children in the Pickerington school
> > district, one of only three school districts in central Ohio to meet
federal
> > guidelines. Then I bought one of the least expensive houses for sale
here,
> > which is 1/3 again what my home was in Illinois, minus one bedroom and
400
> > square feet. And my mortgage is only 1% higher. Thank God I only took
a
> > $5K cut in pay to boost the economy.
>
> We're about two hours east of you SE of Wheeling. The houses are much
> cheaper, the property tax is unbelievably low and so is the cost of
> living. Of course there aren't many jobs but that isn't what I was
> looking for. I live out in the county where there is no zoning. There
> are more dairy and beef cattle out here than people.

With small children that's not really a practical plan for us. I need a job
with some health care, and decent schools. Later on, perhaps.

Brian/N0iMD

357. RE: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 03:40:42 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c82ecd0_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36350

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020303211411.20827.00000337@mb-mj.aol.com...
> wa6vse-shack@fast.net writes:
>
> >It's as Ed and
> >others have observed ... they seem to remember the "tests
> >that they took" as being much more rigorous than they
> >actually were, view any changes as "dumbing down," and
> >resent that newcomers are not subject to the same set of
> >limitations and restrictions that they faced as newcomers.
>
> Since we don't actually have the old tests, it's impossible to tell
> how tough they really were.

I took the full general 25 years ago at the FCC field office
in Long Beach, CA ... the writtens up through general today
are, IMHO (as an RF engineer and long-time holder of a
commerical license) not any easier than the "old" test.

> The issue of "dumbing down" is not about what it takes for newcomers
to
> get started, but what it takes for more/full privileges. The
requirements for
> full privileges used to be more rigorous than they are now - and I'm
not just
> talking about the code tests.

Other than the "pig without wings" idea of "time in grade"
requirements (which the FCC abandoned years ago),
there are lots of people who disagree ... people who took
the old tests. I don't believe that the old tests through extra
were any more difficult than a commercial license test. I
passed that with flying colors 25 years ago ...

> >I'm NOT saying that rank beginners should have FULL
> >privileges ... just that they should have enough, with
> >sensible, justifiable limits based on their demonstrated
> >level of technical knowledge, that the ARS is, in fact,
> >interesting and they don't feel like they are being treated
> >as 2nd class citizens who are reviled and looked down on
> >by "their superiors."
>
> Sure. But what constitutes adequate knowledge for full privileges?
```

> How is it demonstrated?

By passing the tests prescribed by the FCC ... NOT by
"proving one's self" to "one's superiors" by "paying one's
dues" with stupid, arbitrary "time in grade" requirements.

> >Nobody is trying to "ban Morse useage" ... I think you know
> >that.
>
> From what I have read on this NG the past several years, I am
convinced
> that some folks want Morse/CW use to end. Not just the test - the
mode
> itself.

Like who??? Name some names ... call 'em out ...
it's certainly not me, nor NCI ... exactly WHO wants
to "end Morse/CW use???" And even if there were
one or two, or even a dozen, that fanatical about it,
do you REALLY believe they could muster enough
influence with the FCC to pull it off???

I guarantee you that "they" couldn't, even if "they"
existed ... are you seeing black helicopters, too???

> >There is "room for the old" in terms of what people
> >choose to use ...
> >
> >There is NOT room for the old in terms of: "It's always been
> >this way, we've always used ____ and we don't want no
> >stinking ____ taking up space in the bands;"
>
> I agree!

Based on your proposal for 35% Morse only setaside,
apparently you agree with the part in quotes, not the
whole sentence that rebukes the part in quotes.

> >"We have to make it really hard to get a license so that people
> >'prove their dedication and worth' and to make sure that we
> >are not 'over-run by the dreaded CBers';"
> >etc.
>
> We do have to be careful that what happened on 27 MHz does not
> happen to the ARS. Some would say it has already happened.

Oh, God ... now YOU're seriously raising "the spectre of CB" ????

Sorry, Jim ... I give up on you ... up until today, even though
we disagreed on some things, I thought you had some sense
and I had a measure of respect for you ... but you posts today
are just TOO FAR over the edge ...

I'm not going to waste any more time debating with someone
who's wacky enough to suggest a 35% exclusive setaside
for Morse, wants arbitrary "time in grade" barriers, and now is
seriously agreeing with the "we'll be over-run by CBers" stuff ...

Bye ...

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPILspZe+N6+q84HiEQJRWACcDxuk+FIiiTYdOgLGJGts20GjsLkAnRK9
vcA5BxAykVwl2LNev9IKy5mS
=KJYB
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

358. Re: Watch out Cecil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 04:12:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020303231233.17754.00000788@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 36352

In article <Hprg8.20375$Di3.2967445725@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> [452] CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> 13.1%
>> [435] Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> 12.6%
>> [430] W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> 12.5%
>> [279] W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> 8.1%
>> [200] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 5.8%
>> [154] Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> 4.5%
>> [128] Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> 3.7%
>> [114] Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> 3.3%
>> [112] Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> 3.2%
>> [110] Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> 3.2%
>>
>>
>> --
>> Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG
>
>How many of these guys have day jobs?

Brian:

I was going to say, "those of us in the bottom half of the list," but that wouldn't explain how Ed Hare is in the 400's -- and we all know he has a day job.

73 de Larry, K3LT

359. Re: Code Is Dead

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 04:12:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020303231233.17754.00000787@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 36355

In article <6org8.20371$Vg3.2967346332@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> There you have it, folks! A perfect example of the value of the code
>> testing requirements as a "LID filter." In his own poor attempt at a
>> troll, Leadpipe has proven the value of the PCTA philosophy by having
>> been "filtered out" of HF by one of the best secondary attributes of
>> code testing! And when he does finally get his codeless HF privileges,
>> I hope you enjoy his on-the-air antics, for I'm sure that was the one
>> part of his message about which he was totally serious!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Larry, attention.
>
>This is obviously a troll, saying exactly the right things to get you going.
>How gullible you are.

Brian:

Snap to, yourself, and find the part where I say, "In his own poor attempt at a troll..." There you go. I knew you could do it.

>As I said before the rule making, "What I fear most about restructuring is a
>lack of enforcement, and what I fear most about maintaining the status quo
>is a lack of enforcement." Code never has been a barrier to poor ham
>behavior, at least it hasn't worked in your case.

Don't look now, but I've said the same thing many times over. I've never claimed the code was an infallable "Lid filter," but it does have that secondary effect. Lids are usually activated by microphones, as opposed to being de-activated by CW keys. Trust me, there are an increasing number of Lids on the CW bands these days.

>Meanwhile, we are supposed to have enforcement once again in the name of
>Riley Hollingsworth.

Actually, we DO have enforcement again, in the person of Riley Hollingsworth. Do you doubt that he exists?

>
>As you were.
>
>Brian

Very funny. I was sitting in my chair the whole time.

73 de Larry, K3LT

360. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 04:12:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020303231234.17754.00000789@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 36354

In article <3C823E57.D4397E07@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> I must agree. Ham radio seems to be fairly stable at the moment,
>> from a standpoint of numbers of licensees. However, after the
>> final chapter of dumbing-down is written, and the 5 WPM code test
>> goes away, the chaos on the HF phone bands will be so bad that
>> it won't be resolved by any amount of "refarming" of spectrum. At
>> that point, any remaining "old timers" will give up in disgust, and
>> the CW/Digital sub-bands will be given over to phone band
>> expansion out of sheer demand -- or rather outcry from the whiners
>> who can't get a word in edgewise on HF and want the ARRL/FCC
>> to do something about it. Ultimately, the FCC will tire of managing
>> this mess, and either totally deregulate the amateur HF allocations,
>> or merely pull the rug out from under our feet, sell everything above
>> 500 MHz to the highest bidder, and leave us with deregulated, CB-like
>> chaos on HF and fill-in-the-application-blank licensed repeater
>> monkeys. OH, right -- there will be all those eager new CW users
>> who were "sold" on the value of that mode. Right.
>
>Are you willing to pick a year by which all of this will have happened
>and lay a substantial money bet on it?

Cecil:

Sure -- 2105 and 5,000 dollars (US). Only thing is, you have to be
alive to collect it personally if you win. Surely any 300,000 foot
alien should be able to live another 103 years.

73 de Larry, K3LT

361. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 04:12:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020303231235.17754.00000790@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 36351

In article <3C823EFC.2135F3A3@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> ... therefore a lack of knowledge of one of our simplest,
>> most durable, and most effective operating modes does, indeed,
>> cause a general "dumbing down" of radio amateurs.
>
>Larry, you still have not explained how a person can be dumbed down
>simply by meeting the requirements for an amateur radio license.

Cecil:

Maybe so, but I have, many times, stated that this "dumbing down"
is relative to previous, more stringent licensing requirements. Therefore,
your question is nothing more than one of your typical trolls.

73 de Larry, K3LT

362. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 04:12:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020303231235.17754.00000791@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 36353

In article <3c825216_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>
>I don't buy that at all ... just as one example, I firmly believe that
>Ed firmly believes that Morse will survive without Morse testing
>welfare state support. I also believe that.
>
>However, I ALSO agree with Ed that you and Dick and other PCTAs
>who rail about how Morse can't stand on its own merits without the
>coercion of a mandatory pass/fail, can't get an HF license without it
>Morse test, and how those who aren't interested in learning and
>using Morse are "dumbed down" ARE YOUR OWN WORST ENEMIES.
>
>Carl - wa6vse

Carl:

Well, my friend, this is America, and you're entitled to believe what
you believe, and so am I. However, I don't recall ever calling you
"your own worst enemy" just for believing the way you do. I have
no axe to grind when it comes to ham radio. I've lived without it
before, and I do believe I'll end up having to live without it again in the
future. I think it probably has a few good years left in it, and I plan
on exploiting them. But in the absence of what I consider to be
reasonable licensing requirements, including code testing to useful
proficiency levels, I don't think the ARS will remain viable for very
long. I hope we can agree to disagree, for it would seem as though
you have no choice.

I've said it before, and I'll say it again...I would dearly love to be proved
wrong, but I don't have that kind of luck!

73 de Larry, K3LT

363. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 04:56:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C82FE84.2E5871F6@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36356

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >ARE you kidding? She "exposes" it every time she signs it, either here or on
> >the air
> >There's no way, as you well know, that Larry or anyone else comes close to
> >that
> >
> >level of "exposure".
>
> Do you really think that DE <callsign> is as much exposure as paragraph after
> paragraph discussing that callsign? Or making up cute names for her using that
> callsign? You chose do do that, Dick, and you chose to give it exposure by
> posting it.

I guess we all could do the ARRL thing and just stick our heads in the sand,
ignore her
and see if she'll go away.

364. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 04:57:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C82FEE0.453047B2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36357

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Sorry, Ed, you're working on the wrong end of the problem. I learned it from
> >them,
> >
> >not them from me.
>
> Is this another "look at what they made me do" sort of things?
>
> I don't care where you learned it, Dick; you are giving advice to newcomers

I describe what many are doing, and by your measure that is ME giving them
advice.
Are you a recent graduate of Cecil's School of Trolling?

365. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 04:59:03 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <raDg8.12936$gK2.942716@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36358

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C82FE84.2E5871F6@worldnet.att.net...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > >ARE you kidding? She "exposes" it every time she signs it, either
here or on
> > >the air
> > >There's no way, as you well know, that Larry or anyone else comes
close to
> > >that
> > >
> > >level of "exposure".
> >
> > Do you really think that DE <callsign> is as much exposure as
paragraph after
> > paragraph discussing that callsign? Or making up cute names for her
using that
> > callsign? You chose do do that, Dick, and you chose to give it
exposure by
> > posting it.
>
> I guess we all could do the ARRL thing and just stick our heads in the
sand,
> ignore her
> and see if she'll go away.
>

Anyone who has not killfiled her is just asking for aggravation. Same
with Lennie and Krell.
The light in the eyes is the sun shining thru the back of the head.

Dick NBK

366. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 04:59:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C82FF3C.81AA6C4B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 36359

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C826638.6CF5A4E4@earthlink.net...
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > > > > Sure, Dave, pick on blind pigs. Do you want to go double or nothing
> and
> > > > > > make fun of blind hams while you're on a roll?
> > > > >
> > > > > Are there blind hams out looking for acorns?
> > > >
> > > > You tell me. Since blind pigs weren't the topic, only you can tell us
> where
> > > > your point is going.
> > >
> > > I don't recall the old saying about blind hams finding acorns. The only
> > > one I knew was about blind pigs. You brought up blind hams. Did you
> > > have a point?

> I don't recall the old saying about blind pigs. I do recall a saying about
> a one-legged man in an ass kicking contest, but I'm not sure how it went.
>
> So you didn't have a point?

I did but it appears that you missed it.

> > I'm really close to giving up on you again, Brian. You bring up a tale
> > of an FR6 you used to QSO. I told you that I didn't recall that. It
> > was of little significance to me then. It is of little significance to
> > me now. It isn't as if it'll show up as a Jeopardy clue.
>
> Dave, I don't know why it upset you so. Only you can answer that. If you
> can't recall why it prompted you to say that I didn't know much about DX,
> then we'll never know.

I didn't state that it upset me. It would be hard to know that it would
be something I'd need to remember. It mustn't have seemed important to
me then and it doesn't seem important now. The fact that you've gone on
and on about would indicate that it occupies an important place in your
life.

>
> > Yeah, like many DXers whose QSO totals are numbered in the tens of
> > thousands for each operation, I had nothing to do with QSLing other than
> > sending logs to WA8JOC. Notify the QSLing police.
>

> Why? Did you do something wrong?

According to you, I must have violated the QSLer's Oath in handing
QSLing chores to WA8JOC.

> > That was for operation from Guinea-Bissau. I was active there from Feb.
> > 1988 through early Sept. 1989. It was one illustration of just how
> > wealthy I became from QSLing proceeds. How about this one? I didn't
> > have to QSL anyone at all. I just didn't think there was much purpose
> > to getting on the air from a rare spot, making all of QSOs and then not
> > confirming the contacts.
>
> eQSL supposedly has the answer.

Not for me. I'll not be having non-cards printed and mailed. There
aren't many I need and my QSLing will decrease dramatically after
finishing up work on 6m and 160m DXCCs.

> > > When the word spreads that you'll work them out of band, then follow it
> up
> > > with a QSL card???
> > > If anyone's in the market for something illegal, its not hard to find
> out
> > > who the bootlegger or dealer is.
> >
> > I wasn't out of band nor did I have any knowledge that they were.
>
> Now Dave, you know that's not true. Our French ham on here told us what the
> French 6M authorization was. You simply chose to ignore it.

What's not true--that I was not out of band? I don't care if a French
ham breaks a French law. I only need concern myself with the radio regs
in the country where I operate.

> > Do
> > you know the permitted 6m band allocation is in each country?
>
> A good DXer knows what the 160M authorizations are.

I haven't memorized the 160m allocations in each country. I do give a
nod to the JA's once in a while. Otherwise I scan the band.

> Why is it different for
> 6M? Are you aware that there's a different 6M calling freq in the Pacific?

I don't memorize every other countries 6m authorization either. As to
the Pacific calling frequency, I'm not in the Pacific calling other
Pacific stations. The V7 station I worked on 6m was at 50.080 CW. The
numerous Pacific area stations I worked from Tanzania were around
50.110. Would you like me to supply a list of prefixes so you can check
to see if any of those stations operated outside their assigned band
segments?

> There's a lot to know if you want to be a DXer.

Well, good luck.

> > Do you go
> > through your logs, looking for actual frequency and compare logs to a
> > country's 6m frequency allocation. If you do, you'd be called
> > obsessive-compulsive by medical folks.
>
> A French ham verified that his countrymen were operating out of band. That
> is good enough for me to at least check it out.

Naw, it was good enough for you to work yourself into a dither over what
I was doing in Tanzania about the "French Problem".

> > Other non-wealthy hams have traveled to North Korea and have obtained
> > permission to operate. There are still no North Koreans hams. There
> > are still no radio amateurs other than foreigners in many countries.
>
> Yes, I've noticed that only DXpeditions activate some populated countries,
> where they could have their own people on the air. Yet they don't.

What are you going to do to alleviate the problem?

> > > That was the thrust of my comment prior to you and/or Steve misdirecting
> it.
> >
> > Is that because you didn't have your facts straight and you went on a
> > tangent arguing those facts? If so, you've given us much power over
> > you. I guess we have the power to cloud men's minds.
>
> Yes, lets talk about Marty some more. What rig is he running? Antennas?
> How's he doing? Perhaps he's risen from mere salesman to VP by now? I wish
> him the best of luck in his career.

I'll ask him when he visits the house for a couple of days after Dayton.
Would you like him to phone you?

> > > Sounds fantastic. I'm tempted to turn in my life insurance for cash
> value
> > > and purchase a plot of land in south eastern Ohio to spend my weekends.
> A
> > > 60 foot tower is my little dream. That's one solution.
> >
> > That's the BIG dream for many folks. It is a good idea. I'm sure you
> > can find a spot high enough to give you nose bleed for not much loot.
> > My VHF enthusiast friends in Hinton, West Virginia had a little wooden
> > shack on top of a mountain across the New River. It was equipped with a
> > generator and a kerosene heater. They spent many weekends there since
> > there was no way to work anyone except locals in town.
>
> I've got a deep cycle battery and a kerosene heater. Now I need to find
> that hilltop.
> I was looking in the paper today. Some of the "hunting/recreational"

> property starts at about $2k/acre. Most is more.

Such land can run as low as $1200 - $1500 per acre here though my
neighbor's son is building his home about a 1/4 mile down the road on 27
acres he obtained for $18k.

> > > Another is to go
> > > mobile to public parks and state forests and do "field day" on big
> contest
> > > weekends. I've got a nice deep cycle battery. Paper logs aren't a
> problem
> > > for "hunt and pounce" that I'd be using.
> >
> > The antennas won't be as good though. I bought an old Grid 386, a pile
> > of batteries and an AC supply for peanuts at a hamfest some years back.
> > It is perfect for Field Day activity. Log-EQF doesn't know it is
> > operating on an old, slow computer.
>
> That's a popular logger. My friend bundles it with his computer interface
> kit. And I haven't heard of Grid since using the weather UTC, "Quick
> Reaction Communications Terminal" The Grid interfaced with a Transworld
> briefcase HF and a piece of comsec. The laptop is the least of my concerns
> though. I need to get beyond mobile type antennas.

My Grid came out of a Bradley and was labeled "unclassified only".

>
> > > I've put two of the the mfj split ferrite kits on one of the computers
> and I
> > > still get racket on my portable shortwave. That's six of them. My work
> > > laptop is quiet except when booting up, but I won't use it except for
> work.
> > > Perhaps I need to trade off my old 300mhz machine for an older laptop.
> >
> > I found that most of the crud emanating from my computer here in the
> > shack came from the monitor. A monitor extension cable and ferrites at
> > both the monitor and the computer helped greatly. It is a pain but
> > there are tempesting sprays available. You can take your monitor out of
> > the case and spray the interior of the case with the stuff. There'll
> > still be some residual noise because of the large glass area. It isn't
> > much fun to read through copper screen.
>
> Like Yaesu did with the FT-747 plastic cased radio? Can you name the
> product?

Not off hand. There are a number of similar products out there.

Dave K8MN

367. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 05:01:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C82FFCE.71D3C5C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36360

Joshua Houk wrote:

> In article <3c81155c_2@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse-shack@fast.net says...
> > "Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:MPG.16e9d56034df8eab9896a2@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > > Simply because that for the job that they do, CW isn't required. You're
> > > talking about local communications on VHF frequencies. It's hard to see
> > > any kind of advantage that CW would have over voice in those situations.
> > > However, it's not hard to see the potential advantage of CW in emergency
> > > communications between stations at large distances.
> >
> > Sure it is ... PARTICULARLY since that's NOT the type of service
> > that the emergency management folks WANT.
>
> "Emergency management folks" are not the only people involved with
> emergencies.

Kandid Karl isn't knowledgable enough on emergencies to understand that by the

time the Emergency Management people show up the emergency is
over, and what they will "manage" is the aftermath.

368. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 05:09:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8301B7.C279E1B2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36397

N2EY wrote:

> In article <3C810A14.9AF1F3AA@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
> <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >
> >> The point I was making, though, was that back in '58 the FCC wasn't
> >satisfied
> >> with what was going on in the ARS.
> >
> >And today, they couldn't care less.
> >
> Actually, I think the FCC does "care", to a certain extent. They just don't
> want to get involved with directing the ARS via license requirements. That
> way, they bear no responsibility for what happens to the ARS.
>
> For example, if don't use our VHF/UHF bands, or don't use them effectively,
> the FCC can self-justify reallocating some of them.
>
> The basic point is that it's up to us hams. The FCC cares about the result.

FCC cared what happened to the ARS when it instigated Incentive Licensing, and what
it got for its trouble was a number of people who upgraded their knowledge and skills, but
as well as a whole lot of harsh criticism. I think that has a bearing on how they view the
ARS today. Why should they make a serious attempt to coddle the selfcentered whiners
when they can hand it all off to the
QPC and VE's and just let nature takes course? I think history will show what
happens when there is no longer any challenge involved in an activity which
thrives on it.

369. Re: Code Is Dead

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 05:55:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C830C75.2112DC66@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36398

Brian P Burke wrote:

> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20020301235526.21807.00000515@mb-mq.aol.com...
> > In article <410b6521.0202282049.72906c94@posting.google.com>,
> > leadpipe@pittnet.com (Leadpipe) writes:
> >
> > >
> > > >I cannot wait till the code requirement is dropped completely from ARS
> > > >so that I can follow in the footsteps of my mentors. Those "20WPM
> > > >Extras" and other code pushing scum that are icons of Amateur Radio
> > > >legend have given us underlings a good education on how to act on HF
> > > >by putting these practices on display on 3898, and 14313 and other
> > > >pompous sections of those elitist bands. I have learned much from them
> > > >about radio protocall that I was able to put to immediate use on CB
> > > >through the years. I as a no code tech that passed his advanced, and
> > > >almost passed the extra written when I tested for my license will be
> > > >looking forward to talking with all my dear friends on HF while I use
> > > >fowl language, discuss the intricacies of trailer trash, tell cat
> > > >killing stories, and work the actions of my firearms, as I have heard
> > > >all of you fine examples do for years. I salute you in your pursuit of
> > > >Amateur Radio excellence, and hope to join you soon in your unholy
> > > >endeavors. Even now I am laying my evil plans, and it will give me
> > > >another use for the best CB I ever owned. A Yaesu FT-100! Two meters,
> > > >440, 6 meters, and CB at 100 watts all in one box. Life is good!
> > >
> > > There you have it, folks! A perfect example of the value of the code
> > > testing requirements as a "LID filter." In his own poor attempt at a
> > > troll, Leadpipe has proven the value of the PCTA philosophy by having
> > > been "filtered out" of HF by one of the best secondary attributes of
> > > code testing! And when he does finally get his codeless HF privileges,
> > > I hope you enjoy his on-the-air antics, for I'm sure that was the one
> > > part of his message about which he was totally serious!
> > >
> > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> > Larry, attention.
> >
> > This is obviously a troll, saying exactly the right things to get you going.
> > How gullible you are.
> >
> > As I said before the rule making, "What I fear most about restructuring is a
> > lack of enforcement, and what I fear most about maintaining the status quo
> > is a lack of enforcement." Code never has been a barrier to poor ham

> behavior, at least it hasn't worked in your case.
>
> Meanwhile, we are supposed to have enforcement once again in the name of
> Riley Hollingsworth.
>
> As you were.
>
> Brian

Egad, it's the Gadfly! He had something to say, too....Didn't he??? If so, what was it??

370. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 06:07:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C830F20.70F5B099@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36362

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I describe what many are doing, and by your measure that is ME giving them
> advice.

You tell them it is easier to memorize the answers than to learn the material.
Do you really want to give an incentive to memorize the answers instead of
learning the material?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

371. Re: Bootleg Call signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 06:10:27 UTC
From: Wayne <wayneleake@wayneleake.net>
Message-ID: <u863uk6o7re893@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 36361

didididit didit... :^)

"K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:5be1855ae04df78bafec5b174e4560ba.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "Bill" <kf6wxj@cwnet.com> wrote in message
> news:3c6ef76c$1_1@news3.cwnet.com...
>
> > Ive been getting email from a couple of guys that claim to be hams. One
is
> > supposed to be an extra class operator and the other claims to be an
> > advanced operator. Neither one know any code. Is this illegal? Bill
> > KF6WXJ
>
>
> Trollin', trollin', trolling' down the ri-i-i-i-ver.
>
>
>
>
>
>
> --
> Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

372. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 06:11:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C83100E.B9BEF05F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36363

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Kandid Karl isn't knowledgable enough on emergencies to understand that by the
> time the Emergency Management people show up the emergency is
> over, and what they will "manage" is the aftermath.

So you show up before the emergency?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

373. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 06:13:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C83106F.AB173E74@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36364

```
Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Are you willing to pick a year by which all of this will have happened
> >and lay a substantial money bet on it?
>
> Sure -- 2105 and 5,000 dollars (US).

I didn't think we could take you seriously.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

374. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 06:16:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C83112E.753AE656@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36365

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Larry, you still have not explained how a person can be dumbed down
> >simply by meeting the requirements for an amateur radio license.
>
> Maybe so, but I have, many times, stated that this "dumbing down"
> is relative to previous, more stringent licensing requirements.

But how does meeting the present requirements dumb a ham down
compared to meeting the past requirements? Why is an Electrical
Engineer, for instance, dumber today than an Electrical Engineer
was a decade ago?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

375. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 06:17:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C831187.3A4AD588@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36366

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I've said it before, and I'll say it again...I would dearly love to be proved
> wrong, but I don't have that kind of luck!

You proved that you don't even believe it yourself, Larry, by setting the
date of the bet to 2105, more than 100 years in the future.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

376. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 06:36:36 UTC
From: Wayne <wayneleake@wayneleake.net>
Message-ID: <u865fl6n95eca2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 36367

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:8sTf8.7361$gK2.531291@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org> wrote in message
> news:3C7FE9B5.6090001@ieee.org...
> > N2EY wrote:
> >
> > > Tech Plus - 82,985 (decrease of 45,875)
> > > General - 138,824 (increase of 26,147)
> > > Advanced - 86,171 (decrease of 13,581)
> > > Extra - 98,891 (increase of 20,141)
> >
> >
> > Looks like there may be a good many Tech+'s upgrading
> > to Extra like Carl did. Think so?
> > --
> > cheers, CAM, W5DXP
>
> Certainly one explanation but remember that Pluses are renewed as Techs so
> they come to expiration and fall off the edge of the Earth.
>

I'll guarantee, that if I get to Tech Plus, I'll take and pass the General
test.
The present General theory test looks easier than it was 25 years ago.
And I took the test for commercial radiotelephone back then, and did hold a
Second Class Radiotelephone (which was converted to General RT.).
And that was one tough test.
Actually, the tech test used to be the same as the general, aside from the
code.

377. Re: ARS Licensing in the USA Since WW2

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 06:56:44 UTC
From: Wayne <wayneleake@wayneleake.net>
Message-ID: <u866lh435ine12@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 36368

A very interesting summary, and well written.
Having been interested in Ham radio when I was in high school, I do recall reading about novices having phone privileges on 2 meters way back, but did not know just when that was taken away.
Would I had found a mentor back then, but alone, I never got far enough along till in the mid 70's, when I did take and pass the novice test.
And only recently did my interest come back.
I passed the tech test last weekend, with an 84% average.
Next for tech plus or general.

Wayne K?6???

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0203010913.55e4f78@posting.google.com...
> A Brief History Of Amateur Radio Licensing In The USA Since WW2
(1946-2002)
>
> by N2EY – Part 2 of 4
>
>
> Growth and Evolution (1957 - 1963)
>
> By the mid '50s several trends in ham radio were clear. There was
continued
> rapid growth in the number of amateurs. The popularity of SSB, RTTY and
VHF
> continued to increase. New modes and operating methods such as SSTV, ATV,
> moonbounce, and amateur radio satellites appeared. The trend towards
> manufactured and kit equipment continued.
>
> In the late '50s the first manufactured HF SSB transceivers aimed at the
> amateur radio market appeared. While the idea of a complete integrated
> station in one box with shared circuitry not new, and homebrew
> transceivers had been built by a few skilled hams, the new HF SSB/CW
> transceiver caused many more changes than were first apparent. Most
> importantly, they paved the way for SSB to displace AM as the premier
voice
> mode. For a little more money than a good receiver, a ham could have a
> transceiver with the effective power output of a much larger and more
expensive
> AM rig. Transceivers were also small enough, and attractive enough, to
find
> their way out of the basement or attic and into the den or living room of
many
> amateurs. Though simple to use, their electrical and mechanical complexity

> meant that only a few advanced homebrewers would even attempt to build
them.
> SSB transceivers were soon followed by separate receiver/transmitter pairs
> designed to work together, and able to transceive or work separately.
> Transistors began to appear in amateur gear. The first amateur satellite
was
> launched in 1961, and the first 2 way amateur moonbounce QSO occurred that
same
> year.
>
> In 1958 the FCC announced the creation of the Class D Citizens Band (CB)
> service. Class A and B CB had existed since 1948, using frequencies in the
> 465 MHz region, but had not attained much popularity. The 11 meter band
was
> withdrawn from amateurs and reassigned to this new service. This change
> was opposed by many hams, but the FCC saw the need for a new service, and
> rejected all opposition. 11 meters was never an exclusive amateur band by
> treaty - US hams had it on a secondary shared basis.
>
> From 1957 to 1962 there existed a set of regulations commonly referred to
by
> hams as "Conelrad". Hams were required to monitor a local broadcast
station at
> intervals of 10 minutes or less whenever they were operating, and if the
> broadcast station went off the air due to an emergency, hams had to leave
the
> air as well.
>
> During this time the number of hams in some districts became so great that
new
> prefixes were needed, and six-character permanent callsigns of the form
"WB2LGJ"
> began to be issued in those districts.
>
> The licensing structure remained basically unchanged through this time
period,
> as did the bands available to hams. Technicians gained access to 2 meters
in
> this time period. The number of US hams exceeded 250,000 by 1963, about
three
> times the total of just 15 years earlier. This figures out to an annual
growth
> rate of about 7%. Most amateurs had General or Conditional class licenses.
> There were about 40,000 Advanceds, all of whom had obtained their licenses
> before December 31, 1952, when the FCC stopped issuing new Advanceds.
Novices
> and Technicians numbered about 10,000 each, but only a few (less than
4,000)
> hams had Extras.
>

>
> Incentive Licensing (1964 - 1969)
>
> In 1958 the FCC began to rethink its late-1952 decision granting all
privileges
> to General class amateurs. They noted that homebrewing and experimenting
were
> decreasing, phone operation was increasing, and the technical knowledge
and
> operating skills of many amateurs seemed mediocre at best. It's also
possible
> that the unexpected launch of Sputnik by the Soviet Union in 1957, and the
> Soviets' early space triumphs, led the FCC to think that American amateur
radio
> needed some kind of change in the licensing area.
>
> At that time, many new hams followed a fairly straightforward path. First,
a
> new ham got a Novice license, and set up a simple station, often with
homebrew,
> secondhand, or converted surplus gear. The Novice year was marked by rapid
> learning and improvement of skills - it had to be, because if the new ham
did
> not upgrade before the license term ended, he/she would be off the air
until a
> higher level license could be earned. Most new hams upgraded to General or
> Conditional, but some went to Technician. However, once the General or
> Conditional license was passed, many hams bought new manufactured gear and
lost
> interest in increasing their skills or technical knowledge. The FCC
thought
> this was a problem, and began to inquire about ways to change what they
saw as
> an undesirable trend.
>
> The ARRL responded in 1963 with a simple proposal: Reopen the Advanced to
new
> applicants, and restrict the 75, 40, and 20 meter phone bands to Advanced
and
> Extra licensees. The idea was to add one more step on the ladder from
beginner
> to full privileges, and thus extend the learning time and raise the level
of
> knowledge required for an all amateur privileges license. The concept
became
> known as "Incentive Licensing".
>
> The FCC responded with a general call for ideas, and was deluged with
responses.
> No less than 10 proposals were given RM numbers by the FCC. The FCC

combined
> features from many of these proposals and came up with a complex plan.
>
> The HF bands would be divided into segments, or subbands, with some
segments
> reserved for Extras, some for Advanceds and Extras, and some for all
classes
> General and above. 6 meters was also slightly involved. Novices would be
> unaffected by these changes, and Techs were only affected by the change to
6
> meters.
>
> One particularly unpopular feature of the FCC plan was the replacement of
> the Advanced license with a new "Amateur First Class" license, with a new
> 16 wpm code test and a new written test. FCC proposed to demote holders of
> the Advanced to General. This idea was finally dropped due to stiff
> opposition from the amateur community, including the ARRL.
>
> Several proposals and counterproposals went back and forth, each
> with different features, all hotly debated. Finally in 1967 a final plan
was
> announced. Enacted in two phases, much of the HF spectrum available to
holders
> of General and Advanced class licenses would be withdrawn from their use.
The
> plan as conceived by the FCC is shown below. Only the affected bands are
shown.
>
> Phase 1 Incentive Licensing plan - effective Nov. 22, 1968
>
> Extra Class Only: (all frequencies in MHz):
> 3.5-3.525 CW 3.8-3.825 Phone 7-7.025 CW 14-14.025 CW 21-21.025 CW
> 21.250-21.275 Phone
>
> Extra and Advanced Classes Only:
> 3.825-3.85 Phone 7.2-7.225 Phone 14.2-14.235 Phone 21.275-21.3 Phone
> 50-50.1 CW
>
> Phase 2 Incentive Licensing plan - effective Nov. 22, 1969:
>
> Extra Class Only: (all frequencies in MHz):
> 3.5-3.525 CW 3.8-3.825 Phone 7-7.025 CW 14-14.025 CW 21-21.025 CW
> 21.250-21.275 Phone
>
> Extra and Advanced Classes Only:
> 3.825-3.9 Phone 7.2-7.25 Phone 14.2-14.275 Phone 21.275-21.35 Phone
50-50.1
> CW
>
> In addition, anyone with 25 years as a ham and an Extra class license

could get
> a 1X2 call.
>
> Opinion on this change was deeply divided. A very slight majority favored
the
> plan, but many opponents felt cheated and had bitter resentment towards
the
> FCC, ARRL, or both. There was a feeling among some that they had the
"right" to
> all amateur privileges. Some left ham radio, but most grumbled but set
about
> getting a higher class license, to get back the lost privileges.
>
> The trends in amateur radio did not change, however. More and more hams
bought,
> rather than built, their stations. HF SSB voice operation continued to
increase
> in popularity, while AM declined and CW stayed about the same. RTTY and
SSTV
> continued to progress, but the expense and complexity of those modes, and
the
> lack of commercially available gear limited their appeal. VHF operation
became
> more popular as compact transceivers for 6 and 2 meter AM were produced by
> several manufacturers. There were also a growing number of VHF/UHF
stations on
> the air using more advanced equipment, usually homemade.
>
> In 1964, the FCC imposed fees for amateur licenses (except the Novice). A
new
> or renewed license, or any exam except Novice, cost $4, a modification
cost $2,
> and the very limited "vanity call" program cost $20. Fees were charged
whether
> or not the applicant passed the test. While these fees may seem nominal
today,
> in the early '60s they represented a significant amount of money.
>
> This time period also saw changes to the procedures for exams by mail. The
> distance requirement for a Conditional license was extended from 75 to 175
> miles, and more exam points included. The procedure for Novice and
Technician
> licenses became longer and more complicated.
>
> First, you found a volunteer examiner to give you the test, as before. The
> volunteer examiner gave you the code test, and when you passed, sent the
proper
> forms to the FCC certifying that you had passed the code and requesting
the
> written exam. There was typically a six to eight week wait for the written

exam
> to arrive from the FCC. The written exam was sent in a sealed envelope,
and the
> volunteer examiner acted as a proctor only - he/she wasn't supposed to
even
> look at the exam. The exam was sent back to the FCC for marking, and you
had
> another six to eight week wait to find out the results. If you passed,
your new
> license came in the mail, and you could go on the air as soon as it
arrived. If
> you failed, you had to do the whole thing all over again. The process
typically
> took about three months to complete if all tests were passed the first
time.
>
> In addition, the Advanced and Extra were available by mail, but only to
those
> with a physical disablity that prevented them from appearing at an FCC
office.
>
> In 1967 the Novice license term was extended to two years. This came about
due
> to concern about too many newcomers dropping out because a year was too
short a
> period in which to learn all that was needed to upgrade. Novices lost 2
meter
> voice privileges, but retained CW privileges on 2. In 1969 the FCC revised
the
> "one time" provision of the Novice so that anyone who had been unlicensed
for
> at least a year could get a Novice. Also, simultaneous holding of Novice
and
> Technician licenses was prohibited.
>
> After more than a decade and a half of rapid growth, the number of US hams
> stabilized at about 250,000 in 1964 and stayed at about that level for
several
> years. By 1970 there were about 270,000 US hams.
>
> In 1968, amateur access to 160 meters was increased significantly. US hams
got
> access to 1800 to 2000 kHz - but still subject to complex geographical and
> power limitations.
>
> In this time period the use of transistors and integrated circuits became
> increasingly common in amateur equipment. Digital logic began to be used
for a
> variety of purposes, from CW keyers to frequency counters. This period
also saw

> the appearance of Japanese amateur gear in significant numbers.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

378. Re: Code Is Dead

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 07:11:25 UTC
From: Wayne <wayneleake@wayneleake.net>
Message-ID: <u867h28ftdq4f7@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 36369

"JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:lpQf8.6741$gK2.509390@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Leadpipe" <leadpipe@pittnet.com> wrote in message
> news:410b6521.0202282049.72906c94@posting.google.com...
> > I cannot wait till the code requirement is dropped completely from ARS
> > so that I can follow in the footsteps of my mentors. Those "20WPM
> > Extras" and other code pushing scum that are icons of Amateur Radio
> > legend have given us underlings a good education on how to act on HF
> > by putting these practices on display on 3898, and 14313 and other
> > pompous sections of those elitist bands.
> <<SNIP>>
>
> Nice try. Both 3898 and 14313 are available to general and higher classes
> of tickets. Although I do not believe in the necessity of Morse, I'm
> beginning to realize I might have to use CW on HF just to avoid both
> unlicensed individuals, folks such as you mention, and you as well. For
> what it is worth, in 1993 I had no license either. One sitting - that was
> it. The 20 words per minute wasn't fun, but then I had no license, no
> practice, and no CW since 1969. Since you seem to believe that 14313 and
> 3898 are extra portions of the band, one tends to question how well you
did
> on your exams you have already passed (but, of course, you don't need all
of
> 'em right).
>
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
> (and enjoying 440 FM more and more!)
>

What can you really expect from some of these twits?
He said that he liked to use 'fowl' language, and that might translate to
chicken band.
He might not even have any class of license, as it is possible that he was
unable in fact to even pass the present tech...

I think I may stick with 6 or up for the time, even once I get the tech
plus or general.
Actually, if I get the tech plus, the present general should be a snap if I
study a couple of weeks.
BTW, I moved to California from Rochester.
Possible we may even have met at one time or another.

Wayne K?6??? (waiting for the word on the FFC web site).

379. Re: Code Is Dead

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 11:39:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020304063905.16980.00001559@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36371

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Actually, we DO have enforcement again, in the person of Riley Hollingsworth.
>Do you doubt that he exists?

Riley is providing the leadership, but he has stressed that this is an FCC
effort.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

380. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 11:42:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020304064218.16980.00001560@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36372

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> I describe what many are doing, and by your measure that is ME giving them
>advice.

Would you be willing to add a statement to the end of your repeating that vaste hordes of people are rote memorizing 300 sets of questions three separate times because they want to be hams so they won't learn anything that this is not the easiest way to pass the tests, or the best way to start a lifetime of hamming?

>Are you a recent graduate of Cecil's School of Trolling?

Why would you consider my telling newcomers that it is best, and easiest, to learn the underlying material as a "troll?"

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

381. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 11:43:36 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020304064336.16980.00001561@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36373

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> I guess we all could do the ARRL thing and just stick our heads in the sand,
>ignore her
>and see if she'll go away.

In my work at ARRL, Dick, I don't ignore things on a daily basis. Can you explain why you believe that all ARRL does is to ignore ham radio?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

382. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 11:45:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020304064525.16980.00001562@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36374

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>Are you willing to pick a year by which all of this will have happened
>>and lay a substantial money bet on it?
>

>Sure -- 2105 and 5,000 dollars (US). Only thing is, you have to be
>alive to collect it personally if you win. Surely any 300,000 foot
>alien should be able to live another 103 years.

I think we can all infer from this how much confidence you have in your own
words, Larry.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

383. K3LT wasn't serious (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 11:46:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020304064618.16980.00001563@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36375

>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>> >Are you willing to pick a year by which all of this will have happened
>> >and lay a substantial money bet on it?

>> Sure -- 2105 and 5,000 dollars (US).

>I didn't think we could take you seriously.

Not any more. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

384. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 11:48:54 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020304064854.16980.00001564@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36376

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>However, I ALSO agree with Ed that you and Dick and other PCTAs
>>who rail about how Morse can't stand on its own merits without the
>>coercion of a mandatory pass/fail, can't get an HF license without it
>>Morse test, and how those who aren't interested in learning and
>>using Morse are "dumbed down" ARE YOUR OWN WORST ENEMIES.

>Well, my friend, this is America, and you're entitled to believe what
>you believe, and so am I. However, I don't recall ever calling you
>"your own worst enemy" just for believing the way you do.

He wasn't calling you your own worst enemy for "believing the way you do,"
Larry. He was calling you your own worst enemy for railing.

>I've said it before, and I'll say it again...I would dearly love to be proved
>wrong, but I don't have that kind of luck!

Do you believe that the insultive things you are saying to people is slowing,
or hastening, its demise?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

385. Re: Morse as an "essential element" in emergencies (new thread title)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 11:54:29 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020304065429.16980.00001565@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36377

From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson)

>Makes sense to me. Assuming hams would be effective at providing
>message services in emergencies when they've had little practice at
>doing so in non-emergency situations would be like assuming hams would
>be effective at using IEEE 802.11 devices to provide Internet connectivity
>or other data connectivity services in an emergency when they've had
>little or no experience at doing this in non-emergency situations.
>Unfortunately Part 97 rules make it hard to even "contrive" connectivity
>that would simulate the real thing in the latter case, so hams might be
>better off yielding to those who've been getting real-life experience
>under Part 15 when the emergency happens.

Why do you believe that Part 97 does not permit connectivity using IEEE 802.11b
devices? The only possible limitation I see is that some of the internet
content would not be permitted under Part 97.

>I hence still
>think these bands are of little use to amateurs under Part 97 with its
>current constraints on encryption of content and that, without changes
>to Part 97, the public interest is probably best served by allowing the
>use of the bands for applications which don't have these constraints.

The IEEE 802.11b devices can run un-encrypted.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

386. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 11:56:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020304065625.16980.00001566@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36378

From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net

>Larry's too stupid to understand that a huge waste of time is spent trying
>to make me feel in some way bad about my callsign. I like it.

Actually, he is helping to give you lots of publicity for your call sign. I don't like your call, for pretty much the same reasons that Larry doesn't, but I believe that the FCC regulations are more important to Amateur Radio than my personal opinion.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

387. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 12:00:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020304070025.16980.00001568@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36379

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>> My views have evolved since our first fight, Carl; I am sure yours
>have, too.
>> Maybe even because of some of the disagreements we have had. :-)
>
>What to you think of Jim's suggestion that 35% of the bands be set
>aside for Morse, 15% for digital, and 50% for phone?

I don't see that it is necessary, at least not for the time being. Most of the QRM I have had on CW is from other CW operators. For the most part, the band seems to shake itself out pretty well. During the CW contests and operating events, the CW operation extends well into the "digital" part of the band, but on the RTTY contest weekend, the converse is true.

As to the figure, I would agree that a 35% CW only enclave is more than is needed for CW.

Of course, I think it is all moot anyway, because I don't think there is a change in hades that the FCC will consider any major mode apportionments ever again. I think if they were starting Amateur Radio from scratch, they would say "1500 watts; these are your band edges; stay within them."

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

388. Re: Watch out Cecil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 12:05:12 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020304070512.16980.00001569@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36380

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>I was going to say, "those of us in the bottom half of the list," but
>that wouldn't explain how Ed Hare is in the 400's -- and we all know
>he has a day job.

I type almost as fast as you do, Larry.

I think, too, that last month I spent 3 days home sick, so I had a bit more
day-time for posting. RRAP is better than reruns of Gilligan's Island -- just.
:-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

389. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 12:24:56 UTC
From: Reg Edwards <g4fgq.regp@btinternet.com>
Message-ID: <a5vrco$abbg0$1@ID-124126.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 36389
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
>>> Look at the RFC
========================

What is it ? In my book it's a ɾadio frequency choke.
```

390. Re: ARRL Newsgroup?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 12:41:20 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <QXJg8.414$rc.417228@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 36381

>
> Ryan, I'd rather not see the name "ARRL" on any newsgroup not initiated
and
> moderated by the ARRL. There's already enough ARRL bashing out there.
And
> I believe that there are some SIG reflectors on the members only side of
the
> ARRL.org site. The ARRL also has a number of weekly reports and
newsletters
> that are available via e-mail.
>
Not any different than if they are mentioned in any other group or list???
Do they authorize there too?

Ryan

391. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 12:41:21 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <RXJg8.416$rc.417116@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 36382

Nope... a legitimate and sincere question..... unless asking a question or stating a belief makes me a troll in your eyes, well, I guess I am a troll.....

Now for the rest of society!

> Are you vying with Cecil for the position of Trollmeister of RRAP?
>

392. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 12:41:21 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <RXJg8.415$rc.417238@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 36385

So.... morse code is only good over long distances eh? Or is it only to be used in disasters, or other situations where voice won't go through, that MUST be a distance away?

There have been circumstances even locally where even on our fire dept. we could not communicate with Central Dispatch, because our radio's weren't able to hit the repeater, and we needed help, and maybe if there was an alternate method of being able to communicate, we could have gotten help faster. (particular case was we needed law enforcement assistance)

I can't beleive I am actually endorsing Morse code.... Dick ought love that!

Ryan

> alternate means of communicating when conventional modes fail aren't
> > required to learn it? If there is definitely a case where the need for
a
> > message to get through is more important than most we will ever do,
publice
> > service frequency occupants would have to be a prime example?
> >
> > If morse code is so important, why aren't they required?
>
> Simply because that for the job that they do, CW isn't required. You're
> talking about local communications on VHF frequencies. It's hard to see
> any kind of advantage that CW would have over voice in those situations.
> However, it's not hard to see the potential advantage of CW in emergency
> communications between stations at large distances.
>
> joshua houk
> ac7ri (ex-kd7pos)

393. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 12:41:22 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <SXJg8.417$rc.416961@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 36386

C'mon Jim, don't you know??? Those aren't (sarc.) ****REAL**** ham bands!
:)

Ryan KC8PMX

> For example, if don't use our VHF/UHF bands, or don't use them
effectively,
> the FCC can self-justify reallocating some of them.
>
> The basic point is that it's up to us hams. The FCC cares about the
result.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

394. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 12:41:23 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <TXJg8.418$rc.417025@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 36383

Yeah... I can't image it either. As well as other things that have occurred, unimaginable, but did occur. Is there at least a freakin' PDF file of the application I could at least print off at my own expense?

Ryan

> You said this the last time, and everyone I talked to in Circulations cannot
> imagine what you described. They send out paper applications on a daily basis.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

395. Re: Watch out Cecil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 12:41:24 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <UXJg8.419$rc.417210@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 36384

Not me.... can't stand a day job whatsoever! BUT I do love my night job. (Something about sunlight being a carcinogen in any amount :) And my job allows me to read these posts while at work too.. just download them for off-line reading.

Ryan

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020303125656.17460.00001491@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >> [430] W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> 12.5%
>
> >How many of these guys have day jobs?
>
> I do.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

396. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 12:41:24 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <UXJg8.420$rc.417185@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 36388

Hmmm..... forcing a "work ethic"..... Forcing something on someone that is supposed to come from inside. Kinda like asking for a self-help section in a bookstore eh?

> However, having said that, the more important point is that Dick
> doesn't seem to be able or willing to grasp the fundamental
> concept that enforcing some sort of "work ethic" (making sure
> that folks have to "work hard, so that they earn their licenses")
> is not a legitimate govt. regulatory function. Fortunately, the
> government DOES recognize this fact, which really seems to
> get Dick all "honked off."

The government forcing how a person should feel on the inside? (see ethic) Sounds reminiscent of a guy in the 40's with a tiny little moustache who tried that.... amongst other criminal acts.

Ryan

397. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 12:41:26 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <WXJg8.421$rc.416572@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 36387

>
> Some good debating points but you've just sealed your fate (so to speak)
> in this newsgroup. ;-) As a "happy old man" skeptic of the established
> quasi-religion of radio amateurism, I'll comment and draw some of the
> fire away from you.

Not worried about the fire.... but feel free to comment. That is a
fundamental right associated with living in America. Agreement not
necessarily needed.

>
> [I can almost guarantee some of the responses you will get since
> they've been repeated and repeated and repeated for a quarter
> century by the faithful.]
>

Would surprise me either.

> >1. Lack of promotion (a good offense) by our largest
psuedo-representative.
> >(ARRL)
>
> Saying such a thing is heresy of the highest order, an automatic cause
> for ostracism and possible burning at the stake. :-)
>
> The number one excuse for this is "lack of funds and time" and "it is
> very difficult to get the media to listen." Other equal-size or smaller
> recreation organizations manage to do so.

True... but as it was stated somewhere before, a key thing that could have
been done was to come up with a PSA that commercial broadcasters are
required to air for free, a certain amount of their daily broadcast
schedule could have been done after the WTC incidents. How about working
with PBS? Pushing more interviews and shows on NPR are another couple of
good sources. Only cost is the initial studio/production times and I am
sure that there is grant money available for the cost of the tapes for the
broadcasters. (Anyone know if print media is required to do free PSA
related material?)

>
> >2. Lack of promotion on a local level. Some clubs and groups may be
doing a
> > great job with that, but most aren't. There is so much that could be
> done.
>
> The usual response I'd expect there is an angry remark about "MY

> club is doing GREAT, we have a BIG turnout, etc.,etc." as if one
> local organization represents 50 states and 650+ thousand licensed
> US radio amateurs. I can only quantify my own region as a part of
> Greater Los Angeles and the San Fernando Valley of that with a
> population of 1.5+ million (L.A. County has over 8 million population).
> This small place has been a large part of the aerospace and
> electronics industry with a goodly percentage of radio amateurs per
> grid. About the only way to find out who is who and where on clubs
> is to visit the local HRO store branch and hope that someone has
> put out some free flyers. The San Fernando Valley has exactly
> one HRO. Two other electronics stores sell amateur radio gear as
> a sideline, are not in business to promote ham radio. There are, by
> mail spam count, four community schools and at least eight other
> community organizations...none of them offer any news of amateur
> radio organizations. The Los Angeles TIMES, circulation 1.5 million,
> might offer a single item of interest of ham interest a year, a freebie
> notice tucked away and competing for attention with maybe four
> dozen other groups listed twice every week. The only "easy" way
> to get information is to know a ham who is active in some local
> group.

Granted, as I had stated... .some groups are doing great, but the majority
aren't.

>
> >3. NEGATIVITY. Now I understand that the older a person gets, the
grumpier
> > they get
> > and that in and of itself must be justification for that. Would you
> > want to involve yourself
> > in something where you are constantly told you are a bad or lesser
> > person, even before
> > you put a signal on the air? I don't think so.
>
> Heh heh heh heh...having to coexist with lots of grumpy old men for a
> long time, I can understand your feelings. :-) I don't like them
either.

I am not saying I do not like them. Not even close. I can learn alot from
them. I choose to stay away from the bitter ones though. I would be nice to
have someone to speak with on a local level that was in my own general age
group though. With any topic whatsoever outside of ham radio, it is hard to
"relate" to someone who is considerable older, as well as I am sure that the
older ones would have a hard time relating in the same way.

>
> Cheer up, there are many happy old men out there...also avoiding those
> gumpy old men. They feel the same way you do.
>
>

Happy here.... just some observations.

> >4. Education/Elmerism is just not there as well as it should be. From a
>
> It's my opinion that much of the "elmerism" is more fish story than
> actuality. Yes, I believe that there have been one-on-one tutoring
> situations but more likely the recipient was an impressionable
> teen-ager and the "elmer" was a family member. Such recountings
> may be exaggerations due to their nostalgia of a quarter century
> back. :-)
>
> Finding a volunteer teacher who can actually teach something,
> anything, reasonably effectively would be a rare treasure find. That's
> an acquired skill and depends on their experience with different
> age groups. Different age groups need different techniques. Based
> on insider information and suggestions I have, it would be a better
> bet to ask a professional teacher to help tutor a knowledgeable ham
> in the rudiments of teaching techniques...and to review his/her
> presentation. Actual teaching is NOT the same as giving a one-hour
> presentation.

True... some people are better at teaching and giving presentations than other. I am not saying that professional teachers are necessary, but a someone who truly knows their "stuff" will display that confidence and knowledge very apparently. And that will rub off on a receptive individual. I have asked, begged, and have even offered to pay for a tutor to help get me over the morse code in the past, but do you think I recieved any help? Hell no.

>
>
> > 5. The "If you build it, they will come" syndrome. I guess this one
> >ties into the promotion idea. I have seen clubs and VE groups that offer
> >test sessions and only get a few testees. (as well as other functions)
Just
> >because we exist does not mean that people automatically come to us.
>
> From what I've seen for a few decades the general feelings within
> the club are simply as fraternal orders and their events are for
> themselves. I don't find that strange at all.

I was referring more to the concept of maintaining and growth. I do see similar though.

>
> >Constant promotion in a positive way is needed to get people to these
> >events. Some of these events are ONLY listed with ham circles, (ARRL
site,
> >club web sites etc.) so how does the general public get to know about all
> >the wonderful things we have access to as hams?
>
> National events such as Field Day could be promoted far more than
> it is; it's a perfect propaganda byte opportunity for TV, open-air,
> mysterious morse code beeping sound over-lay on video, strange

> radio equipment, etc., etc. I don't think that ever happened here in
> the L.A. area during the years Roy Neal, K6DUE, was a journalist
> with KNBC-TV, channel 4.
>

True.... I agree 100%.

Ryan

>

398. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 13:10:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020304081020.17584.00000355@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 36394

In article <3c82e728_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020303211404.20827.00000336@mb-mj.aol.com...
>> In article <3c824edc_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>>
>> I think experience is part of the qualification. Just my opinion.
>
>We disagree ...

OK, fine. It's just an idea.

> I believe that demonstrating technical
>competence by passing the test is sufficient

Just technical competence? What about regs, safety, operating procedures, etc.
?

>and artificial
>waiting periods are nothing more than an elitist pile of
>crap that discriminates against qualified newcomers.

Why all the name calling over an IDEA?

>You're trying to "make up for" the loss of the Morse
>test by adding another unnecessary barrier, plain and
>simple.

Nope. I just think practical experience should be part of the requirements.
You don't. Why all the fuss?
>
>I think the FCC will agree with me ...

Probably. A newcomer could simply toss the license in the drawer for a
year. Plus it would increase the number of interactions with the FCC and VEs.

>> > I *also*
>> >believe that the FCC would have problems with this in legal terms
>as
>> >a form of discriimination against otherwise qualified individuals.
>>
>> Why? How is it discriminatory to require some experience?
>
>Because it treats equally competent/qualified individuals
>differently on the basis of an arbitrary requirement.

Depends how you measure competency. Which is a
subjective, opinion-based thing in the first place.

>I think the FCC will agree with me ...

They didn't agree for many years. And if they will agree, why are you
getting so worked up over a simple idea?
>
>> >PLEASE NOTE that as an Extra, "I've got mine" and would "map"
>> >to what you call First Class ... so I have nothing personally to
>gain
>> >by objecting to this "time in grade, have to wait a year before you
>> >can upgrade" thing ...
>>
>> I've been an Extra for 32 years, Carl.
>
>I've been an RF engineer for 32+ years ...

You were an RF engineer when you were 19?

>don't expect me to bow down to your "superiority."

I don't - I was simply pointing out that I already "had mine", too.

Don't expect me to "bow down" to your "superiority" either.
>
>> >> Bands are divided into subbands by mode type - CW, digital,
>analog
>> >phone/image.
>> >> Typical division 35/15/50% of a band
>> >
>> >Wait a minute ... now you're trying to carve out a 35% set-aside
>for
>> >"CW ONLY" ????
>>
>> Sure - why not?
>
>Because it's an outrageous proposal ...

Why? You agreed to an exclusive 25 kHz at the bottom of the band - all
we're discussig is a percentage.

>CW and other narrowband
>modes have shared the lower parts of the HF bands for many, many
>years.

"we've always done it this way", you mean.

> Now you want 35% EXCLUSIVELY for CW ... I DON'T THINK
>SO!!!!!!!

But you don't give any reasons - you just shout. Interesting.

>I think the FCC will agree with me ...

>> >And only allowing 15% for digital????
>>
>> Yep. Why not?
>
>Because it's totally inadequate and you damned well know it.

Ah, the cussing starts.

>You just want to stifle the growth of digital modes because you
>know deep in your heart that Morse ultimately won't be as
>attractive and you want to "lock down" enough turf "all for yourself."

Nope. I just want some room, that's all.

Sounds like you're saying what you really want to happen.

>I DON'T THINK SO!!!!!
>I think the FCC will agree with me ...
>
>> The PSK31 folks say that mode is only 50 Hz wide. Cecil drools over
>PACTOR II,
>> saying it's about as wide as CW but much faster. Plus dynamic
>allocation of
>> frequencies and all that.
>>
>> Plus HF digital isn't all that common on the ham bands compared to
>CW or SSB.
>
>It's growing a LOT faster than you'd like to admit ...

How much digital did you use to work those 70+ countries and 40+
states, Carl? You bragged about your results but won't tell what modes
were used. Was that a "do as I say, not as I do"?

> you're AFRAID
>that
>Morse can't cut the mustard, that's all.

So all modes must compete as if in a battle? Why not simply allow all
modes everywhere?

>> >I DON'T THINK
>> >SO!!! That is TOTALLY unreasonable and inconsistent with the
>> >realities
>> >and the needs for the future.
>>
>> Ah, I see."Nobody wants to ban CW", huh? Just take away the usable
>spectrum
>> for the mode a little at a time until the CW folks have nowhere to
>go.
>
>NOBODY is "taking ANYTHING away from" Morse ... I stated before
>that I would not support ANY reduction in the amount of spectrum
>where Morse is permitted in the HF bands. NONE, ZIP, NADA ...

>now you want to take 35% EXCLUSIVELY for Morse????
>I DON'T THINK SO!!!!!!

The phone bands are effectively off-limits to routine Morse. So are the places
where digital foks congregate.
>
>> >Since CW requires ~0.1 the bandwidth of
>> >SSB, your proposed "split" would indicate approximately (35*10)=350
>> >CW users for every 50 SSB users ... that is TOTALLY ridiculous and
>> >unreasonable.
>>
>> Why? Should we reward the users of wider modes by giving them more
>spectrum?
>
>The way things are, Morse users have access to ALL of the HF spectrum
>Phone users have access to only about 50% ... since there are
>arguably
>more phone users than Morse users, the situation would ALREADY be
>WAY inbalanced in preferential treatment for Morse ... now you want
>MORE???
>I DON'T THINK SO!!!!!!
>I think the FCC will agree with me ...

You sure do like to cut and paste.
>
>> >I would say "CW is still allowed EVERYWHERE it is allowed today,
>but
>> >it certainly doesn't deserve an INCREASED status over what it has
>now,
>> >either." The lower parts of the bands (now
>> >CW/narrowband_digital_modes)
>> >could remain that way.
>>
>> I'm looking to the future. Those rules are from when there were only
>a few
>> digital modes, and when all hams could be expected to understand CW.
>That
>> won't be the case in the future. Gotta accept change, Carl.
>
>I am ... you aren't ...

Then why are you so reluctant to even discuss change in a calm,
rational fashion? You're defending the status quo.

> you must be smoking something funny if you
>think that Morse deserves 35% EXCLUSIVE use of the HF bands.

Nope.

Ever hear of "brainstorming", Carl? Where people just toss out ideas and
they get kicked around and maybe something useful pops out? One of the
key rules is that ALL ideas, no matter how weird, are discussed calmly. Most

brainstorm ideas are found to be impractical, of course, but the 'stormers are
not
attacked for coming up with weird ideas.

When I see "elitist pile of crap" and "wacky" and "smoking something funny",
it kinda makes me wonder...
>
>> >The "phone bands" should NOT be expanded, but should allow the
>> >use of wider bandwidth digital techniques (digital voice, imaging,
>and
>> >higher speed data, for example) in addition to SSB/SSTV.
>>
>> Why? That would only add to the QRM. Let the digital segment be
>where
>> all that stuff resides. Digital modes are robust and spectrum
>efficient, are
>> they not?
>>
>> If 15% isn't enough, then go for 1/3 CW, 1/6 digital, 1/2
>phone/image.
>
>You've apparently lost you mind ...

Nope. Why all the abuse over an IDEA?
>
>> I see a double standard. On the one hand you don't want any
>"setasides" for
>> CW, but at the same time you don't want to widen the 'phone bands.
>> Makes no sense to me.
>
>Makes perfect sense ... it's called "dynamic frequency allocation."

Not for the SSB/AM/SSTV folks.

>You want to use Morse, listen for a clear frequency and have at it.

I always do just that - or listen for a CQ.

>You want to operate digital, your modem does the same thing.
>(In the digital world, it's called CSMA-CA.)

Sure.
>
>> I say give each mode type its own backyard. If it's OK to fence in
>the
>> phone/image folks, then it's OK to fence in the digital folks too.
>
>I can see how you'd like that, seeing as how your proposal would
>grant Morse a HUGE, undeserved, unnecessary windfall at the
>expense of everyone else. The more I think about it, the crazier
>I think you must be to even have the cajones to even suggest such
>a thing.

Good to know that ideas can be tossed around without personal attacks.

>> >> Existing Novices and Techs get Third Class, existing Generals and
>> >Advanceds get
>> >> Second Class, and existing Extras get First. Existing hams do not
>> >lose high
>> >> power privs as long as they retain old license documents.
>> >
>> >The mapping from the existing classes to the proposed ones is OK
>> >with me .... it seems perfectly reasonable ...
>>
>> Nobody loses.
>
>Except that everyone but Morse enthusiasts gets royally screwed
>under your absurd Morse setaside idea ...
>
>You've apparently lost it man ... totally lost it ...
>
Not me, Carl. I'm calm, cool and collected. Just talking about ideas for the
future.
Maybe some of them are good ideas.

But for simply suggesting these ideas, you call me "wacky", "smoking something
funny", "crazy", "apparently lost your mind". The ideas are dismissed as "an
elitist pile of crap", "undeserved", "absurd", "discriminatory" and a host of
other
pejoratives.

All because you disagree.

Interesting.

Is this the example you want to set for newcomers?

73 de Jim, N2EY

399. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 13:10:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020304081022.17584.00000356@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 36392

In article <3c82ecd0_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020303211411.20827.00000337@mb-mj.aol.com...
>> wa6vse-shack@fast.net writes:
>>
>> >It's as Ed and
>> >others have observed ... they seem to remember the "tests
>> >that they took" as being much more rigorous than they
>> >actually were, view any changes as "dumbing down," and
>> >resent that newcomers are not subject to the same set of
>> >limitations and restrictions that they faced as newcomers.
>>
>> Since we don't actually have the old tests, it's impossible to tell
>> how tough they really were.
>
>I took the full general 25 years ago at the FCC field office
>in Long Beach, CA ...

But you didn't pass it. The "full general" included the 13 wpm code test.

> the writtens up through general today
>are, IMHO (as an RF engineer and long-time holder of a
>commerical license) not any easier than the "old" test.

It's the method. If a person knows the stuff, they're not much different.

I took the full Advanced in the summer of 1968 and passed first try - code
and written. That was when I was 14. The old pre-restructuring Extra has been
passed by at least one third-grader.
>
>> The issue of "dumbing down" is not about what it takes for newcomers
>to
>> get started, but what it takes for more/full privileges. The
>requirements for
>> full privileges used to be more rigorous than they are now - and I'm
>not just
>> talking about the code tests.
>
>Other than the "pig without wings" idea of "time in grade"
>requirements (which the FCC abandoned years ago),
>there are lots of people who disagree ... people who took
>the old tests.

So? It's just an idea - a talking point.

Carl, you sure do seem to get agitated over new ideas that don't agree
with your version of How It Ought To Be.
>
>> >I'm NOT saying that rank beginners should have FULL
>> >privileges ... just that they should have enough, with
>> >sensible, justifiable limits based on their demonstrated
>> >level of technical knowledge, that the ARS is, in fact,
>> >interesting and they don't feel like they are being treated
>> >as 2nd class citizens who are reviled and looked down on
>> >by "their superiors."
>>
>> Sure. But what constitutes adequate knowledge for full privileges?
>> How is it demonstrated?
>
>By passing the tests prescribed by the FCC ... NOT by
>"proving one's self" to "one's superiors" by "paying one's
>dues" with stupid, arbitrary "time in grade" requirements.

The FCC didn't think they were "stupid" or "arbitrary" for a very
long time.
>
>> >Nobody is trying to "ban Morse useage" ... I think you know
>> >that.
>>
>> From what I have read on this NG the past several years, I am
>convinced
>> that some folks want Morse/CW use to end. Not just the test - the
>mode
>> itself.
>
>Like who??? Name some names ... call 'em out ...

Remember Mark Morgan, KB9RQZ? He comes to mind.

>it's certainly not me, nor NCI ...

So you say. But the name is "no code international" not "no code test..."

Freudian slip showing?

> exactly WHO wants
>to "end Morse/CW use???" And even if there were
>one or two, or even a dozen, that fanatical about it,
>do you REALLY believe they could muster enough
>influence with the FCC to pull it off???

There was a time when folks who opposed the code TEST would have been
dismissed with exactly those words.

Fact is, some folks DO want Morse/CW to disappear from the ham bands.
>
>I guarantee you that "they" couldn't, even if "they"
>existed ... are you seeing black helicopters, too???

Somehow I don't find such guarantees very reassuring, Carl ;-)
>
>> >There is "room for the old" in terms of what people
>> >choose to use ...
>> >
>> >There is NOT room for the old in terms of: "It's always been
>> >this way, we've always used ____ and we don't want no
>> >stinking ____ taking up space in the bands;"
>>
>> I agree!
>
>Based on your proposal for 35% Morse only setaside,
>apparently you agree with the part in quotes, not the
>whole sentence that rebukes the part in quotes.

Nope. The idea of a Morse-only subband on HF is a new thing. But it
seems to get you all riled up.
>
>> >"We have to make it really hard to get a license so that people
>> >'prove their dedication and worth' and to make sure that we
>> >are not 'over-run by the dreaded CBers';"
>> >etc.
>>
>> We do have to be careful that what happened on 27 MHz does not
>> happen to the ARS. Some would say it has already happened.
>
>Oh, God ... now YOU're seriously raising "the spectre of CB" ????

Why not? Bring it out in the open and talk about it. Did I say we MUST have
difficult tests to prevent it? Nope. Just that we must be careful. Is that
wrong?
>
>Sorry, Jim ... I give up on you ... up until today, even though
>we disagreed on some things, I thought you had some sense
>and I had a measure of respect for you ... but you posts today
>are just TOO FAR over the edge ...

Carl, it seems to me that when presented with something you don't like, you
just blow up, start shouting, and walk away. Is that leadership for the 21st
century? Is that a reasonable response?

The things I have posted are simply ideas - talking points - a work in
progress. Nothing I mention is carved in stone or even without precedent. But
the mere
mention of things you disagree with seems to spark a tantrum. Why?
>
>I'm not going to waste any more time debating with someone
>who's wacky enough to suggest a 35% exclusive setaside
>for Morse, wants arbitrary "time in grade" barriers, and now is
>seriously agreeing with the "we'll be over-run by CBers" stuff ...

I see. Attack the person, not the ideas.
>

>Bye ...
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

400. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 13:10:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020304081023.17584.00000357@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 36390

In article <3c82dff7_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:3C82B9F3.27A9DAE5@adelphia.net...
>> That idea must have escaped while I was looking the other way!
>>
>> 35 percent of a band devoted to CW is pretty outrageous.
>
>I agree completely.
>
>> Considering that CW has a smaller BW requirement,
>
>Yes, MUCH smaller ...

Interesting to see the virtues of the mode finally being acknowledged.
>
>> it is like setting aside *most* of the band for CW.
>
>Some CW enthusiasts seem to think that they outnumber
>all of the users of all other modes ...

Is that the criteria? What will you say if the SSB folks want 70, 80 or 90%
of the band, claiming they are the most numerous?
>
>> I don't think it accounts for the increasing popularity of the digital
>> modes like psk31 either.
>
>It certainly doesn't ... that's why I would oppose it vigorously.
>(I would also oppose phone band expansion for the same
>reason ...)

Even though SSB is #1 in popularity?
>
>> What exactly is the rationale for such a chunk of a band being set
>> aside for this.
>
>I guess it's wishful thinking on Jim's part ...

It's an idea, nothing more.

> as I said, I could still
>personally go along with a very small chunk of CW ONLY (like the
>bottom 25 kHz of the major bands as I had originally proposed
>and Cecil mentioned),

Then you agree in principle - it's just the amount that's the issue.

> but NO WAY would I EVER go along with
>setting aside 35% of the band ... that's ABSURD.
>
Why all the shouting, Carl? You're sure getting worked up over an
idea - a suggestion - a talking point. Why all the fuss?

73 de Jim, N2EY

401. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 13:10:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020304081023.17584.00000358@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 36391

In article <3C82B9F3.27A9DAE5@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>That idea must have escaped while I was looking the other way!

It's just an idea.
>
> 35 percent of a band devoted to CW is pretty outrageous.

Why?

>Considering
>that CW has a smaller BW requirement, it is like setting aside *most* of
>the band for CW.

So we should penalize the narrow modes by allowing them less space?

If 35% is too much, what would be a reasonable number?
>
> I don't think it accounts for the increasing popularity of the digital
>modes like psk31 either.

They get their own space, as described in the idea. PSK31 is perhaps 50 Hz
wide - how much band does it need?
>
> What exactly is the rationale for such a chunk of a band being set
>aside for this.

Simple.

- Without a code test, there will be lots of hams on the air who don't know
the code and can't tell that they are interfering with a Morse/CW station

- Just as narrow and wide modes don't mix well, automated and manual modes
don't mix well.

- 73 de Jim, N2EY

402. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 13:10:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020304081025.17584.00000359@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 36393

In article <3c8272b0_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020303125611.17460.00001490@mb-cr.aol.com...
>> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>>
>> >There is NOT room for the old in terms of: "It's always been
>> >this way, we've always used ____ and we don't want no
>> >stinking ____ taking up space in the bands;"
>>
>> I have seen little of tha attitude, Carl. Even those who support a
>code test
>> have not been opposed to the use of digital modes in ham bands.
>
>I've personally seen, and know a lot of others who have also seen,
>a lot of it ...

There is also the attitude of disrespect and rejection of old things simply
because they are old.
>
>And what of Jim's proposal to set aside 35% of the HF bands
>for "CW ONLY," 15% for digital, and 50% for SSB ?????

That is incorrect. You have misquoted me.

The 50% is for analog voice and image. Includes SSB, SSTV, AM, NFM, etc. Not
just SSB.
>
>Sorry, but that pig has no wings ...

I have no idea what that is supposed to mean.
>
>1st CW can go virtually anywhere now.

Sure - but does it? How much routine CW is there in the 'phone bands? Virtually
none.
The 'phone bands are effectively off-limits to CW except for very special
cases, such as the
SSB QSO that fades and the ops continue on CW to finish up, or to coordinate
QSY to a
more useful QRG.

>2nd, CW usage (considering relative bandwidths) doesn't
>need or justify such a setaside.

So how much would be justified? I tossed out those numbers as a talking point. They're not
carved in stone anywhere.

>And finally, that would be a major, crippling loss for the
>digital modes ...

How? What's the current use of digital modes on HF by hams? What would be a reasonable
amount?

>perhaps something that some CW
>enthusiasts would like, but NOT a good thing for the
>future.

Not at all.
>
>As I said, leaving CW/narrowband_data as they are
>would be FAR preferable (and more realistic) than
>Jim's 35/15/50 proposal.

I disagree.
>
>While I don't support restricting CW usage, I would
>NEVER support such a setaside, either.

None at all?

73 de Jim, N2EY

403. Re: Len's issues with NCI and ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 13:29:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020304082956.26473.00001517@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36395

>Subject: Re: Len's issues with NCI and ARRL
>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>Date: 3/3/2002 12:59 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3c827556_1@news7.fast.net>

>I do not, nor did I have, any reason to doubt Len's word ... I
>only stated that I don't understand why he's had a problem.

And I thought you did so very effectively. I understood the problem and
your explanation of the circumstances. Why did Lennie take three pages to go
into another "the world doesn't like me" dissertation?

>[snipped some Steve comments WRT Len's stability that
>I felt were gratuitous insults that lent nothing to the substance
>of the thread]

Nothing is "gratuitous" about insulting Lennie. HIS every post is a
gratuitous insult of you, me and everyone who is a Licesned Amateur Radio
operator. He deserves every last bit of it back.

73

Steve, K4YZ

404. Re: Morse as an "essential element" in emergencies (new thread title)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 16:25:44 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c83a0ac_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36399

Furthermore, there was EXTENSIVE use of 802.11b devices
at "ground zero" in the aftermath of Sept. 11th ... not by hams,
of course, but lots of use ...

As has been pointed out repeatedly, there is no legitimate
reason why hams CAN'T make good use of such existing
technologies.

Carl - wa6vse

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020304065429.16980.00001565@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson)
>
> >Makes sense to me. Assuming hams would be effective at providing
> >message services in emergencies when they've had little practice at
> >doing so in non-emergency situations would be like assuming hams would
> >be effective at using IEEE 802.11 devices to provide Internet
connectivity
> >or other data connectivity services in an emergency when they've had
> >little or no experience at doing this in non-emergency situations.
> >Unfortunately Part 97 rules make it hard to even "contrive" connectivity
> >that would simulate the real thing in the latter case, so hams might be
> >better off yielding to those who've been getting real-life experience
> >under Part 15 when the emergency happens.
>
> Why do you believe that Part 97 does not permit connectivity using IEEE
802.11b
> devices? The only possible limitation I see is that some of the internet
> content would not be permitted under Part 97.
>
> >I hence still
> >think these bands are of little use to amateurs under Part 97 with its
> >current constraints on encryption of content and that, without changes
> >to Part 97, the public interest is probably best served by allowing the
> >use of the bands for applications which don't have these constraints.
>
> The IEEE 802.11b devices can run un-encrypted.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

405. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 16:38:26 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c83a3af_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36400

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020304081023.17584.00000358@mb-ct.aol.com...
> In article <3C82B9F3.27A9DAE5@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
> >That idea must have escaped while I was looking the other way!
>
> It's just an idea.
> >
> > 35 percent of a band devoted to CW is pretty outrageous.
>
> Why?

Because there's absolutely NO need for such a setaside and
it would be a very inefficent use of spectrum (when frequencies
were not being used by CW users, they would be forced to lie
fallow)

> If 35% is too much, what would be a reasonable number?

I've suggested that I could support making the bottom 25 kHz
"CW ONLY" ... but certainly no more than that. I don't think a
"setaside" is necessary at all, but this was suggested in a
sprit of compromise ... now you want to take 35% of the bands
for "CW ONLY" ??? No way!

> > What exactly is the rationale for such a chunk of a band being set
> >aside for this.
>
> Simple.
>
> - Without a code test, there will be lots of hams on the air who
don't know
> the code and can't tell that they are interfering with a Morse/CW
station

That is absurd ... one doesn't need to know how to decode Morse
in their head to recognize that it's there and avoid transmitting on
that frequency ... you're grasping a straws now.

> - Just as narrow and wide modes don't mix well, automated and manual
modes

> don't mix well.

On what basis do you make that assertion? In both cases there is
some "intelligence" involved in making the decision to transmit on
a given frequency or not ... in fact, in the case of the digital
modes,
there are two levels ... first, the operator can listen/watch the
spectrum
display to determine if a frequency is occupied, second, the machine
can listen before transmit and make a further determination ...

That some operators (either CW or digital) choose to ignore
the fact that a channel is occupied is a matter of poor operating
practice, which may be a matter for enforcement ... it does NOT
justify chopping the bands up into all sorts of mode-specific
enclaves with the result that otherwise usable frequencies go
unused.

The FCC already rejected this when the ARRL asked that
bandplans effectively be codified ... they also rejected it
when the CSVHFS asked for more "protection" for weak
signal modes ...

Once again, this pig has no wings ...

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPIOi/pe+N6+q84HiEQK/lQCgh6iKZ+HyY7iqC0zymMeIXPgRxekAoO9B
sQNI4tfBqKCb1btg2whSMkKn
=Ibkz
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

406. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 16:48:11 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c83a5fd_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36401

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020304081023.17584.00000357@mb-ct.aol.com...
> In article <3c82dff7_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>
> >"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> >news:3C82B9F3.27A9DAE5@adelphia.net...
> >> That idea must have escaped while I was looking the other way!
> >>
> >> 35 percent of a band devoted to CW is pretty outrageous.
> >
> >I agree completely.
> >
> >> Considering that CW has a smaller BW requirement,
> >
> >Yes, MUCH smaller ...
>
> Interesting to see the virtues of the mode finally being
acknowledged.

I don't recall ever disputing the fact that OOK Morse has a
relatively low occupied bandwidth ... there is more to "virtues"
than simply that ...

> >> it is like setting aside *most* of the band for CW.
> >
> >Some CW enthusiasts seem to think that they outnumber
> >all of the users of all other modes ...
>
> Is that the criteria? What will you say if the SSB folks want 70, 80
or 90%
> of the band, claiming they are the most numerous?

Just an observation of how things tend to be slanted by Morse
enthusiasts in the direction that "they are the only thing of
importance or that counts."

No ... I've stated publicly that I would NOT support an expansion
of SSB sub-bands.

> >> I don't think it accounts for the increasing popularity of the
digital
> >> modes like psk31 either.
```

> >
> >It certainly doesn't ... that's why I would oppose it vigorously.
> >(I would also oppose phone band expansion for the same
> >reason ...)
>
> Even though SSB is #1 in popularity?

Good spectrum managment (like good public policy) is NOT
based on a "popularity contest amongst the current incumbents."

> >> What exactly is the rationale for such a chunk of a band being
set
> >> aside for this.
> >
> >I guess it's wishful thinking on Jim's part ...
>
> It's a idea, nothing more.

It's a BAD idea ...

> > as I said, I could still
> >personally go along with a very small chunk of CW ONLY (like the
> >bottom 25 kHz of the major bands as I had originally proposed
> >and Cecil mentioned),
>
> Then you agree in principle - it's just the amount that's the issue.

I said "I could go along with it." That was an attempt at showing
a spirit of compromise and to convince the CW folks that there
is NOT an "agenda" to eliminate Morse USE.

I don't think it's necessary, nor is it really good spectrum
management,
but I could compromise for a SMALL slice like that.

> > but NO WAY would I EVER go along with
> >setting aside 35% of the band ... that's ABSURD.
> >
> Why all the shouting, Carl? You're sure getting worked up over an
> idea - a suggestion - a talking point. Why all the fuss?

Because it appears that YOU have an agenda to make a rather
large "spectrum grab" for CW ONLY use ... and I oppose that
idea VEHMENTLY because, as I said, it's bad spectrum management
and bad public policy.

Are you just trolling, knowing that such an outrageous proposal
would meet with stiff resistance from me?

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

```
iQA/AwUBPIOlNZe+N6+q84HiEQLWZQCgnaLf4WstC3e0urMdIF1AuAlC3ssAoNSf
D/gB7VUWi6SvY1ipPTj678bL
=It/K
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

407. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 16:53:23 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020304115323.09689.00002585@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 36402

>Once again, this pig has no wings ...
>
>Carl - wa6vse

Thats right Pig, you cant FLY.

408. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 16:59:34 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c83a8ad_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36403

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020304081025.17584.00000359@mb-ct.aol.com...
> In article <3c8272b0_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
> >And what of Jim's proposal to set aside 35% of the HF bands
> >for "CW ONLY," 15% for digital, and 50% for SSB ?????
>
> That is incorrect. You have misquoted me.
>
> The 50% is for analog voice and image. Includes SSB, SSTV, AM, NFM,
etc. Not
> just SSB.

Excuse me ... I believe (but may be recalling incorrectly) that
your text said "35% CW/15% digital/50% phone" ... it is correct
that the other "wider band" modes are also permitted in the
upper parts of (most of) the HF bands ... that wasn't really the
issue ... the issue was your proposal to set aside 35% of the
bands for CW ONLY.

> >Sorry, but that pig has no wings ...
>
> I have no idea what that is supposed to mean.

To explain ... the idea is a pig, an having no wings, it won't fly ..

> >1st CW can go virtually anywhere now.
>
> Sure - but does it? How much routine CW is there in the 'phone
bands? Virtually
> none.
> The 'phone bands are effectively off-limits to CW except for very
special
> cases, such as the
> SSB QSO that fades and the ops continue on CW to finish up, or to
coordinate
> QSY to a
> more useful QRG.
>
> >2nd, CW usage (considering relative bandwidths) doesn't
> >need or justify such a setaside.
>
> So how much would be justified? I tossed out those numbers as a

talking point.
> They're not carved in stone anywhere.

No CW ONLY setaside is justified (or necessary).
(remember, I'm NOT suggesting taking anything AWAY from CW
users ... just objecting to your bad idea)

> >And finally, that would be a major, crippling loss for the
> >digital modes ...
>
> How? What's the current use of digital modes on HF by hams?
> What would be a reasonable amount?

Current use is not the only issue ... future use is also a
consideration.
A reasonable amount would be "as it is now." The current situation
provides the flexibility for usage patterns to adapt to conditions of
the moment, and also allows for long-term changes in usage patterns
without having to go back through the time-consuming process of
getting the FCC rules changed.

> >perhaps something that some CW
> >enthusiasts would like, but NOT a good thing for the
> >future.
>
> Not at all.

I agree ... it's not at all a good thing for the future.

> >As I said, leaving CW/narrowband_data as they are
> >would be FAR preferable (and more realistic) than
> >Jim's 35/15/50 proposal.
>
> I disagree.

Have fun trying to convince the FCC, since they've rejected
the idea of codifying sub-band by mode usage several times
recently.

> >While I don't support restricting CW usage, I would
> >NEVER support such a setaside, either.
>
> None at all?

Again, I said I would "go along with" the lower 25 kHz of the
major HF bands ... as a compromise, not because it's necessary,
despite the fact that it's actually not good spectrum management.

That is ABSOLUTELY as far as I would be willing to stretch in
terms of any sort of CW ONLY setaside.

Carl - wa6vse

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPIOn8Ze+N6+q84HiEQLuGQCg4qGiE3crEPIU9sipjAaZwqRvexEAn2No
V1VV6wU1ZZ4XtkD9pziz9nG9
=wia/
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

409. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 17:03:58 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c83a9c0_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36404

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020304081020.17584.00000355@mb-ct.aol.com...
> In article <3c82e728_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020303211404.20827.00000336@mb-mj.aol.com...
> >> In article <3c824edc_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >>
> >> I think experience is part of the qualification. Just my opinion.
> >
> >We disagree ...
>
> OK, fine. It's just an idea.
>
> > I believe that demonstrating technical
> >competence by passing the test is sufficient
>
> Just technical competence? What about regs, safety, operating procedures,
etc.
> ?
>
> >and artificial
> >waiting periods are nothing more than an elitist pile of
> >crap that discriminates against qualified newcomers.
>
> Why all the name calling over an IDEA?
>
> >You're trying to "make up for" the loss of the Morse
> >test by adding another unnecessary barrier, plain and
> >simple.
>
> Nope. I just think practical experience should be part of the
requirements.
> You don't. Why all the fuss?
> >
> >I think the FCC will agree with me ...
>
> Probably. A newcomer could simply toss the license in the drawer for a
> year. Plus it would increase the number of interactions with the FCC and
VEs.
>
> >> > I *also*
> >> >believe that the FCC would have problems with this in legal terms

> >as
> >> >a form of discriimination against otherwise qualified individuals.
> >>
> >> Why? How is it discriminatory to require some experience?
> >
> >Because it treats equally competent/qualified individuals
> >differently on the basis of an arbitrary requirement.
>
> Depends how you measure competency. Which is a
> subjective, opinion-based thing in the first place.
>
> >I think the FCC will agree with me ...
>
> They didn't agree for many years. And if they will agree, why are you
> getting so worked up over a simple idea?
> >
> >> >PLEASE NOTE that as an Extra, "I've got mine" and would "map"
> >> >to what you call First Class ... so I have nothing personally to
> >gain
> >> >by objecting to this "time in grade, have to wait a year before you
> >> >can upgrade" thing ...
> >>
> >> I've been an Extra for 32 years, Carl.
> >
> >I've been an RF engineer for 32+ years ...
>
> You were an RF engineer when you were 19?
>
> >don't expect me to bow down to your "superiority."
>
> I don't - I was simply pointing out that I already "had mine", too.
>
> Don't expect me to "bow down" to your "superiority" either.
> >
> >> >> Bands are divided into subbands by mode type - CW, digital,
> >analog
> >> >phone/image.
> >> >> Typical division 35/15/50% of a band
> >> >
> >> >Wait a minute ... now you're trying to carve out a 35% set-aside
> >for
> >> >"CW ONLY" ????
> >>
> >> Sure - why not?
> >
> >Because it's an outrageous proposal ...
>
> Why? You agreed to an exclusive 25 kHz at the bottom of the band - all
> we're discussig is a percentage.
>

> >CW and other narrowband
> >modes have shared the lower parts of the HF bands for many, many
> >years.
>
> "we've always done it this way", you mean.
>
> > Now you want 35% EXCLUSIVELY for CW ... I DON'T THINK
> >SO!!!!!!!
>
> But you don't give any reasons - you just shout. Interesting.
>
> >I think the FCC will agree with me ...
>
> >> >And only allowing 15% for digital????
> >>
> >> Yep. Why not?
> >
> >Because it's totally inadequate and you damned well know it.
>
> Ah, the cussing starts.
>
> >You just want to stifle the growth of digital modes because you
> >know deep in your heart that Morse ultimately won't be as
> >attractive and you want to "lock down" enough turf "all for yourself."
>
> Nope. I just want some room, that's all.
>
> Sounds like you're saying what you really want to happen.
>
> >I DON'T THINK SO!!!!!
> >I think the FCC will agree with me ...
> >
> >> The PSK31 folks say that mode is only 50 Hz wide. Cecil drools over
> >PACTOR II,
> >> saying it's about as wide as CW but much faster. Plus dynamic
> >allocation of
> >> frequencies and all that.
> >>
> >> Plus HF digital isn't all that common on the ham bands compared to
> >CW or SSB.
> >
> >It's growing a LOT faster than you'd like to admit ...
>
> How much digital did you use to work those 70+ countries and 40+
> states, Carl? You bragged about your results but won't tell what modes
> were used. Was that a "do as I say, not as I do"?
>
> > you're AFRAID
> >that
> >Morse can't cut the mustard, that's all.

>
> So all modes must compete as if in a battle? Why not simply allow all
> modes everywhere?
>
> >> >I DON'T THINK
> >> >SO!!! That is TOTALLY unreasonable and inconsistent with the
> >> >realities
> >> >and the needs for the future.
> >>
> >> Ah, I see."Nobody wants to ban CW", huh? Just take away the usable
> >spectrum
> >> for the mode a little at a time until the CW folks have nowhere to
> >go.
> >
> >NOBODY is "taking ANYTHING away from" Morse ... I stated before
> >that I would not support ANY reduction in the amount of spectrum
> >where Morse is permitted in the HF bands. NONE, ZIP, NADA ...
> >now you want to take 35% EXCLUSIVELY for Morse????
> >I DON'T THINK SO!!!!!!
>
> The phone bands are effectively off-limits to routine Morse. So are the
places
> where digital foks congregate.
> >
> >> >Since CW requires ~0.1 the bandwidth of
> >> >SSB, your proposed "split" would indicate approximately (35*10)=350
> >> >CW users for every 50 SSB users ... that is TOTALLY ridiculous and
> >> >unreasonable.
> >>
> >> Why? Should we reward the users of wider modes by giving them more
> >spectrum?
> >
> >The way things are, Morse users have access to ALL of the HF spectrum
> >Phone users have access to only about 50% ... since there are
> >arguably
> >more phone users than Morse users, the situation would ALREADY be
> >WAY inbalanced in preferential treatment for Morse ... now you want
> >MORE???
> >I DON'T THINK SO!!!!!!
> >I think the FCC will agree with me ...
>
> You sure do like to cut and paste.
> >
> >> >I would say "CW is still allowed EVERYWHERE it is allowed today,
> >but
> >> >it certainly doesn't deserve an INCREASED status over what it has
> >now,
> >> >either." The lower parts of the bands (now
> >> >CW/narrowband_digital_modes)
> >> >could remain that way.

> >>
> >> I'm looking to the future. Those rules are from when there were only
> >a few
> >> digital modes, and when all hams could be expected to understand CW.
> >That
> >> won't be the case in the future. Gotta accept change, Carl.
> >
> >I am ... you aren't ...
>
> Then why are you so reluctant to even discuss change in a calm,
> rational fashion? You're defending the status quo.
>
> > you must be smoking something funny if you
> >think that Morse deserves 35% EXCLUSIVE use of the HF bands.
>
> Nope.
>
> Ever hear of "brainstorming", Carl? Where people just toss out ideas and
> they get kicked around and maybe something useful pops out? One of the
> key rules is that ALL ideas, no matter how weird, are discussed calmly.
Most
> brainstorm ideas are found to be impractical, of course, but the 'stormers
are
> not
> attacked for coming up with weird ideas.
>
> When I see "elitist pile of crap" and "wacky" and "smoking something
funny",
> it kinda makes me wonder...
> >
> >> >The "phone bands" should NOT be expanded, but should allow the
> >> >use of wider bandwidth digital techniques (digital voice, imaging,
> >and
> >> >higher speed data, for example) in addition to SSB/SSTV.
> >>
> >> Why? That would only add to the QRM. Let the digital segment be
> >where
> >> all that stuff resides. Digital modes are robust and spectrum
> >efficient, are
> >> they not?
> >>
> >> If 15% isn't enough, then go for 1/3 CW, 1/6 digital, 1/2
> >phone/image.
> >
> >You've apparently lost you mind ...
>
> Nope. Why all the abuse over an IDEA?
> >
> >> I see a double standard. On the one hand you don't want any
> >"setasides" for

> >> CW, but at the same time you don't want to widen the 'phone bands.
> >> Makes no sense to me.
> >
> >Makes perfect sense ... it's called "dynamic frequency allocation."
>
> Not for the SSB/AM/SSTV folks.
>
> >You want to use Morse, listen for a clear frequency and have at it.
>
> I always do just that - or listen for a CQ.
>
> >You want to operate digital, your modem does the same thing.
> >(In the digital world, it's called CSMA-CA.)
>
> Sure.
> >
> >> I say give each mode type its own backyard. If it's OK to fence in
> >the
> >> phone/image folks, then it's OK to fence in the digital folks too.
> >>
> >I can see how you'd like that, seeing as how your proposal would
> >grant Morse a HUGE, undeserved, unnecessary windfall at the
> >expense of everyone else. The more I think about it, the crazier
> >I think you must be to even have the cajones to even suggest such
> >a thing.
>
> Good to know that ideas can be tossed around without personal attacks.
>
> >> >> Existing Novices and Techs get Third Class, existing Generals and
> >> >Advanceds get
> >> >> Second Class, and existing Extras get First. Existing hams do not
> >> >lose high
> >> >> power privs as long as they retain old license documents.
> >> >
> >> >The mapping from the existing classes to the proposed ones is OK
> >> >with me .... it seems perfectly reasonable ...
> >>
> >> Nobody loses.
> >>
> >Except that everyone but Morse enthusiasts gets royally screwed
> >under your absurd Morse setaside idea ...
> >
> >You've apparently lost it man ... totally lost it ...
> >
> Not me, Carl. I'm calm, cool and collected. Just talking about ideas for
the
> future.
> Maybe some of them are good ideas.
>
> But for simply suggesting these ideas, you call me "wacky", "smoking

something
> funny", "crazy", "apparently lost your mind". The ideas are dismissed as
"an
> elitist pile of crap", "undeserved", "absurd", "discriminatory" and a host
of
> other
> pejoratives.
>
> All because you disagree.
>
> Interesting.
>
> Is this the example you want to set for newcomers?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

410. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 17:36:52 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c83b17d_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36405

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020304081020.17584.00000355@mb-ct.aol.com...
> In article <3c82e728_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020303211404.20827.00000336@mb-mj.aol.com...
> >> In article <3c824edc_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >>
> >> I think experience is part of the qualification. Just my opinion.
> >
> >We disagree ...
>
> OK, fine. It's just an idea.
>
> > I believe that demonstrating technical
> >competence by passing the test is sufficient
>
> Just technical competence? What about regs, safety, operating
procedures, etc.
> ?

I stand corrected ... when I refer to the written tests, I intend
that their entire content be included ... sometimes I tend to
refer to that simply as "technical competence" ... perhaps
a mistake on my part.

>
> >and artificial
> >waiting periods are nothing more than an elitist pile of
> >crap that discriminates against qualified newcomers.
>
> Why all the name calling over an IDEA?

Because its such a BAD idea that it can't help but
evoke an emotional response ... note, however, that
the names were directed at the IDEA, not at individuals.

> >You're trying to "make up for" the loss of the Morse
> >test by adding another unnecessary barrier, plain and
> >simple.
>
> Nope. I just think practical experience should be part of the
```

requirements.
> You don't. Why all the fuss?
> >
> >I think the FCC will agree with me ...
>
> Probably. A newcomer could simply toss the license in the drawer for
a
> year. Plus it would increase the number of interactions with the FCC
and VEs.
>
> >> > I *also*
> >> >believe that the FCC would have problems with this in legal
terms
> >as
> >> >a form of discriimination against otherwise qualified
individuals.
> >>
> >> Why? How is it discriminatory to require some experience?
> >
> >Because it treats equally competent/qualified individuals
> >differently on the basis of an arbitrary requirement.
>
> Depends how you measure competency. Which is a
> subjective, opinion-based thing in the first place.
>
> >I think the FCC will agree with me ...
>
> They didn't agree for many years. And if they will agree, why are
you
> getting so worked up over a simple idea?

Because I hate to see such bad ideas even tossed around
because they will give prospective hams who may read them
the (perhaps correct) idea that some hams would just as soon
erect barriers to keep them out (or at least keep them down,
below their level of ability/interest for as long as possible.)

> >> >PLEASE NOTE that as an Extra, "I've got mine" and would "map"
> >> >to what you call First Class ... so I have nothing personally to
> >gain
> >> >by objecting to this "time in grade, have to wait a year before
you
> >> >can upgrade" thing ...
> >>
> >> I've been an Extra for 32 years, Carl.
> >
> >I've been an RF engineer for 32+ years ...
>
> You were an RF engineer when you were 19?

Actually yes ... but the "+" was an error ... I think of
myself in round numbers as 52, but won't have my
birthday until later this year ... I skipped grades in
school and entered the job market several years
earlier than most ...

> >don't expect me to bow down to your "superiority."
>
> I don't - I was simply pointing out that I already "had mine", too.

OK ... I already knew that ...

> Don't expect me to "bow down" to your "superiority" either.

That was not the intention of my retort ...

> >CW and other narrowband
> >modes have shared the lower parts of the HF bands for many, many
> >years.
>
> "we've always done it this way", you mean.

I mean it's worked and there is no reason to assume
that it won't continue to do so ... besides, flexible usage
of the spectrum = good spectrum management.
> >You just want to stifle the growth of digital modes because you
> >know deep in your heart that Morse ultimately won't be as
> >attractive and you want to "lock down" enough turf "all for
yourself."
>
> Nope. I just want some room, that's all.

You have room NOW ... you have access to ALL of the HF
bands ... no need for a "Morse only setaside."

> > you're AFRAID
> >that
> >Morse can't cut the mustard, that's all.
>
> So all modes must compete as if in a battle? Why not simply allow
all
> modes everywhere?

Why characterize it as a "battle?" Cecil has used the term
"free market" ... as far as allowing all modes everywhere,
that is actually the way MOST of the world does it ... and it
really doesn't seem to have created any real problems.
However, given the history here in the US it's probably not
a politically practical option ... though it could result in better
spectrum utilization from a technical/analytical standpoint.
(Don't get excited ... I'm not proposing it ... I already said I
would not support phone band expansion.)

> >> Ah, I see."Nobody wants to ban CW", huh? Just take away the
usable
> >spectrum
> >> for the mode a little at a time until the CW folks have nowhere
to
> >go.
> >
> >NOBODY is "taking ANYTHING away from" Morse ... I stated before
> >that I would not support ANY reduction in the amount of spectrum
> >where Morse is permitted in the HF bands. NONE, ZIP, NADA ...
> >now you want to take 35% EXCLUSIVELY for Morse????
> >I DON'T THINK SO!!!!!!
>
> The phone bands are effectively off-limits to routine Morse.

While that is a matter of practice, it is not "the law" ... besides,
the lower parts of the band are NOT so "full" with CW that the
CW folks NEED to expand into the upper part of the bands.

> So are the places where digital foks congregate.

How so? It may bea matter of practice, but it is not "the law".
Those frequencies are available for CW use, should you
actually NEED them, as long as there is not already an ongoing
QSO there ...

> Then why are you so reluctant to even discuss change in a calm,
> rational fashion? You're defending the status quo.

It's not so much that I'm "defending the status quo" but
that I'm incensed by your outrageous proposal to set
aside 35% of the HF bands for CW ONLY.

> Ever hear of "brainstorming", Carl? Where people just toss out ideas
and
> they get kicked around and maybe something useful pops out? One of
the
> key rules is that ALL ideas, no matter how weird, are discussed
calmly. Most
> brainstorm ideas are found to be impractical, of course, but the
'stormers are
> not attacked for coming up with weird ideas.

There's a BIG difference between "wierd ideas" and "just plain BAD
ideas."

> When I see "elitist pile of crap" and "wacky" and "smoking something
funny",
> it kinda makes me wonder...

Sorry ... you really pushed a button ... but then, I guess you knew
you would ... maybe it was just a troll to see how hard I'd bite ...

> >> >The "phone bands" should NOT be expanded, but should allow the
> >> >use of wider bandwidth digital techniques (digital voice,
imaging,
> >> >and higher speed data, for example) in addition to SSB/SSTV.
> >>
> >> Why? That would only add to the QRM.

I think that that is a rather rash, unfounded assumption.

> >> I see a double standard. On the one hand you don't want any
> >"setasides" for
> >> CW, but at the same time you don't want to widen the 'phone
bands.
> >> Makes no sense to me.
> >
> >Makes perfect sense ... it's called "dynamic frequency allocation."
>
> Not for the SSB/AM/SSTV folks.

As I said, in purely technical terms, applying dynamic frequency
selection might well be the best solution (it's the norm in the rest
of the world and hasn't caused problems), but I recognize that,
based on US history, it would be a politically unacceptable
solution, at least for the foreseeable future.

> >You want to use Morse, listen for a clear frequency and have at it.
>
> I always do just that - or listen for a CQ.
>
> >You want to operate digital, your modem does the same thing.
> >(In the digital world, it's called CSMA-CA.)
>
> Sure.
> >
> >> I say give each mode type its own backyard. If it's OK to fence
in
> >the
> >> phone/image folks, then it's OK to fence in the digital folks
too.
> >
> >I can see how you'd like that, seeing as how your proposal would
> >grant Morse a HUGE, undeserved, unnecessary windfall at the
> >expense of everyone else. The more I think about it, the crazier
> >I think you must be to even have the cajones to even suggest such
> >a thing.
>
> Good to know that ideas can be tossed around without personal
attacks.

If I tossed out an absurd idea, I would expect to get flamed a bit
for it ... (heck, I get flamed for good ideas :-)

> But for simply suggesting these ideas, you call me "wacky", "smoking
something
> funny", "crazy", "apparently lost your mind". The ideas are
dismissed as "an
> elitist pile of crap", "undeserved", "absurd", "discriminatory" and
a host of
> other
> pejoratives.
>
> All because you disagree.
>
> Interesting.
>
> Is this the example you want to set for newcomers?

I admitted that you pushed my button ... I believe I said "I'm sorry"
above ... if not, I'm saying it here ... congrats for a "gotcha."

I would HOPE, however, that even newcomers would be able
to recognize grossly bad ideas and object to them ...

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPIOwnpe+N6+q84HiEQKkZQCg6GWJB061CumWIxcWKVLrZzjwP4EAoNCP
cP/2QzF81nGgLOG4AthrTcbX
=+AFn
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

411. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 17:51:19 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c83b4e6_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36406

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020304081022.17584.00000356@mb-ct.aol.com...
> In article <3c82ecd0_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020303211411.20827.00000337@mb-mj.aol.com...
> >> wa6vse-shack@fast.net writes:
> >>
> >> >It's as Ed and
> >> >others have observed ... they seem to remember the "tests
> >> >that they took" as being much more rigorous than they
> >> >actually were, view any changes as "dumbing down," and
> >> >resent that newcomers are not subject to the same set of
> >> >limitations and restrictions that they faced as newcomers.
> >>
> >> Since we don't actually have the old tests, it's impossible to
tell
> >> how tough they really were.
> >
> >I took the full general 25 years ago at the FCC field office
> >in Long Beach, CA ...
>
> But you didn't pass it. The "full general" included the 13 wpm code
test.

You know PERFECTLY well that I was talking about
the written tests ...

> > the writtens up through general today
> >are, IMHO (as an RF engineer and long-time holder of a
> >commerical license) not any easier than the "old" test.
>
> It's the method. If a person knows the stuff, they're not much
different.
>
> I took the full Advanced in the summer of 1968 and passed first try
- - code
> and written. That was when I was 14. The old pre-restructuring Extra
has been
> passed by at least one third-grader.
> >
```

> >> The issue of "dumbing down" is not about what it takes for
newcomers
> >to
> >> get started, but what it takes for more/full privileges. The
> >requirements for
> >> full privileges used to be more rigorous than they are now - and
I'm
> >not just
> >> talking about the code tests.
> >
> >Other than the "pig without wings" idea of "time in grade"
> >requirements (which the FCC abandoned years ago),
> >there are lots of people who disagree ... people who took
> >the old tests.
>
> So? It's just an idea - a talking point.
>
> Carl, you sure do seem to get agitated over new ideas that don't
agree
> with your version of How It Ought To Be.

I get "agitated" over ideas that I believe to be TRULY
bad for the future of ham radio ...

> >> >I'm NOT saying that rank beginners should have FULL
> >> >privileges ... just that they should have enough, with
> >> >sensible, justifiable limits based on their demonstrated
> >> >level of technical knowledge, that the ARS is, in fact,
> >> >interesting and they don't feel like they are being treated
> >> >as 2nd class citizens who are reviled and looked down on
> >> >by "their superiors."
> >>
> >> Sure. But what constitutes adequate knowledge for full
privileges?
> >> How is it demonstrated?
> >
> >By passing the tests prescribed by the FCC ... NOT by
> >"proving one's self" to "one's superiors" by "paying one's
> >dues" with stupid, arbitrary "time in grade" requirements.
>
> The FCC didn't think they were "stupid" or "arbitrary" for a very
> long time.
> >
> >> >Nobody is trying to "ban Morse useage" ... I think you know
> >> >that.
> >>
> >> From what I have read on this NG the past several years, I am
> >convinced
> >> that some folks want Morse/CW use to end. Not just the test - the
> >mode
> >> itself.

> >
> >Like who??? Name some names ... call 'em out ...
>
> Remember Mark Morgan, KB9RQZ? He comes to mind.

One person who I don't recall having seen here in some
time ... do you think Mark has the influence to eliminate
amateur's ability to use Morse?

> >it's certainly not me, nor NCI ...
>
> So you say. But the name is "no code international" not "no code
test..."
>
> Freudian slip showing?

No ...we've been down that road many times before ...
been asked and answered over and over ad nauseum ...

> > exactly WHO wants
> >to "end Morse/CW use???" And even if there were
> >one or two, or even a dozen, that fanatical about it,
> >do you REALLY believe they could muster enough
> >influence with the FCC to pull it off???
>
> There was a time when folks who opposed the code TEST would have
been
> dismissed with exactly those words.
>
> Fact is, some folks DO want Morse/CW to disappear from the ham
bands.

Maybe a very few individuals, but I don't see ANY evidence
of any sort of organized effort in that direction ... plus, do
you REALLY think the FCC would ban Morse (after all, there's
no good reason to do so ...)??? I certainly don't believe they
would even consider it.

> >I guarantee you that "they" couldn't, even if "they"
> >existed ... are you seeing black helicopters, too???
>
> Somehow I don't find such guarantees very reassuring, Carl ;-)

Whatever ... I'm just telling you the political realities as I
see them ... take 'em or leave 'em ... your choice ... but
what's the sense in getting people all worked up over
something that isn't likely to happen in my grandchildren's
lives?

> >> >There is "room for the old" in terms of what people
> >> >choose to use ...
> >> >
> >> >There is NOT room for the old in terms of: "It's always been

> >> >this way, we've always used ____ and we don't want no
> >> >stinking ____ taking up space in the bands;"
> >>
> >> I agree!
> >
> >Based on your proposal for 35% Morse only setaside,
> >apparently you agree with the part in quotes, not the
> >whole sentence that rebukes the part in quotes.
>
> Nope. The idea of a Morse-only subband on HF is a new thing. But it
> seems to get you all riled up.

Sure does when you're talking 35% at the expense of the future
and that it's completely unnecessary ...

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPIO0C5e+N6+q84HiEQJIowCgnQkhAeLwHbwKjxISzktpdTrgII0AoMff
SJ67HZ9LDN3NHM8cd10HuTuQ
=P/im
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

412. Gee, This Frequency Looks Open

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 18:03:33 UTC
From: Jammer <how@dumb.ny>
Message-ID: <Xns91C766147C6C7321newsguy@209.155.56.100>
Source record: 36407

February 15, 2002

Mr. Thomas D. Batista
10124 45 Avenue
Corona, NY 11368

Mr. Gerardo Arias
278 Sharpe Avenue
Staten Island, NY 10302

RE: Amateur Radio licenses KC2DDD, N2IFU--Repeater Operation

Dear Messrs Batista and Arias:

It has come to our attention that you are operating an uncoordinated repeater with an output on 147.020 MHz and input on 143.020 MHz. The frequency 143.020 MHz is not allocated to the Amateur Radio Service. Our information also indicates that you use this repeater as a reverse auto-patch, that it is not being identified, and that it is causing interference to coordinated repeaters

Section 97.205 of the Commission's rules states that where there is interference between a coordinated and an uncoordinated repeater, "the licensee of the uncoordinated repeater has primary responsibility to resolve the interference." Operation on 143.020 MHz unlicensed is a violation of Section 312 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and will result in fine or imprisonment.

Section 308(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. Section 308(b), gives the Commission the authority to request information from a licensee regarding the operation of a radio station. Accordingly, you are requested to respond to this letter within 20 days from the above date, furnishing: 1) full details about the operation of the repeater; 2) the identity of control operators, if any; 3) the call signs of the users; 4) names and addresses of any unlicensed users; and 5) the location of the repeater. If the repeater is located on property that you do not own or rent, state the name and address of the landlord or site manager.

Address your response to 1270 Fairfield Road at the above letterhead address, and please be advised that Congress has made punishable a willfully false or misleading reply to a letter of this type. See Title 18, Section 1001 of the United States Code.

413. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 19:02:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020304140207.08443.00000421@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 36408

In article <a5td73qsq1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020302160937.03941.00000492@mb-ck.aol.com...
>> In article <20020302064800.26453.00001185@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
>(W1RFI)
>> writes:
>>
>> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >
>> >>Neither I nor any other non-insider
>> >>knows what is said, communicated between the FCC and
>> >>organizations in private...yet all organizations insist the public
>> >>should believe them.
>> >
>> >Sure you know what is communicated, Len. The law requires that a
>> >summary of any Ex Parte communication be filed into the public record.
>Such
>> >summary is required to contain the essence of what was presented. Both
>the
>> >ARRL and NCI Ex Parte presentations were summarized in great detail.
>>
>> One may argue the "summary" and "essence" but that is still a
>> subjective viewpoint when there is no confirmation to the exact
>> presentation from a third party.
>>
>> Skeptics have justifiable fuel for suspicion from several areas. As
>> an example, take the minutes of the IWG-6 concerning Agenda Items
>> 1.7.1 through 1.7.3. The September 2001 minutes were not posted
>> until FOUR MONTHS LATER. The January 24, 2002 meeting minutes
>> were not posted until March 1, 2002. The "scribe" for IWG-6 is allied
>> with the ARRL.
>
>WHO has the "ownership" of making sure notes are published? That woiuld
>seem to be the FCC. If YOU have a complaint as to timliness of
>meeting minutes, perhaps you need to direct that complaint to the proper
>entity responsible.

I have. :-)

>Ditto my prior comment. Neither NCI nor ARRL have official
>responsibility to publish the notes/,eetings, etc.

Nobody said so. :-) But you damn well know that every
involved organization is going to take credit for it all later. :-)

>As before, take you gripe to the feds.

Wah, wah, wah. Yes, I have. :-)

>> No specifics were given, only standard boilerplate
>> assurances of honest, dilligence, and hard work.
>
>Which, you are free to belive or not.

Well, thankyew most kindly, but I think I've been able to do that
for a very long time already. :-)

>Your problem, again, seems to be more with the federal
>process than anything else.

Thankyew again for instant divination of my thinking-motivation-
whatever processes but those aren't correct. :-)

Let's see...I was talking about the WAC documentation at the
FCC International Bureau website, mentioned the "scribe" of
IWG-6, and stated who got "credit" for a complete change of
preliminary views of S25.1 through S25.6, the IARU.

Yes, indeedy, a FEDERAL agency! Also a couple of
organizations which do not get to vote at any world radio
conference. Did I mention NCI at all? No.

>Maybe no one else cared enough to want to see it.

That is indeed a possibility, absolutely, total agreement.

Are you saying that all else are "sheep" or too lazy to go
look? Are they sluffing off such tasks and letting the Big
Brothers do all they work for them? That doesn't look good
for their supposed "committment" to the ARS "community,"
does it?

>Those are the current buzzwords used whenever someone disagrees
>with the position taken. On Madison Avenue its called marketing.
>Should Ford offer its competitors equivalent "reporting" when
>Ford advertises what it is doing in development?

I've walked along Madison Avenue in NYC and driven a few Ford
vehicles elsewhere in the country. :-)

Let's summarize a large membership organization (having about
the same membership as the Academy of Model Aeronautics
and the same services...but underwrites far more insurance).

The ARRL is a private membership organization having a special
interest in amateur radio. The ARRL must sustain itself as an
organization with some means of funding to pay permanent staff,
its overhead (facilities, equipment, utilities, etc.), legal co$ts

(billings from a legal firm in DC). Judging from a prodigious amount of goods on sale, that is obtained largely from publication sales and resale of goods (mostly publications).

The membership magazine should be, and seems, self-sustaining through advertising sales so this is not a major source of ARRL operating revenue. Note: As a membership periodical it can claim a definite demographic group as proof of readership; newsstand or store sales are stated as less than 8 percent. Membership dues pay for the brunt of "fulfillment" costs, mailings to "subscribers." All other periodicals cost extra.

While ARRL publications and products may be ordered direct from Newington, there is always a "shipping and handling" charge in addition to the product cost. The product cost is the same as in-store price but an in-store purchase has no "shipping and handling" charge. The Ham Radio Outlet chain offers a large number of ARRL periodicals and one has to assume that HRO is in business to make a profit. If HRO can make a profit without charging "shipping and handling" to a customer, then one can safely assume that the break-even cost to the ARRL on any product or publication is lower than the stated cost to any direct purchaser. But ARRL ups the direct cost by the "shipping and handling" charge. That's definitely a profit on goods situation.

A better evidence of altruism would be to absorb shipping and handling costs if the direct sales prices are the same as over-the-counter prices. There is no "service to the membership" if they demand more money than stores to sell the same goods.

The above was an example. It is not a complaint. It is an illustration that the ARRL's so-often stated claims of altruism and "service to amateur radio" is a teeny bit towards the hypocritical. It is NOT altruistic in EVERY "service" it provides the radio amateur...yet the statements of the ARRL in all its publications and periodicals is that it DOES provide a "service." Is the "service" one of taking MORE money from its members or prospective members?

Somewhere, somehow the ARRL *MUST* sustain itself. It calls itself a "non-profit organization" but that is for legal purposes, taxation and so forth. Obviously, it DOES make a profit on publishing and resale of goods. It shouldn't pretend to be in the fabric business by trying to pull wool over others' eyes.

Ed Hare likes to bring up all the Directors and their unpaid "service" such as attending meetings in different US cities. What is always (conveniently?) left out of the mention is costs of travel, lodging, meals, rental of the meeting place, and other incidentals. None of those are free and nobody has pointed out their staying at a Motel 6 or eating at a MacDonalds for meals. One has to assume that VIAs (Very Important Amateurs) travel and stay "comfortably."

Someone or some organization pays for that. :-)

The ARRL assures everyone that these traveling Directors "give of their free time." That's believable. If that "free" stuff includes their paying for travel, lodging, meals, etc. out of their own pocket, then that becomes suspect. Altruism is a noble attribute, but continued claims of near-total altruism just isn't believable.

There are several areas where the ARRL is not consistent between claiming all that altruism and being a not-for-profit corporation which is obviously making a profit as a publisher and reseller. That's like saying a professional legal firm is working ENTIRELY pro bono (for no fee to client) all these years in DC. :-)

>Who cares, so what. It isn't the role or responsibility of ARRL
>to promote or report on the history of every club that exists
>or existed.

No one is asking that. I simply pointed out that the ARRL just doesn't acknowledge that an older radio club (the first one in the world) even exists. :-)

>As part of the car club I belong to, we do NOT mention other
>clubs that might compete for our members. WHY should we?

1. To show your club is "better," to bring car afficionados to your club instead of another one.

2. If you maintain a car museum, have a legal representative in Washington lobbying for auto laws, publish books about cars, and have a have a lot of "car services," and then say you are ten kinds of good people about auto afficionado-ing, it would seem right by example. :-)

>No outrage at all. Indeed, for you to EXPECT every public
>report by any organization to not be positioned in the best light
>for that organization is pretty simplistic.

The only "expectation" I have is for the ARRL to quit its schizophrenia of being an altruistic goods dealer with overtones of religious fanaticsm in being Big Brother.

One place to start is to reword article Two of The Amateur's Code...or reorganize as a religious order.

Another place to begin is for them to quit "talking down" to everyone in regards to everything from radio technical knowledge and the constant implications of it knowing what is best for the hobby. The rest of the radio world is NOT composed of impressionable teen-agers who have little exposure to radio.

ARRL membership seems to remain static at 170 K, less than a quarter of all licensed US radio amateurs. That

membership seems to be largely a core of long-timers, of Believers, of those content to let Big Brother do all the detail work. That isn't a good image and continual evangelism in the same manner is not winning new converts.

>I await the responses.

That is doubtful. Few bother to get involved, preferring to sit back, don't-bother-me-disdain spouted while they play in contests, or remain in the twilight zone of some fantasy world of their imagination and nostalgia of long ago. Some even come into this chat room to demonstrate how good and noble they are from a lifetime of devotion to Morseodism. :-)

A very few get their horns honked by others and cannot stand the noise. They honk back in irritation as if their horn is the only horn with any quality, are upset that so few recognize an unquestionable atrribute of theirs. QRM and QRN. :-)

Beep, beep

414. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 19:02:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020304140210.08443.00000422@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 36409

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gsd6wdd.pminews@news.earthlink.net>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>On 02 Mar 2002 22:27:45 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>>The NTIA routinely monitors spectral occupancy and signal
>>content in urban areas, recording such for days at a time.
>>NTIA reports are forwarded to the FCC. Those reports are
>>publicly available and downloadable from the NTIA website.
>>Full details of the monitoring equipment and recordings are
>>included.
>
> The FCC Spectrum Task Force did those surveys in the early 1970s and
> said reports proved to be totally useless absent content intercepts.
> Typical problems where electrical noise or intermods showing up as
> "occupancies", low-power or distant transmitters not triggering the
> sophisticated receiving equipment, and lots of "empty" air time on
> emergency channels (fire, rescue, etc) when there were no disasters to
> handle. In some cases the "regular" field office engineers had to go
> out to resolve "stuck carriers" which turned out to be electrical
> noise or overload at the receiving site.
>
> So they conned the NTIA into doing it, eh?

Phil, there was no "conning" evidence that I see. What I DO see is another in series of "I was there" thirty years ago, "we did all the dirty work, etc.". Let's review some history -

The NTIA wasn't created until 1978. In that creation the Office of Telecommunications Policy (OTP) became a part of the new NTIA. The OTP itself was created in 1970.

In 1995 and 1996 the NTIA sent its RSMS (Radio Survey Measurement System) truck to L.A., San Francisco, Denver, San Diego, and Atlanta. Except for Atlanta, each site was surveyed for a two-week period, 24 hours a day. In Atlanta the area was monitored before, during, and after the Summer Olympics, a period longer than two weeks. The truck and its equipment is perhaps best described in the Los Angeles survey report, NTIA 97-336. That report includes pictures and drawings of the truck and the software description for measurement and logging. The L.A. spectrum was surveyed from 108 MHz to 22 GHz. Feel free to put on your PE hat and review the report. Caution, some of the survey instrumentation did not exist in the 1970s.

Anyone may access a number of different reports I quoted, download them all for free by going to the home page www.ntia.doc.gov and

clicking on the left button "Publications." From there one can go to the Internet-accessible documents or the full list from 1978 onwards. For those not accessible through the Internet, NTIS can be contacted for an at-cost copy.

> Your taxpayers' dollars at work.....

I think it is well worth the taxpayer dollars. Radio waves do not owe any allegiance to any particular radio service. All radio services have to share EM spectrum. ONE agency to survey one locality detecting ALL users in a broad spectrum seems reasonable and logical. In putting on my "engineer's hat" and reviewing the NTIA RSMS description, I found no fault in the system parked up on Oat Mountain in Los Angeles for two weeks 7 years ago.

The alternative seems to be some hit-or-miss gobbling from long-timers well away from an area (much, much farther away than line-of-sight) who have no calibrated equipment or recording apparatus. I'm sure your mileage varies.

1970 was 32 years ago. 1995 was 7 years ago. The NTIA didn't exist until 1978, 24 years ago. Get the picture or do you want to "roar" some more?

On several reports, even in the 1993 Fed Standards on ALE and RF Modems, Fed Std 1045A and 1052, respectively, the report makers cite up front the advancing nature of radio technology and that new technology will come to pass to make some of the report conclusions obsolete...at which time they will update standards and reports to reflect changes. Which is better, doing a survey at a given date, establishing a standard at a given date, or grousing about older times, ways, and "we did it then" without specifics?

Times change. Eleven years ago the number of US households with Internet access was ZERO. In 2001 fully HALF of all US households have some form of Internet access. That varies from about 15% of households with aggregate reported income of $5K or less annually to about 85% with reported income over $70K. The Internet is growing worldwide as fast as cellular telephony, giving ALL a link to the rest of the world never before possible.

415. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 19:34:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C83CC42.FA3B5E14@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36410

Richard McCollum wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C82FE84.2E5871F6@worldnet.att.net...
> > W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> > >
> > > >ARE you kidding? She "exposes" it every time she signs it, either
> here or on
> > > >the air
> > > >There's no way, as you well know, that Larry or anyone else comes
> close to
> > > >that
> > > >
> > > >level of "exposure".
> > >
> > > Do you really think that DE <callsign> is as much exposure as
> paragraph after
> > > paragraph discussing that callsign? Or making up cute names for her
> using that
> > > callsign? You chose do do that, Dick, and you chose to give it
> exposure by
> > > posting it.
> >
> > I guess we all could do the ARRL thing and just stick our heads in the
> sand,
> > ignore her
> > and see if she'll go away.
> >
>
> Anyone who has not killfiled her is just asking for aggravation. Same
> with Lennie and Krell.
> The light in the eyes is the sun shining thru the back of the head

> We must be alike in more than just given name, Dick. I have all three in
> the bit bucket.

416. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 19:37:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C83CD00.48C357CB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36411

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I describe what many are doing, and by your measure that is ME giving them
> > advice.
>
> You tell them it is easier to memorize the answers than to learn the material.
> Do you really want to give an incentive to memorize the answers instead of
> learning the material?

You're a graduate of your OWN school of trolling. I SAID, that's what they told
me
they were doing, and proceeded to prove it by showing they were not in any
meaningful
way knowledgeble on the subject matter.

417. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 19:41:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C83CDF3.59B2D07C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36412

CAM wrote:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >Larry, you still have not explained how a person can be dumbed down
> > >simply by meeting the requirements for an amateur radio license.
> >
> > Maybe so, but I have, many times, stated that this "dumbing down"
> > is relative to previous, more stringent licensing requirements.
>
> But how does meeting the present requirements dumb a ham down
> compared to meeting the past requirements? Why is an Electrical
> Engineer, for instance, dumber today than an Electrical Engineer
> was a decade ago?

The subject is AMATEUR RADIO OPERATORS, not engineers. If an engineer
who holds an Extra Lite doesn't know morse code to 20wpm, he holds a
dumbed down
license. Is that to deep for you?

418. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 19:42:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C83CE1F.27412611@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36413

CAM wrote:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > I've said it before, and I'll say it again...I would dearly love to be proved
> > wrong, but I don't have that kind of luck!
>
> You proved that you don't even believe it yourself, Larry, by setting the
> date of the bet to 2105, more than 100 years in the future.

No, he just dodged another of your trolls.

419. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 19:47:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C83CF6B.262DF33A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36414

W1RFI wrote:

> >Are you a recent graduate of Cecil's School of Trolling?
>
> Why would you consider my telling newcomers that it is best, and easiest, to
> learn the underlying material as a "troll?"

No, but I would consider your saying that I was giving them advice to be trolling.

I stated whatI learned as a VE that they were doing, and which has been confirmed here on rrap and elsewhere.

420. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 19:48:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C83CF9B.B8E94A71@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36415

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > I guess we all could do the ARRL thing and just stick our heads in the sand,
> >ignore her
> >and see if she'll go away.
>
> In my work at ARRL, Dick, I don't ignore things on a daily basis. Can you
> explain why you believe that all ARRL does is to ignore ham radio?

You consider Kim to be "ham radio"??? Poor fella.

421. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 19:59:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C83D242.F82361CC@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36416

KC8PMX wrote:

> So.... morse code is only good over long distances eh? Or is it only to be
> used in disasters, or other situations where voice won't go through, that
> MUST be a distance away?
>
> There have been circumstances even locally where even on our fire dept. we
> could not communicate with Central Dispatch, because our radio's weren't
> able to hit the repeater, and we needed help, and maybe if there was an
> alternate method of being able to communicate, we could have gotten help
> faster. (particular case was we needed law enforcement assistance)
>
> I can't beleive I am actually endorsing Morse code.... Dick ought love that!

Ryan, my belief has always been that hams should WANT to learn the most basic mode
of radiocommunications. Why wouldn't they, if they were serious about their avocation?
If you look into it you'll find that many hightech people who are hams DO know and
use it, and not just for novelty. The EME weaksignal work is a current use outside the
box. Who knows when it might come in very useful? Those who say "never" are
missing the point. Many earlier technologies are useful today.

422. Re: Watch out Cecil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 21:21:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020304162114.03540.00000451@mb-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 36417

In article <3c826a35_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>I think Len may be retired, or working as a consultant perhaps ... I'm
>not sure.

Both...and more! :-)

For recreation I spread wolfbane to shield others from being attacked
by I-was-a-teenage-wolfham was-wolves. :-)

423. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 21:21:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020304162114.03540.00000450@mb-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 36419

In article <20020304081022.17584.00000356@mb-ct.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <3c82ecd0_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
><wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20020303211411.20827.00000337@mb-mj.aol.com...
>>> wa6vse-shack@fast.net writes:
>>>
>>> >It's as Ed and
>>> >others have observed ... they seem to remember the "tests
>>> >that they took" as being much more rigorous than they
>>> >actually were, view any changes as "dumbing down," and
>>> >resent that newcomers are not subject to the same set of
>>> >limitations and restrictions that they faced as newcomers.
>>>
>>> Since we don't actually have the old tests, it's impossible to tell
>>> how tough they really were.
>>
>>I took the full general 25 years ago at the FCC field office
>>in Long Beach, CA ...
>
>But you didn't pass it. The "full general" included the 13 wpm code test.

Oh, yes, that CODE TEST is most important! The "full measure of the
ham MAN!" Noble, glorious, the very essence of communications
skill and ability! :-)

>> the writtens up through general today
>>are, IMHO (as an RF engineer and long-time holder of a
>>commerical license) not any easier than the "old" test.
>
>It's the method. If a person knows the stuff, they're not much different.
>
>I took the full Advanced in the summer of 1968 and passed first try - code
>and written. That was when I was 14. The old pre-restructuring Extra has been
>passed by at least one third-grader.

Oh, my! :-)

So, that ONE instance "proves" that the old, pre-restructuring tests
were superior or inferior? Which is it? :-)

Did you know that fully 50% of all medical doctors graduated from
the bottom half of their class! :-)

>>Other than the "pig without wings" idea of "time in grade"
>>requirements (which the FCC abandoned years ago),
>>there are lots of people who disagree ... people who took
>>the old tests.
>
>So? It's just an idea - a talking point.
>
>Carl, you sure do seem to get agitated over new ideas that don't agree
>with your version of How It Ought To Be.

Ah...so we must all acknowledge ONLY the ideas of N2EY as How
Things Ought To Be? :-)

>Remember Mark Morgan, KB9RQZ? He comes to mind.

Remember Steve Adell, KF2TI? At least four pseudonyms, full
pseudonyms with pretenses of being other radio amateurs? :-)

>>it's certainly not me, nor NCI ...
>
>So you say. But the name is "no code international" not "no code test..."
>
>Freudian slip showing?

How can anyone forget No SSB International? Or the absolute
earnest fighting spirit of Eric June? Or FISTS whose predominant
spokesperson is a woman? :-) :-) :-)

Jimmie-the-radio-station forgets the "Relay" in the full name of
the ARRL whose original purpose was to relay free telegrams?

:-) :-) :-)

>Fact is, some folks DO want Morse/CW to disappear from the ham bands.

Why on earth would they ever DO such a thing! Heresy!

>Nope. The idea of a Morse-only subband on HF is a new thing. But it
>seems to get you all riled up.

Oh, my, the "renowned ham historian" seems to have FORGETTEN
past history! Unbelieveable! Insegrevious!

"New thing!" :-) :-) :-)

>Why not? Bring it out in the open and talk about it. Did I say we MUST have
>difficult tests to prevent it? Nope. Just that we must be careful. Is that
>wrong?

Yes, "everything out in the open!" Let's ressurect KH2D and No SSB
International. Let's spread around his vitriol about "Sic Meters" and
other wonderful "support" pieces for the old ways, old modes.

By all means, FIGHT to KEEP THINGS AS YOUR MINORITY WANTS!

Isn't that the American Way? :-)

>I see. Attack the person, not the ideas.

You do that so well... :-)

424. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 21:21:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020304162115.03540.00000452@mb-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 36418

In article <3C8293E2.D91AACAB@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Krell wrote:
>> I never said that there's anything wrong with bicycling or walking, but if
>> you have a one hour commute to work every day, which mode of transportation
>> would you want to use?
>
>Helicopter.

Black, Cecil, BLACK helicopter!!! :-) :-) :-) :-)

425. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 21:50:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020304165041.10578.00000342@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 36420

In article <3C83D242.F82361CC@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>Ryan, my belief has always been that hams should WANT to learn the most basic
mode
>of radiocommunications. Why wouldn't they, if they were serious about their
avocation?

Oh, my! By that "logic" Carroll should expect "serious" hobbyists to know the
basic
radio technology, the FIRST ever in radio! Spark transmitters! Galena
crystal
detectors and "coherers!"

>If you look into it you'll find that many hightech people who are hams DO know
and
>use it, and not just for novelty. The EME weaksignal work is a current use
outside the
>box.

...and far MORE of the "hightech people" just disregard morse modes without
giving
it a second thought.

Moonbounce was first done in 1946. FIRST "eme" Dickie. It did NOT use morse.

"Shannon's Law" was written and published in 1947. It's examples were about
TELEGRAPHY! It established the basic relationship between bandwidth, signal-
to-noise ratio, and communications information rate.

Dickie DID NOT KNOW OF THIS back in 1998! Shame! Shame!

>Who knows when it might come in very useful?

Yes, always wear a J-38 in case one gets in an accident....

>Those who say "never" are missing the point.

Yes, our heads are normal, not pointy...

>Many earlier technologies are useful today.

Absolutely! Even today, the most modern, efficient, and reliable stagecoaches
ever made are found in Los Angeles, CA, and Old Tucson, AZ! Some are
true marvels of ingenuity, able to break apart on direct command! Why its
just a damn shame that none of them are ever used in public transport, isn't
it? Just think of the obvious advantages of traveling at a speedy 10 MPH
without generating any terrible pollutants such as steam or hydrocarbons

(except for a lot of horse manure randomly scattered). They might even be used in emergencies, replacing ambulances!!!

Beep, beep

426. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 22:38:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C83F74F.2D732252@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36421

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > I describe what many are doing, and by your measure that is ME giving them
> > > advice.
> >
> > You tell them it is easier to memorize the answers than to learn the material.
> > Do you really want to give an incentive to memorize the answers instead of
> > learning the material?
>
> You're a graduate of your OWN school of trolling. I SAID, that's what they told
> me they were doing, and proceeded to prove it by showing they were not in any
> meaningful way knowledgeble on the subject matter.

And the fact that you are agreeing with them is giving newcomers an incentive
to do exactly the same thing. Is that what you really want?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

427. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 22:50:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C83FA25.4AE38635@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36422

Dick Carroll wrote:
> If an engineer
> who holds an Extra Lite doesn't know morse code to 20wpm, he holds a
> dumbed down license. Is that to deep for you?

I still don't completely understand, Dick. Let's take an Electrical
Engineer who is contemplating obtaining a ham license. As long as
he avoids becoming a ham, he is not dumbed-down? But just as soon
as he expends the necessary energy to study and become a ham, he
gets dumbed-down in that process? Dick, exactly how can learning
something new dumb a person down while avoiding learning something
new keeps him from being dumbed-down?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

428. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 22:50:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C83FA4F.A9A954BE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36423

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > I've said it before, and I'll say it again...I would dearly love to be proved
> > > wrong, but I don't have that kind of luck!
> > >
> > You proved that you don't even believe it yourself, Larry, by setting the
> > date of the bet to 2105, more than 100 years in the future.
> >
> No, he just dodged another of your trolls.

You guys just don't have the guts to put your money where your mouth is.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

429. \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 23:16:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020304181636.18505.00001747@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36424

>Subject: Re: The tests that Real Hams took
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/4/2002 1:02 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020304140207.08443.00000421@mb-fk.aol.com>

>In article <a5td73qsq1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
><billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

Bill's comments about the proceedings of WRC, reporting and resposibilitiy
(or NON responsibility) of agencies to post the minutes of the WRC noted.
Specific and to the point.

Which makes an iquiring mind wonder how someone ALLEGEDLY as intelligent
as Lennie the Loser come to THESE comments...

>The only "expectation" I have is for the ARRL to quit its
>schizophrenia of being an altruistic goods dealer with
>overtones of religious fanaticsm in being Big Brother.

Thanks, Anderscum. You never let us down.

Putz.

430. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-04 23:22:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020304182217.18505.00001748@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36425

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/4/2002 1:02 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020304140210.08443.00000422@mb-fk.aol.com>

>Phil, there was no "conning" evidence that I see. What I DO see
>is another in series of "I was there" thirty years ago, "we did all the
>dirty work, etc.". Let's review some history -

So we can substitute some of YOUR "I was there thirty years ago"
stuff...?!?

>Times change. Eleven years ago the number of US households with
>Internet access was ZERO.

And? There was NO Internet (publically available) 11 years ago? So?

431. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 01:06:04 UTC
From: Brainbuster <brainbuster@lineone.spamtrap.net>
Message-ID: <a6171m$v2r$1@news8.svr.pol.co.uk>
Source record: 36426
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Radio Ham <no.spam@no.spam> wrote in message
news:3c81e64a_3@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> Stupid Boy.
===

A "Dad's army" fan, are we?

Hey, has WOL (Tiscali) got it's act together yet?
When they took over Lineone, the service instantly got so bad that I
stopped using it.

--
Brainbuster.
http://www.brainbuster.da.ru

432. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 01:14:56 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c856f99$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36498

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020305102332.09750.00001221@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article <3C83106F.AB173E74@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >>
> >> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >> >Are you willing to pick a year by which all of this will have happened
> >> >and lay a substantial money bet on it?
> >>
> >> Sure -- 2105 and 5,000 dollars (US).
> >
> >I didn't think we could take you seriously.
>
> Cecil:
>
> I'm as serious as a coronary infaction. If the ARS is toast sometime
> between now and 2105, I'll pay you 5 kilobucks -- but not BEFORE
> Jan. 1, 2105! All you gotta do is be there to collect, assuming ham
> radio is histoire by then!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Aren't you a little on the chunky side to be saying things like you'll pay someone money in 2105? You just don't look all that healthy, Larry. Unless you're talking about some kind of "trust" you'll establish for Cecil in the event of your demise.

Kim W5TIT

433. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 01:37:48 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MjVg8.15414$gK2.1079227@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36427

```
"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C83CC42.FA3B5E14@worldnet.att.net...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C82FE84.2E5871F6@worldnet.att.net...
> > > W1RFI wrote:
> > >
> > > > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> > > >
> > > > >ARE you kidding? She "exposes" it every time she signs it, either
> > here or on
> > > > >the air
> > > > >There's no way, as you well know, that Larry or anyone else comes
> > close to
> > > > >that
> > > > >
> > > > >level of "exposure".
> > > >
> > > > Do you really think that DE <callsign> is as much exposure as
> > paragraph after
> > > > paragraph discussing that callsign? Or making up cute names for
her
> > using that
> > > > callsign? You chose do do that, Dick, and you chose to give it
> > exposure by
> > > > posting it.
> > >
> > > I guess we all could do the ARRL thing and just stick our heads in
the
> > sand,
> > > ignore her
> > > and see if she'll go away.
> > >
> >
> > Anyone who has not killfiled her is just asking for aggravation. Same
> > with Lennie and Krell.
> > The light in the eyes is the sun shining thru the back of the head
>
> > We must be alike in more than just given name, Dick. I have all three
in
> > the bit bucket.
>
```

I think it is simply that by different paths we aquired a dislike of bullshit, you did the civil service thing I did the insurance company thing, and are both concious enough of our own mortality to wish to avoid taking the time to call a manure pile a fertilizer storage facility.

434. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 02:08:58 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c857c44_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36499

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C8500CA.7F953AE0@worldnet.att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > So you, Ed, the rest of the ARRL,the FCC and most everybody else
believe that if
> > > you just ignore it all, it'll go away. And for darn sure you don't
want anyone talking
> > > about it.
> >
> > Prospective hams who memorize the Q&A without knowing the underlying
material
> > are doing it the hard way, Dick.
>
> For hams with a technical background, that is correct, as I have already
stated several
> times. For those like Kim, who have no technical background, what you say
is NOT
> correct. Ask Gordon West.
>

Dick, you mistake your impression of me. I have no "technial" background in radio--at least didn't. I certainly have some now. However, I do have a technical background in computers and the computing environment. I am A+ Certified, ITIL Foundation Certified, and have worked in the hardware and software environment with a focus on SQL based applications in the training environment (as trainer), and project/process management side of IT for quite a few years. I train the trainers.

It is for that very reason that I use ham radio mostly for the "distraction" and *don't* care to get involved in the technical end. I do too much of that at work. I am lucky in that my work is also an avocation.

I have absolutely no doubt at all that I have quite the capability to learn technical aspects of the ham radio hobby...however, I don't care to spend the time in ham radio when I do this stuff all day at work.

Kim W5TIT

435. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 03:10:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020304221032.19404.00000280@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 36428

In article <3c83b17d_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote

>> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" wrote

(WA6VSE wrote):

>> > I believe that demonstrating technical
>> >competence by passing the test is sufficient
>>
>> Just technical competence? What about regs, safety, operating
>procedures, etc.
>> ?
>
>I stand corrected ... when I refer to the written tests, I intend
>that their entire content be included ... sometimes I tend to
>refer to that simply as "technical competence" ... perhaps
>a mistake on my part.

OK, no problem. But I think that the regs, safety and operating procedure stuff
are
actually more essential than the theory/technical. A ham who has no idea how
his rig
works can still use it safely, legally and effectively if he/she knows the regs
and other
stuff.

>> >and artificial
>> >waiting periods are nothing more than an elitist pile of
>> >crap that discriminates against qualified newcomers.
>>
>> Why all the name calling over an IDEA?
>
>Because its such a BAD idea that it can't help but
>evoke an emotional response ...

"Your Honor, she made me beat her".

(tnx Ed).

If it's not a good idea, refute it.

> note, however, that
>the names were directed at the IDEA, not at individuals.

Not true.

The words and phrases "wacky", "smoking something funny",
"crazy", "apparently lost your mind" and others were aimed
squarely at an individual, not the ideas expressed by that
individual.

>> >You're trying to "make up for" the loss of the Morse
>> >test by adding another unnecessary barrier, plain and
>> >simple.

>> Nope. I just think practical experience should be part of the
>requirements.
>> You don't. Why all the fuss?
>> >
>> >I think the FCC will agree with me ...
>>
>> Probably. A newcomer could simply toss the license in the drawer for
>a
>> year. Plus it would increase the number of interactions with the FCC
>and VEs.
>>
>> >> > I *also*
>> >> >believe that the FCC would have problems with this in legal
>terms
>> >as
>> >> >a form of discriimination against otherwise qualified
>individuals.
>> >>
>> >> Why? How is it discriminatory to require some experience?
>> >
>> >Because it treats equally competent/qualified individuals
>> >differently on the basis of an arbitrary requirement.
>>
>> Depends how you measure competency. Which is a
>> subjective, opinion-based thing in the first place.
>>
>> >I think the FCC will agree with me ...
>>
>> They didn't agree for many years. And if they will agree, why are
>you
>> getting so worked up over a simple idea?
>
>Because I hate to see such bad ideas even tossed around
>because they will give prospective hams who may read them
>the (perhaps correct) idea that some hams would just as soon
>erect barriers to keep them out (or at least keep them down,
>below their level of ability/interest for as long as possible.)

Sounds like you think the newcomers need to be patronized and
protected. I think they're smarter than that.

But let me see if I get this straight.

The person expressing the ideas shouldn't express them, because
newcomers might be turned off by them.

But it's OK for you to call the ideas "an elitist pile of crap",
"undeserved", "absurd", "discriminatory", and to call the person
expressing them "wacky", "smoking something funny", "crazy", and
"apparently lost your mind". That sort of thing won't have any
effect on newcomers' opinions.

Sorry, I disagree.

>> >> >PLEASE NOTE that as an Extra, "I've got mine" and would "map"
>> >> >to what you call First Class ... so I have nothing personally to
>> >gain
>> >> >by objecting to this "time in grade, have to wait a year before
>you
>> >> >can upgrade" thing ...
>> >>
>> >> I've been an Extra for 32 years, Carl.
>> >
>> >I've been an RF engineer for 32+ years ...
>>
>> You were an RF engineer when you were 19?
>
>Actually yes ... but the "+" was an error ... I think of
>myself in round numbers as 52, but won't have my
>birthday until later this year ... I skipped grades in
>school and entered the job market several years
>earlier than most ...
>
>> >don't expect me to bow down to your "superiority."
>>
>> I don't - I was simply pointing out that I already "had mine", too.
>
>OK ... I already knew that ...
>
>> Don't expect me to "bow down" to your "superiority" either.
>
>That was not the intention of my retort ...

Sure sounded like it. I don't bow down to anybody. Against my religion.
>
>> >CW and other narrowband
>> >modes have shared the lower parts of the HF bands for many, many
>> >years.
>>
>> "we've always done it this way", you mean.
>

>I mean it's worked and there is no reason to assume
>that it won't continue to do so ...

Maybe so, maybe not. I'm simply tossing the idea out there.

> besides, flexible usage
>of the spectrum = good spectrum management.

Sure. But at the same time, both of us and K3LT (!) oppose
widening the 'phone bands. Don't you see the contradiction
between saying that it's OK to have a setaside for narrowband
modes but not OK to have a setaside for CW? Or the contradiction
that you want the users of the most popular HF/MF mode (for hams)
to get only about half the band, and their crowding enforced by law,
but scream and cuss because I only proposed 15% for digital?

>> >You just want to stifle the growth of digital modes because you
>> >know deep in your heart that Morse ultimately won't be as
>> >attractive and you want to "lock down" enough turf "all for
>yourself."
>>
>> Nope. I just want some room, that's all.
>
>You have room NOW ...

Sure.

>you have access to ALL of the HF
>bands ...

I've had all amateur privileges since the fall of 1970.

>no need for a "Morse only setaside."

Using Morse for routine operating in the 'phone bands is poor
operating, so right away at least half of HF is off limits. Operating near
digital folks may be construed as QRM, so it's poor operating to get too
close - and they may not be able to tell me I'm too close. With the
end of code testing it may get worse.

You have already said 25 kHz CW only would be OK. 25 kHz is 5% of
80 meters and 8.375% of 40 meters. 35% of 80 meters is 175 kHz
35% of 40 meters is 105 kHz. Somewhere in the middle a workable compromise
may exist.

Making the lower 25 kHz of 80/40/20/15 CW-only would mean that for a ham to
operate in the only CW-only HF subbands they'd need an Extra. Looks like
somebody wants to steer the newbies away from CW, maybe?

>> > you're AFRAID
>> >that
>> >Morse can't cut the mustard, that's all.
>>
>> So all modes must compete as if in a battle? Why not simply allow

>all
>> modes everywhere?
>
>Why characterize it as a "battle?"

Bruce Perens used that very word.

> Cecil has used the term
>"free market" ...

Cecil uses lots of words, but many of us have learned not to
take him too seriously - unless he's talking about antennas.

>as far as allowing all modes everywhere,
>that is actually the way MOST of the world does it ... and it
>really doesn't seem to have created any real problems.

"they've always done it that way".

MOST of the world doesn't have anywhere near the ham population
that the USA does.

>However, given the history here in the US it's probably not
>a politically practical option ... though it could result in better
>spectrum utilization from a technical/analytical standpoint.
>(Don't get excited ... I'm not proposing it ... I already said I
>would not support phone band expansion.)

OK
>
>> >> Ah, I see."Nobody wants to ban CW", huh? Just take away the
>usable
>> >spectrum
>> >> for the mode a little at a time until the CW folks have nowhere
>to
>> >go.
>> >
>> >NOBODY is "taking ANYTHING away from" Morse ... I stated before
>> >that I would not support ANY reduction in the amount of spectrum
>> >where Morse is permitted in the HF bands. NONE, ZIP, NADA ...
>> >now you want to take 35% EXCLUSIVELY for Morse????
>> >I DON'T THINK SO!!!!!!
>>
>> The phone bands are effectively off-limits to routine Morse.
>
>While that is a matter of practice, it is not "the law" ...

It's a matter of good operating practice. "The law" would side
with the bandplan.

> besides,
>the lower parts of the band are NOT so "full" with CW that the
>CW folks NEED to expand into the upper part of the bands.

Take a listen when things are jumping...

>> So are the places where digital foks congregate.
>
>How so? It may bea matter of practice, but it is not "the law".
>Those frequencies are available for CW use, should you
>actually NEED them, as long as there is not already an ongoing
>QSO there ...

The bands are not so full of digital....

>> Then why are you so reluctant to even discuss change in a calm,
>> rational fashion? You're defending the status quo.
>
>It's not so much that I'm "defending the status quo" but
>that I'm incensed by your outrageous proposal to set
>aside 35% of the HF bands for CW ONLY.

"Your Honor, she was wearing that red dress"..

>> Ever hear of "brainstorming", Carl? Where people just toss out ideas
>and
>> they get kicked around and maybe something useful pops out? One of
>the
>> key rules is that ALL ideas, no matter how weird, are discussed
>calmly. Most
>> brainstorm ideas are found to be impractical, of course, but the
>'stormers are
>> not attacked for coming up with weird ideas.
>
>There's a BIG difference between "wierd ideas" and "just plain BAD
>ideas."

Seems to me they are only "BAD" when you don't like them. Why not just
calmly state WHY they aren't the best solution?
>
>> When I see "elitist pile of crap" and "wacky" and "smoking something
>funny",
>> it kinda makes me wonder...
>
>Sorry ... you really pushed a button ...

"Your Honor..."

>but then, I guess you knew
>you would ... maybe it was just a troll to see how hard I'd bite ...

Nope. It was just an idea. A compromise to give everybody something.
That's how consensus is built.

Remember that what Mr. Plourde and I were trying to do was come up
with a license structure that would have broad-based support. That means
everybody gets something but nobody gets everything.

Imagine if a proposal could go to the FCC with truly broad-based
support from the ARS community. It'd be a shoo-in.

Maybe a CW-only section is a workable idea, maybe not. Maybe a different
percentage or a fixed number of kHz is a better way. Maybe there's no real need

for it.

>> >> >The "phone bands" should NOT be expanded, but should allow the
>> >> >use of wider bandwidth digital techniques (digital voice,
>imaging,
>> >> >and higher speed data, for example) in addition to SSB/SSTV.
>> >>
>> >> Why? That would only add to the QRM.
>
>I think that that is a rather rash, unfounded assumption.

So the phone subbands aren't crowded either?

Maybe the solution is to characterize the subbands as "narrow" and "wide"
instead of "CW/digital" and "phone".

>> >> I say give each mode type its own backyard. If it's OK to fence
>in
>> >the
>> >> phone/image folks, then it's OK to fence in the digital folks
>too.
>> >
>> >I can see how you'd like that, seeing as how your proposal would
>> >grant Morse a HUGE, undeserved, unnecessary windfall at the
>> >expense of everyone else. The more I think about it, the crazier
>> >I think you must be to even have the cajones to even suggest such
>> >a thing.
>>
>> Good to know that ideas can be tossed around without personal
>attacks.
>
>If I tossed out an absurd idea, I would expect to get flamed a bit
>for it ... (heck, I get flamed for good ideas :-)

You ever see me "flame" anybody for an idea?
>
>> But for simply suggesting these ideas, you call me "wacky", "smoking
>something
>> funny", "crazy", "apparently lost your mind". The ideas are
>dismissed as "an
>> elitist pile of crap", "undeserved", "absurd", "discriminatory" and
>a host of
>> other
>> pejoratives.
>>
>> All because you disagree.
>>

>> Interesting.
>>
>> Is this the example you want to set for newcomers?
>
>I admitted that you pushed my button ... I believe I said "I'm sorry"
>above ... if not, I'm saying it here ... congrats for a "gotcha."

Not meant to be a "gotcha". Just an idea. You previously agreed to the 25 kHz thing, so the problem is really just a matter of degree.

>I would HOPE, however, that even newcomers would be able
>to recognize grossly bad ideas and object to them ...

If, indeed, they are bad ideas. But saying the newcomers shouldn't see them is a much worse idea.

73 de Jim, N2EY

436. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 03:28:23 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c858ce3_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36505

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020305215013.18506.00000039@mb-cg.aol.com...
> In article <20020305071523.16975.00001563@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
(W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >
> >From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> >>> You proved that you don't even believe it yourself, Larry, by setting
the
> >>> date of the bet to 2105, more than 100 years in the future.
> >>
> >>No, he just dodged another of your trolls.
> >
> >By posting something he didn't believe was true just to get a reaction
out
> >Cecil and others here?
> >
> >I will take Larry at his word that he does not believe that removing the
code
> >test will destroy amateur radio for over 100 years.
>
> Ed:
>
> I don't recall saying that. I'm saying that removing the code test will
> destroy amateur radio *within* the next 103 years. It could happen
> tomorrow. I'm just not paying off on the bet until 2105. If Cecil is
> too impatient to wait that long (assuming we can determine that he
> won sometime between now and 2105), then he should not have
> proposed the wager.
>
> Personally, I think I'm going to win -- and am more than willing to
> wait until 2105 for Cecil to pay me.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

I don't think Larry has much faith in his prediction and is taking the safe
way out, as is usual with him.

Kim W5TIT

437. Re: K3LT wasn't serious (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 03:43:05 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a61evq$p79$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36429

> >From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >> >Are you willing to pick a year by which all of this will have happened
> >> >and lay a substantial money bet on it?
>
> >> Sure -- 2105 and 5,000 dollars (US).
>
> >I didn't think we could take you seriously.

I'll consider it to be serious. Now each of
you can put up $5K...I'll hold it until 2105
and we'll decide the outcome then :-)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

438. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 03:59:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C842CF4.2FE937AC@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36430

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > I describe what many are doing, and by your measure that is ME giving them
> > > > advice.
> > >
> > > You tell them it is easier to memorize the answers than to learn the material.
> > > Do you really want to give an incentive to memorize the answers instead of
> > > learning the material?
> >
> > You're a graduate of your OWN school of trolling. I SAID, that's what they told
> > me they were doing, and proceeded to prove it by showing they were not in any
> > meaningful way knowledgeble on the subject matter.
>
> And the fact that you are agreeing with them is giving newcomers an incentive
> to do exactly the same thing. Is that what you really want?

So you, Ed, the rest of the ARRL,the FCC and most everybody else believe that if
you just ignore it all, it'll go away. And for darn sure you don't want anyone talking
about it.

439. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 03:59:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C842D40.ADF36A08@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36431

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > If an engineer
> > who holds an Extra Lite doesn't know morse code to 20wpm, he holds a
> > dumbed down license. Is that to deep for you?
>
> I still don't completely understand,

Dint think you would.

440. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 04:00:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C844303.92A4CFED@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36432

Richard McCollum wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C83CC42.FA3B5E14@worldnet.att.net...
> > Richard McCollum wrote:
> >
> > > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C82FE84.2E5871F6@worldnet.att.net...
> > > > W1RFI wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> > > > >
> > > > > >ARE you kidding? She "exposes" it every time she signs it, either
> > > here or on
> > > > > >the air
> > > > > >There's no way, as you well know, that Larry or anyone else comes
> > > close to
> > > > > >that
> > > > > >
> > > > > >level of "exposure".
> > > > >
> > > > > Do you really think that DE <callsign> is as much exposure as
> > > paragraph after
> > > > > paragraph discussing that callsign? Or making up cute names for
> her
> > > using that
> > > > > callsign? You chose do do that, Dick, and you chose to give it
> > > exposure by
> > > > > posting it.
> > > >
> > > > I guess we all could do the ARRL thing and just stick our heads in
> the
> > > sand,
> > > > ignore her
> > > > and see if she'll go away.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Anyone who has not killfiled her is just asking for aggravation. Same
> > > with Lennie and Krell.
> > > The light in the eyes is the sun shining thru the back of the head
> >
> > > We must be alike in more than just given name, Dick. I have all three
> in
> > > the bit bucket.

> >
>
> I think it is simply that by different paths we aquired a dislike of
> bullshit, you did the civil service thing I did the insurance company
> thing, and are both concious enough of our own mortality to wish to avoid
> taking the time to call a manure pile a fertilizer storage facility.

Ahhhhmen, Brother!

441. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 04:49:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C844E53.83692DB3@adelphia.net>
Source record: 36433

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3C82B9F3.27A9DAE5@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
> >That idea must have escaped while I was looking the other way!
>
> It's just an idea.

Ahh, not so much of a problem- an idea for discussion. I heard it being discussed, and wasn't sure if it was just an idea or something that was going to become law of the land!

> > 35 percent of a band devoted to CW is pretty outrageous.
>
> Why?
>
> >Considering
> >that CW has a smaller BW requirement, it is like setting aside *most* of
> >the band for CW.
>
> So we should penalize the narrow modes by allowing them less space?
>
> If 35% is too much, what would be a reasonable number?

I think that the slice of band should be appropriate to the mode and the number of users. CW has less bandwidth need and judging by what I hear, I can tune across the CW sections and hear traffic, but no jams except once in a while.

This is in contrast to PSK 31, where I often have to wait or change bands, because there often isn't enough space to fit another signal.

I don't do much ssb except in contests, so I wouldn't be much of a judge of that.

> > I don't think it accounts for the increasing popularity of the digital
> >modes like psk31 either.
>
> They get their own space, as described in the idea. PSK31 is perhaps 50 Hz
> wide - how much band does it need?

As described above, it gets crowded enough that you can't find a space to put out a signal.
> >
> > What exactly is the rationale for such a chunk of a band being set

> >aside for this.
>
> Simple.
>
> - Without a code test, there will be lots of hams on the air who don't know
> the code and can't tell that they are interfering with a Morse/CW station
>
> - Just as narrow and wide modes don't mix well, automated and manual modes
> don't mix well.

I can understand that, but I don't know how often that could happen.
For PSK31, simply agreeing on one more frequency on each band to use
would double the capacity of the mode, if you know what I mean.

- Mike - KB3EIA

442. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 04:54:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020304235427.19003.00000387@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 36434

In article <20020304221032.19404.00000280@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <3c83b17d_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
><wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>OK, no problem. But I think that the regs, safety and operating procedure
>stuff are
>actually more essential than the theory/technical. A ham who has no idea how
>his rig
>works can still use it safely, legally and effectively if he/she knows the
>regs and other stuff.

Define "other stuff." Each and every licensee is REQUIRED to
operate his or her transmitter according to rather definite technical
requirements. Those that have "no idea how his rig works" cannot
possibly operate it "safely" and avoid interference with others in
the same band or radiate spurious signals outside of allocated
bands. That would be ILLEGAL.

>The words and phrases "wacky", "smoking something funny",
>"crazy", "apparently lost your mind" and others were aimed
>squarely at an individual, not the ideas expressed by that
>individual.

How about the continued use of the pejorative "putz?"

...squarely aimed at an individual.

Apparently there is a great big hypocritical "standard" N2EY
is using in here. His "newsgroup cop" vision is quite narrow.

>Sounds like you think the newcomers need to be patronized and
>protected. I think they're smarter than that.

The ARRL does that quite often in their public statements.

>The person expressing the ideas shouldn't express them, because
>newcomers might be turned off by them.

Some in this chat room have very definite attempts at "turning
off" others, including attempts to bar them from expressing
opinions and ideas to the FCC.

Does N2EY wish to ignore them because they are such
wonderful representatives of the US ARS?

>Sure sounded like it. I don't bow down to anybody. Against my religion.

It sure sounds like N2EY wants everyone to bow down to him.

Is that the "personal religion?"

>Maybe so, maybe not. I'm simply tossing the idea out there.

No, those "tossing ideas" are only partially-disguised diatribes
against all who won't bow down to your demands for protected
spectrum space to enjoy your own personal mode preference.

US radio amateurs ALREADY have two EXCLUSIVE spaces
for code in the ham bands.

>Bruce Perens used that very word.

Is Bruce Perens in this particular thread?

>"they've always done it that way".

...therefore the status quo must be kept?!? That's NO
justification.

>MOST of the world doesn't have anywhere near the ham population
>that the USA does.

The rest of the world does not need to bow down to a minority
of US radio amateurs. Everyone should work together, but some
Ugly Americans wish to put their own personal preferences ahead
of everyone's.

>It's a matter of good operating practice. "The law" would side
>with the bandplan.

If the law is not "good," then attempt to change it. Between
alleged "good operating practice" and the law, the law will win.

>Take a listen when things are jumping...

Keep listening when there is no "jumping."

The law does not make special, reserved room in spectrum just
for contesters.

>The bands are not so full of digital....

...YET.

>Seems to me they are only "BAD" when you don't like them. Why not just
>calmly state WHY they aren't the best solution?

Seems to me that some are highly selective in becoming upset
over alleged "bad behavior." Does the chat room co...er newsgroup
cop not look at other inhabitants of this little enclave of licensed
egos?

>Maybe a CW-only section is a workable idea, maybe not. Maybe a different
>percentage or a fixed number of kHz is a better way. Maybe there's no real

>need for it.

Does N2EY advocate removal of the two CW-only bands in US
amateur allocations?

>You ever see me "flame" anybody for an idea?

Absolutely! By sheer volume of single replies! Been happening
from radio station N2EY for at least three years.

>If, indeed, they are bad ideas. But saying the newcomers shouldn't see
>them is a much worse idea.

Some one-by-twos will NOT ALLOW anyone "under" them to talk back,
or even contact their governments in using their citizenship rights.

Some one-by-twos insist on the eitist preservation of their "turf" as they
believe they "own" spectrum space by just license tenure.

Some one-by-twos read a past QST article on a tool or technique and
claim they have MASTERED it.

Some one-by-twos claiming "electronics design experience" cannot
recognize a common transistor family widely-used in all of electronics
for all of the time they have been licensed.

Some one-by-twos are skillful in morse code, think that it is the
defining ultimate mastership in amateur radio and look down on
others who do not share their highnesses' personal tastes.

Some one-by-twos need a two-by-four harshly applied to them...

443. Re: Morse as an "essential element" in emergencies (new thread title)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 05:36:23 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <a61lgn$n8o$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 36435

W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote:
>From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson)
>>Makes sense to me. Assuming hams would be effective at providing
>>message services in emergencies when they've had little practice at
>>doing so in non-emergency situations would be like assuming hams would
>>be effective at using IEEE 802.11 devices to provide Internet connectivity
>>or other data connectivity services in an emergency when they've had
>>little or no experience at doing this in non-emergency situations.
>>Unfortunately Part 97 rules make it hard to even "contrive" connectivity
>>that would simulate the real thing in the latter case, so hams might be
>>better off yielding to those who've been getting real-life experience
>>under Part 15 when the emergency happens.
>
>Why do you believe that Part 97 does not permit connectivity using IEEE 802.11b
>devices? The only possible limitation I see is that some of the internet
>content would not be permitted under Part 97.

There's a long answer to the question, but the short answer is that while
Part 97 permits connectivity it constrains the kinds of bits that can make
use of the connectivity, even though the communications channel technology
couldn't care less what the bits are. This means you need to control the
users who are generating those bits, which pragmatically means that you
can't provide service to arbitrary users in ordinary circumstances the way,
say, the Part 15 freenet guys do. This has two problems. First, providing
a communications service which has few or no users is boring, which is
probably why even hams do this particular thing under Part 15 instead.
Second, the service you'd likely be asked to provide in an emergency is
exactly the service to users you aren't allowed to provide in a fashion useful
to anyone in non-emergencies, that is to keep a reliable service operating
for those users under somewhat anarchistic, ad hoc circumstances. Assuming
the latter requires no skills beyond the ability to establish connectivity
is like assuming that the ability to erect a dipole makes one a skilled
HF operator.

Also, while I agree you might be able to run your own Internet access
circuit under Part 97, I think you are grossly underestimating how
constrained you would be to do this entirely legally due to the
increasingly pervasive use of transport- and application-level encryption.
For example, are you even aware when your browser loads an encrypted web
page? I only ever find out on the occasions when I try to follow a
link to a non-encrypted page and the browser gives me a warning after
the fact. There's a good chance your mail reader uses SSL as well,
and a lot of the password-protected text-based logins I have assume
that I'll be protecting the entire session running ssh. Avoiding
accesses to www.hotbabes.com is the least of the problems with Part 97,

you probably can't spend 3 minutes playing with your browser without sending or receiving traffic that would violate the Part 97 encryption constraints. Life is way too short to worry about this, which is probably why Part 15 looks so good for this stuff even to hams.

>>I hence still
>>think these bands are of little use to amateurs under Part 97 with its
>>current constraints on encryption of content and that, without changes
>>to Part 97, the public interest is probably best served by allowing the
>>use of the bands for applications which don't have these constraints.
>
>The IEEE 802.11b devices can run un-encrypted.

Turning off link-level encryption doesn't make the application-level encryption go away, so by itself this won't save you from Part 97 for use for Internet connectivity. But providing service to real users doing real user things, which is probably what community service with this technology amounts to, really makes you want to leave the link level encryption on both to protect the users and to protect others from seeing whatever it is that real people do. I'd personally prefer to spend my time worrying about how to provide a communications service then to spend it trying to figure out how to make people behave. YMMV

The last bit does encapsulate the dilemma well, however. You can run the link under Part 97 and spend your time worrying about what the bits are that the service is carrying, or you can run the link under Part 15 and worry solely about providing a decent communications service to move those bits. This is, unfortunately for Part 97, not a hard choice, as is demonstrated by how just about everyone playing with the technology, ham or not, has voted with their feet.

The ironic thing about this is that the community-service argument which amateurs have traditionally relied on as their first line spectrum defense is exactly the argument that WECA, by fixating on freenet use of the technology under Part 15 (even though most of the outside infrastructure that exists is actually supporting paid-for commercial connectivity), makes in support of allowing high-power Part 15 use of yet another 100 MHz or so of amateur 5 GHz spectrum (which will also likely end up mostly supporting paid-for outdoor services). Active use of the frequencies under Part 97 would be the surest defense of them but, given what the most interesting use of this spectrum seems to be, Part 97 is a millstone to be worked around and provides no advantages which come close to compensating as far as I can tell.

Dennis Ferguson

444. Re: Morse as an "essential element" in emergencies (new thread title)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 06:11:18 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <a61ni6ptt1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 36436

Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote:
>Furthermore, there was EXTENSIVE use of 802.11b devices
>at "ground zero" in the aftermath of Sept. 11th ... not by hams,
>of course, but lots of use ...

"Not by hams", or more accurately, "not by hams under Part 97",
is the point. If Part 97 presents an obstacle to the uses
these devices are put to in normal times then it won't be
Part 97 operators supporting those same uses in emergencies.

>As has been pointed out repeatedly, there is no legitimate
>reason why hams CAN'T make good use of such existing
>technologies.

Hams DO make good use of the existing technology, just not
under Part 97. The fact that this happens is not a failure
of the hams, or the technology, which leaves only one thing
in the previous sentence. If you want to spend your time
supporting a communications service rather than being a censor
you'll do it under Part 15 rules instead.

The irony is that that it is WECA who now gets to take the
community service moral high ground when discussing future
use of additional amateur frequencies, and there's a pool of
hobbiests interested in RF communications out there (according
to WECA) who use amateur frequencies to play in but find no
advantage in becoming hams themselves. Given that they can't
do what they do under Part 97, and that their sole contacts
with the ARRL has the ARRL arguing to limit what they can do
under Part 15 as well in defense of bands that hams don't
really use (as hams), I'm sure their view of amateur radio
will be more positive in future.

Do you think there might be something wrong here?

Dennis Ferguson

445. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 06:33:02 UTC
From: Alan Mears <tech2000@nolineone.netspam>
Message-ID: <cEZg8.48628$Hg1.8187039@news6-win.server.ntlworld.com>
Source record: 36437
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Nope, still as bad as ever ;-)

"Brainbuster" <brainbuster@lineone.spamtrap.net> wrote in message
news:a6171m$v2r$1@news8.svr.pol.co.uk...
> Radio Ham <no.spam@no.spam> wrote in message
> news:3c81e64a_3@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> > Stupid Boy.
> ===
>
> A "Dad's army" fan, are we?
>
> Hey, has WOL (Tiscali) got it's act together yet?
> When they took over Lineone, the service instantly got so bad that I
> stopped using it.
>
> --
> Brainbuster.
> http://www.brainbuster.da.ru
>
>

446. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 06:47:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C8469D1.5155CE2C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 36438

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20020304221032.19404.00000280@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <3c83b17d_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> ><wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

> >The words and phrases "wacky", "smoking something funny",
> >"crazy", "apparently lost your mind" and others were aimed
> >squarely at an individual, not the ideas expressed by that
> >individual.
>
> How about the continued use of the pejorative "putz?"

That wasn't used by Jim toward Carl. That was used by Steve toward you.
I think he may be on to something.

> ...squarely aimed at an individual.

Yep, he seems to have nailed the target. Jim, on the other hand, isn't
responsible for Steve's use of the term and he has not used it himself.
Why does that have you all puffed up?

> Apparently there is a great big hypocritical "standard" N2EY
> is using in here. His "newsgroup cop" vision is quite narrow.
>
> >Sounds like you think the newcomers need to be patronized and
> >protected. I think they're smarter than that.
>
> The ARRL does that quite often in their public statements.

Ahh, you needed to get another dig in at the League with whom you have
some long standing dispute over your writing.

> >The person expressing the ideas shouldn't express them, because
> >newcomers might be turned off by them.
>
> Some in this chat room have very definite attempts at "turning
> off" others, including attempts to bar them from expressing
> opinions and ideas to the FCC.

Yet you had your opportunity to submit your material to the FCC. It
looks as if we'll have to hear about this forever.

> Does N2EY wish to ignore them because they are such
> wonderful representatives of the US ARS?

Did you happen to notice Jim defending the individual you accuse of
attempting to stifle your free speech? No? Me neither.

> >Sure sounded like it. I don't bow down to anybody. Against my religion.
>
> It sure sounds like N2EY wants everyone to bow down to him.
>
> Is that the "personal religion?"

You read the response and THAT is what you drew from it?

> >Maybe so, maybe not. I'm simply tossing the idea out there.
>
> No, those "tossing ideas" are only partially-disguised diatribes
> against all who won't bow down to your demands for protected
> spectrum space to enjoy your own personal mode preference.

THAT is what you got from the ideas? I liked it better when you were
cuddling up to the ham radio newcomer and telling him about what a happy
old man you are. It was a kind of "feel good" moment, Len.

> US radio amateurs ALREADY have two EXCLUSIVE spaces
> for code in the ham bands.

What's it to ya?

> >Bruce Perens used that very word.
>
> Is Bruce Perens in this particular thread?

He is now.

> >"they've always done it that way".
>
> ...therefore the status quo must be kept?!? That's NO
> justification.
>
> >MOST of the world doesn't have anywhere near the ham population
> >that the USA does.
>
> The rest of the world does not need to bow down to a minority
> of US radio amateurs. Everyone should work together, but some
> Ugly Americans wish to put their own personal preferences ahead
> of everyone's.

Who sez they are? Who sez they were asked to? What's with the "Ugly
American" term?

> >It's a matter of good operating practice. "The law" would side
> >with the bandplan.
>
> If the law is not "good," then attempt to change it. Between
> alleged "good operating practice" and the law, the law will win.
>
> >Take a listen when things are jumping...

>
> Keep listening when there is no "jumping."

They're always jumping in some part of the world, Leonardo.
>
> The law does not make special, reserved room in spectrum just
> for contesters.

Is THAT what Bruce Perens was doing in this thread? Of all the nerve!

> >The bands are not so full of digital....
>
> ...YET.

They aren't full of Len Anderson yet either.

> >Seems to me they are only "BAD" when you don't like them. Why not just
> >calmly state WHY they aren't the best solution?
>
> Seems to me that some are highly selective in becoming upset
> over alleged "bad behavior." Does the chat room co...er newsgroup
> cop not look at other inhabitants of this little enclave of licensed
> egos?

He surely can't have missed your antics, Len. Somtimes you irritate.
Sometimes you amuse. You almost always wear the clothing you point to
when it is worn by others. You can lay claim to a biggie though--you
win the competition for biggest ego among the tiny number of
non-licensed posters in r.r.a.p.

> >Maybe a CW-only section is a workable idea, maybe not. Maybe a different
> >percentage or a fixed number of kHz is a better way. Maybe there's no real
> >need for it.
>
> Does N2EY advocate removal of the two CW-only bands in US
> amateur allocations?

Did you really believe that the conversation was about VHF?

> >You ever see me "flame" anybody for an idea?
>
> Absolutely! By sheer volume of single replies! Been happening
> from radio station N2EY for at least three years.

So volume of posts = flaming. Finish it up, Len. Go for the
establishment of an entire new group for victimhood.

> >If, indeed, they are bad ideas. But saying the newcomers shouldn't see
> >them is a much worse idea.
>
> Some one-by-twos will NOT ALLOW anyone "under" them to talk back,
> or even contact their governments in using their citizenship rights.

I can see you have worked yourself up into a lather.

> Some one-by-twos insist on the eitist preservation of their "turf" as they
> believe they "own" spectrum space by just license tenure.

...and they won't let you play until you get permission? It's okay,
Len, you can't still watch the others play.

> Some one-by-twos read a past QST article on a tool or technique and
> claim they have MASTERED it.

Time now for a dig at someone who won't bow to your superiority in the
use of the Smith Chart?

> Some one-by-twos claiming "electronics design experience" cannot
> recognize a common transistor family widely-used in all of electronics
> for all of the time they have been licensed.

Keep it up, Len. I think you have them right where you want them.
Maybe you can push the Feds to include memorizing transistor numbers and
characteristics in the exams.

> Some one-by-twos are skillful in morse code, think that it is the
> defining ultimate mastership in amateur radio and look down on
> others who do not share their highnesses' personal tastes.

Why would that bother you? You aren't a ham.

> Some one-by-twos need a two-by-four harshly applied to them...

...and you're just the guy to give it to 'em, huh? You're a lonely old
Git who just can't get no respect. It was probably good for you to get
it out of your system.

Dave K8MN

447. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 07:06:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C846E41.5EBC0018@earthlink.net>
Source record: 36439

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20020304081022.17584.00000356@mb-ct.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <3c82ecd0_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> ><wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
> >
> >>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >>news:20020303211411.20827.00000337@mb-mj.aol.com...
> >>> wa6vse-shack@fast.net writes:
> >>>
> >>> >It's as Ed and
> >>> >others have observed ... they seem to remember the "tests
> >>> >that they took" as being much more rigorous than they
> >>> >actually were, view any changes as "dumbing down," and
> >>> >resent that newcomers are not subject to the same set of
> >>> >limitations and restrictions that they faced as newcomers.
> >>>
> >>> Since we don't actually have the old tests, it's impossible to tell
> >>> how tough they really were.
> >>
> >>I took the full general 25 years ago at the FCC field office
> >>in Long Beach, CA ...
> >
> >But you didn't pass it. The "full general" included the 13 wpm code test.
>
> Oh, yes, that CODE TEST is most important! The "full measure of the
> ham MAN!" Noble, glorious, the very essence of communications
> skill and ability! :-)

This is Len debating the issues. It must be mere coincidence that his
debating style attempts to poke fun at those things which he is
personally unable to do.

> >> the writtens up through general today
> >>are, IMHO (as an RF engineer and long-time holder of a
> >>commerical license) not any easier than the "old" test.
> >
> >It's the method. If a person knows the stuff, they're not much different.
> >
> >I took the full Advanced in the summer of 1968 and passed first try - code
> >and written. That was when I was 14. The old pre-restructuring Extra has been
> >passed by at least one third-grader.
>

> Oh, my! :-)

Len doesn't think third graders should be able to become hams. He
doesn't even think that sixth graders should be able to become hams.

> So, that ONE instance "proves" that the old, pre-restructuring tests
> were superior or inferior? Which is it? :-)
>
> Did you know that fully 50% of all medical doctors graduated from
> the bottom half of their class! :-)

NO! Did you know that the transceiver not made in Japan are made
elsewhere?

> >>Other than the "pig without wings" idea of "time in grade"
> >>requirements (which the FCC abandoned years ago),
> >>there are lots of people who disagree ... people who took
> >>the old tests.
> >
> >So? It's just an idea - a talking point.
> >
> >Carl, you sure do seem to get agitated over new ideas that don't agree
> >with your version of How It Ought To Be.
>
> Ah...so we must all acknowledge ONLY the ideas of N2EY as How
> Things Ought To Be? :-)

Lemme get this straight--are you paraphrasing here?

> >Remember Mark Morgan, KB9RQZ? He comes to mind.
>
> Remember Steve Adell, KF2TI? At least four pseudonyms, full
> pseudonyms with pretenses of being other radio amateurs? :-)

What were the pseudonyms used by you? Avery Label? Leftover 21?
NOCWSKILLS? Were they all you, Len or just the other voices from within
you?

> >>it's certainly not me, nor NCI ...
> >
> >So you say. But the name is "no code international" not "no code test..."
> >
> >Freudian slip showing?
>
> How can anyone forget No SSB International? Or the absolute
> earnest fighting spirit of Eric June? Or FISTS whose predominant
> spokesperson is a woman? :-) :-) :-)

No SSB International was against the SSB test? What SSB test?
>
> Jimmie-the-radio-station forgets the "Relay" in the full name of
> the ARRL whose original purpose was to relay free telegrams?
>

> :-) :-) :-)

Watch out, Jim! Len is in full stride now--resorting to the diminuitive
and the cutesy name. Did you really forget the term "Relay" in the
name "American Radio Relay League? Remember how the League came out
against the dreaded "relay test"?

> >Fact is, some folks DO want Morse/CW to disappear from the ham bands.
>
> Why on earth would they ever DO such a thing! Heresy!

That's spelled "h-e-a-r-s-a-y".

> >Nope. The idea of a Morse-only subband on HF is a new thing. But it
> >seems to get you all riled up.
>
> Oh, my, the "renowned ham historian" seems to have FORGETTEN
> past history! Unbelieveable! Insegrevious!
>
> "New thing!" :-) :-) :-)

...more of Len debating the issues in a civil manner. That is what he
does for he has told us that it is so.

> >Why not? Bring it out in the open and talk about it. Did I say we MUST have
> >difficult tests to prevent it? Nope. Just that we must be careful. Is that
> >wrong?
>
> Yes, "everything out in the open!" Let's ressurect KH2D and No SSB
> International. Let's spread around his vitriol about "Sic Meters" and
> other wonderful "support" pieces for the old ways, old modes.
>
> By all means, FIGHT to KEEP THINGS AS YOUR MINORITY WANTS!

THE MINORITY GETS PROTECTION FROM THE MAJORITY, Leonard H.
>
> Isn't that the American Way? :-)

Actually, it is.
>
> >I see. Attack the person, not the ideas.
>
> You do that so well... :-)

Are you schizophrenic, Len?
"No I'm not".
"Yes, I am".
"Just try on the other hat!"

Dave K8MN

448. K3LT was serious (was Re: K3LT wasn't serious (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took))

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 12:11:51 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020305071151.16975.00001561@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36440

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>I'll consider it to be serious. Now each of
>you can put up $5K...I'll hold it until 2105
>and we'll decide the outcome then :-)

I have reconsidered and I have concluded that Larry is correct. Removing the
Morse code requirement will ensure that ham radio is not destroyed until 2105.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

449. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 12:14:01 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020305071401.16975.00001562@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36441

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)

>>The only "expectation" I have is for the ARRL to quit its
>>schizophrenia of being an altruistic goods dealer with
>>overtones of religious fanaticsm in being Big Brother.

> Thanks, Anderscum. You never let us down.

His statement is scarcely comprehensible. I can piece it together, but it sure
is an odd way to say that he believes that ARRL is really just a publishing
house pretending to be a membership services organization.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

450. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 12:15:23 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020305071523.16975.00001563@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36442

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> You proved that you don't even believe it yourself, Larry, by setting the
>> date of the bet to 2105, more than 100 years in the future.
>
>No, he just dodged another of your trolls.

By posting something he didn't believe was true just to get a reaction out
Cecil and others here?

I will take Larry at his word that he does not believe that removing the code
test will destroy amateur radio for over 100 years.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

451. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 12:17:53 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020305071753.16975.00001564@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36443

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>I SAID, that's what they told
>me
>they were doing, and proceeded to prove it by showing they were not in any
>meaningful
>way knowledgeble on the subject matter.

And we are to believe that more than a tiny handful of those taking their tests had such a warm repore with you that they confided this bit of information, and then were willing to demonstrate it to you. Yeah, right. Your warm and caring nature does not inspire such personal sharing, IMHO.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

452. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 12:19:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020305071957.16975.00001565@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36444

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>So you, Ed, the rest of the ARRL,the FCC and most everybody else believe that
>if you just ignore it all, it'll go away. And for darn sure you don't want
anyone talking about it.

So they are all out to get you!

The way you talk about it encourages people to use rote memorization instead of
the easier and more effective route of learning the material.

Are you willing to add a single statement to your advice that tell prospective
hams the word association memorization is not the easiest way to pass the ham
tests?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

453. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 12:22:31 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c860a0f$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36533

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a646u402g88@enews1.newsguy.com...
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020305191251.17597.00002016@mb-mf.aol.com...
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > > Even YOU consider some of your own notions to be warped. But then.
> > >what is a troll to do?
> >
> > To Dick, "Troll" means "doesn't tell Dick he is right." :-)
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> That only applies to certain people. Dick admits that he has me, Len, and
> Kim killfiled. He still argues with Cecil, however, and continues to make
at
> least one post per day (on average) in which he calls Cecil a "troll." It
> makes one think that he actually LIKES arguing with Cecil.
>
>

Krell, don't believe that "killfile" stuff. Dick opens and reads every single post--most especially those from people with whom he seeths in disagreement. The way he gets around responding to those posts directly is to hope that someone else does--then he can respond to "their" post. LOL A couple of weeks back he made a couple of mistakes and responded directly to at least one of my posts, and I think it was two.

Kim W5TIT

454. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 12:24:21 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020305072421.16975.00001566@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36445

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Why would you consider my telling newcomers that it is best, and easiest,
>to
>> learn the underlying material as a "troll?"
>
> No, but I would consider your saying that I was giving them advice to be
>trolling.

That is not trolling, Dick; it is a difference of opinion. I note that you believe that everyone who disagrees with you is "trolling."

I believe that the choice of words you use saying that prospective hams want to get their licenses the easiest way so they are using word association to memorize 300 questions 3 times is giving them advice that the easiest way to get their ham license is to use word association to memorize 300 questions 3 times.

What does it mean to you when you say that the easiest way for prospective hams to get their licenses is to use word association to memorize 300 questions 3 times?

I believe that some prospective hams who read your words will see them as advice on what is the easiest way to pass the test. What do you think they will think of your telling them what you believe to be the easiest way to pass the test?

I believe that your advice is wrong. You believe that to be "trolling."

Have I summed it up accurately?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

455. The balls (figuratively speaking) are in LHA's court

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 12:27:19 UTC
From: Steve Adell - KF2TI <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a62do3$qu0$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36446

In article <3C846E41.5EBC0018@earthlink.net>, k8mn@earthlink.net says...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >

>
> > >Remember Mark Morgan, KB9RQZ? He comes to mind.
> >
> > Remember Steve Adell, KF2TI? At least four pseudonyms, full
> > pseudonyms with pretenses of being other radio amateurs? :-)
>
> What were the pseudonyms used by you? Avery Label? Leftover 21?
> NOCWSKILLS? Were they all you, Len or just the other voices from within
> you?
>

THIS IS PRICELESS. The man, term loosely defined and used in this instance, is just glorious in his obsession, not the fragrance BTW

Come on old man, put up or shut up! Better yet put up, shut and then drop dead.

Show everyone here your more than a cowardly little lion hiding behind some flat screen, typing on a flat keyboard with thoughts coming from a flat head.

Post your proof or get off my case asshole! I noticed your last diatribe about having proof went over like a lead Zeppelin, not the album, the German equivalent of Leonard H...a giant Nazi gasbag hi hi. I got literally 0's of people e-mailing me with copies. Seems you sent out none as no one believes you. HHmmm wonder why that is. After all you were in military unintelligence passing gas...errr millions of pieces of radio traffic all by yourself. And you did say "I" Len, not we as in team. Sorry, no back pedaling points here.

So let's see something here Leno. Try to avoid some of the standard Internet cop pitfalls by relying on newsgroup readers. In fact, post some DNS numbers, prove I am what you say I am. I doubt you'll even try because accusations are your life and when push comes to shove and proof is actually required, you'd rather run away screaming into the night.

Just as a starter, seeing that you only have one clue...according to an advanced google search, between 1999-2001 there were 27 posters using MicroPlanet Gravity as their newsreader of choice. So according to you, I must be ALL them!!!????!!

Better yet, having perused some threads, why not produce some of the "stalker" information you supposedly supplied the LAPD last year about

"me". Maybe a couple of taped phones calls? Coime on Lennie, this is better than Carl's smoking gun story.

Meet with Bill Sohl this past weekend at a hamfest. Pretty much had several laughs AT you Len. We both felt you cheese has fallen off your cracker...that you're several sandwiches short of a picnic although picnic-wise you are as annoying as gnats, that you are not only a few cards short of a full deck, you haven't any deck. There were lots more, but why bother boring the group with excessive verbiage. You seem to have that semi-retired job all looked up.

BTW,m for the group, I did find out that Len is in the advanced stages of Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease, the human equivalent of Mad Cow's Disease. Symptoms range from dementia to feelings of inadequacy and persecution and paranoia. Essentially the brain is reduced to a mass of jello, so have some compassion for the old geezer, he's has CFJ for all his life and his body is just now realizing it. Pretty soon, Len will be a mass of drooling, farting, pissing, shitting.....wait, he;s already there. Oh my gosh....next step...the big sleep...the never ending dream..the permanent eyelid for light check

Get a clue Anderson, I DARE YOU..I DOUBLE DOG DARE YOU. On a positive note, I've taken you out of my Bozo Bin so that I won't miss a single word of your multi-word replies. So fire away Len. Take your best shot cause I hear you only fire blanks.

As Bill would say...no cheers for you :-(

The one, the only Steve-KF2TI

456. Re: Code Is Dead

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 12:27:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020305072737.16975.00001568@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36447

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>Egad, it's the Gadfly! He had something to say, too....Didn't he??? If so,
>what
>was it??

I can restate his post in simpler language, if it would help.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

457. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 12:28:12 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c860b64_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36534

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C85A25F.14D7BE48@earthlink.net...
>
> ...or we can sit on the veranda and tap our toes to pass the time before
> some non-radio amateur mounts the soap box to advise mere amateurs about
> the woeful state of amateur radio in this country.
>
> Dave K8MN

Why must someone be a radio amateur to comment and have opinion on amateur radio, Dave? That doesn't make sense at all. Must one be in the medical insurance industry before an opinion can be made that medical insurance fails most people miserably and has made a mockery of the true nature of being a doctor? Must one be a teacher to realize they are underpaid?

You have a really weird reaction to people you don't like, but you also throw logic and reasoning out the window simply because you just can't say: I don't like what you just said and I disagree with it.

Len may be totally off-base. I don't know. I am surprised you spend time reading his posts; they all say the same thing. However, that he is not a licensed amateur radio operator has nothing to do with it.

Kim W5TIT

458. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 12:52:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020305075213.03226.00001641@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 36448

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>> >and artificial waiting periods are nothing more than an elitist pile of
>> >crap that discriminates against qualified newcomers.

>> Why all the name calling over an IDEA?

>Because its such a BAD idea that it can't help but
>evoke an emotional response ... note, however, that
>the names were directed at the IDEA, not at individuals.

Many years ago, one had to be a General for a year or two before becoming an Extra. The premise was, IMHO, that there is learning that comes from being an active ham that is not necessarily going to show up in a written exam. That premise is valid, but the difficulty of having a VE system keep track of it makes it an unworkable good idea. It is probably also an unnecessary good idea. I don't see any major problems in the Amateur Radio Service that would be solved by a waiting period to upgrade. Minor problems, perhaps, because new hams tend to make mistakes that annoy old timers, but that is not sufficient cause, IMHO, to try to install such a system.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

For the most part, but calling an idea elitist does imply that you feel the person posing that idea is elitist. It would have been more effective to simply call it a bad idea and explain why you felt it was not necessary. The "own worst enemy" syndrome can strike at any time! :-)

>> >You're trying to "make up for" the loss of the Morse
>> >test by adding another unnecessary barrier, plain and
>> >simple.
>>
>> Nope. I just think practical experience should be part of the
>requirements.
>> You don't. Why all the fuss?
>> >
>> >I think the FCC will agree with me ...
>>
>> Probably. A newcomer could simply toss the license in the drawer for
>a
>> year. Plus it would increase the number of interactions with the FCC
>and VEs.
>>
>> >> > I *also*
>> >> >believe that the FCC would have problems with this in legal

>terms
>> >as
>> >> >a form of discriimination against otherwise qualified
>individuals.
>> >>
>> >> Why? How is it discriminatory to require some experience?
>> >
>> >Because it treats equally competent/qualified individuals
>> >differently on the basis of an arbitrary requirement.
>>
>> Depends how you measure competency. Which is a
>> subjective, opinion-based thing in the first place.
>>
>> >I think the FCC will agree with me ...
>>
>> They didn't agree for many years. And if they will agree, why are
>you
>> getting so worked up over a simple idea?
>
>Because I hate to see such bad ideas even tossed around
>because they will give prospective hams who may read them
>the (perhaps correct) idea that some hams would just as soon
>erect barriers to keep them out (or at least keep them down,
>below their level of ability/interest for as long as possible.)
>
>> >> >PLEASE NOTE that as an Extra, "I've got mine" and would "map"
>> >> >to what you call First Class ... so I have nothing personally to
>> >gain
>> >> >by objecting to this "time in grade, have to wait a year before
>you
>> >> >can upgrade" thing ...
>> >>
>> >> I've been an Extra for 32 years, Carl.
>> >
>> >I've been an RF engineer for 32+ years ...
>>
>> You were an RF engineer when you were 19?
>
>Actually yes ... but the "+" was an error ... I think of
>myself in round numbers as 52, but won't have my
>birthday until later this year ... I skipped grades in
>school and entered the job market several years
>earlier than most ...
>
>> >don't expect me to bow down to your "superiority."
>>
>> I don't - I was simply pointing out that I already "had mine", too.
>
>OK ... I already knew that ...
>

>> Don't expect me to "bow down" to your "superiority" either.
>
>That was not the intention of my retort ...
>
>> >CW and other narrowband
>> >modes have shared the lower parts of the HF bands for many, many
>> >years.
>>
>> "we've always done it this way", you mean.
>
>I mean it's worked and there is no reason to assume
>that it won't continue to do so ... besides, flexible usage
>of the spectrum = good spectrum management.
>> >You just want to stifle the growth of digital modes because you
>> >know deep in your heart that Morse ultimately won't be as
>> >attractive and you want to "lock down" enough turf "all for
>yourself."
>>
>> Nope. I just want some room, that's all.
>
>You have room NOW ... you have access to ALL of the HF
>bands ... no need for a "Morse only setaside."
>
>> > you're AFRAID
>> >that
>> >Morse can't cut the mustard, that's all.
>>
>> So all modes must compete as if in a battle? Why not simply allow
>all
>> modes everywhere?
>
>Why characterize it as a "battle?" Cecil has used the term
>"free market" ... as far as allowing all modes everywhere,
>that is actually the way MOST of the world does it ... and it
>really doesn't seem to have created any real problems.
>However, given the history here in the US it's probably not
>a politically practical option ... though it could result in better
>spectrum utilization from a technical/analytical standpoint.

>Sorry ... you really pushed a button ... but then, I guess you knew
>you would ... maybe it was just a troll to see how hard I'd bite ...

Jim does not troll, and no one pushes an emotional button that we do not help them push. If someone "pushes our button," our response is still our personal responsibility.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

459. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 13:10:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020305081012.20827.00000409@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 36449

In article <3C844E53.83692DB3@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <3C82B9F3.27A9DAE5@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
><mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >That idea must have escaped while I was looking the other way!
>>
>> It's just an idea.
>
> Ahh, not so much of a problem- an idea for discussion.

That's what it is - and that's ALL it is at this point.

Although usually called "CW bands" or "CW subbands", the non-phone
parts of the HF amateur bands are all open to both CW and digital modes.
The ONLY "CW-only" subbands in US amateur allocations are, oddly
enough, 50.0-50.1 and 144.0-144.1

> I heard it being
>discussed, and wasn't sure if it was just an idea or something that was
>going to become law of the land!

If it was going to be made into law or even being proposed to the FCC it would
have an RM number.

>> > 35 percent of a band devoted to CW is pretty outrageous.

>> Why?

>> >Considering
>> >that CW has a smaller BW requirement, it is like setting aside *most* of
>> >the band for CW.

>> So we should penalize the narrow modes by allowing them less space?

>> If 35% is too much, what would be a reasonable number?
>
> I think that the slice of band should be appropriate to the mode and
>the number of users.

OK - but by that logic most of the subbands should be 'phone. Both Carl and I
and others think the 'phone subbands should not be widened any time soon.

>CW has less bandwidth need and judging by what I
>hear, I can tune across the CW sections and hear traffic, but no jams
>except once in a while.

OK - but that depends on the band and the time you listen.

>This is in contrast to PSK 31, where I often have to wait or change
>bands, because there often isn't enough space to fit another signal.

?? On what band(s)? PSK31 is not limited by law to just a few frequencies.

Let's suppose just for a second that my idea was actually adopted. 15% of
80 meters is 75 kHz. Is that enough PSK31 space? If not, how much would
be adequate?

>I don't do much ssb except in contests, so I wouldn't be much of a judge
>of that.
>
>> > I don't think it accounts for the increasing popularity of the
>digital
>> >modes like psk31 either.
>>
>> They get their own space, as described in the idea. PSK31 is perhaps 50 Hz
>> wide - how much band does it need?
>
> As described above, it gets crowded enough that you can't find a space
>to put out a signal.

That may be an artifact of the use of the Small Wonder rigs that only cover a
few kHz. It's not part of the regs or bandplan that PSK31 cannot be used
anywhere
else except those few kHz.

> > What exactly is the rationale for such a chunk of a band being set
>> >aside for this.
>>
>> Simple.
>>
>> - Without a code test, there will be lots of hams on the air who don't know
>> the code and can't tell that they are interfering with a Morse/CW station
>>
>> - Just as narrow and wide modes don't mix well, automated and manual modes
>> don't mix well.
>
> I can understand that, but I don't know how often that could happen.

It happens today. With the end of code testing it can only increase. See
example below about 3579. Of course nobody is guaranteed freedom from
interference on the ham bands.

>For PSK31, simply agreeing on one more frequency on each band to use
>would double the capacity of the mode, if you know what I mean.

Sure - but there's no reason the existing frequencies can't be expanded as needed right now.

Take 80 meters - lots of PSK31 around the colorburst freq. If there's a clear spot a kHz or so up or down, it's perfectly legal to use it for PSK31 if the colorburst freq is busy.

BTW, the 3579 frequency has a tale to tell. This will probably draw all sorts of flames, but it's a true story.

3579 was the "glowbug" CW frequency for a long time. ("Glowbug" being an affectionate term for vacuum tube equipment, particularly simple homebrew transmitters). The reason was obvious - old colorburst xtals were common junkbox items. I have a couple in HC-6/U holders, salvaged from old color TV sets.

Then some ingenious folks designed a neat little PSK31 rig that used 3579 colorburst xtals as the front-end filter. So 3579 became a popular PSK31 frequency.

What was once a quiet haven for the use of simple rigs became full of PSK31 signals. The glowbug folks moved because out of consideration for the PSK31 folks, and because it's easier to change one xtal than to change the filter in the PSK31 rigs.

But there were bad feelings and misunderstanding on both sides for a time, in part because most of them could not communicate with each other on the air.

Do both glowbugs and PSK31 deserve an adequate place on 80 meters? I say YES. That may be electro-politically incorrect to some folks, but I think it's fair.

Of course, 3579 is 16% up from the bottom edge of the band, not 35% ;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

460. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 13:48:17 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0203050548.54a904a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 36450

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.gsewzll.pminews@news.earthlink.net>...
> On Sun, 3 Mar 2002 16:02:02 -0500, Krell wrote:
>
> >I never said that there's anything wrong with bicycling or walking,

The description of the technology sure sounded derogatory, Krell. Is there
not room for all modes, both in transportation and in amateur radio

> >but if
> >you have a one hour commute to work every day, which mode of transportation
> >would you want to use?

First thing I'd do is think about moving. Spending ~1/12 of one's waking hours
just getting back and forth to work seems like a waste to me.

>
> Private electric railcar, with me as the operator. Two hours a day
> pf train driving sounds good to me....

Now THAT works!

But not just any electric railcar. Maybe a GG-1 or a P-5 could be pried loose.
I'm sure that Phil and I could handle one of those. Just as long as it's
done up "as God and the Pennsylvania Railroad intended......"
> ---
> ===> Stand Clear of the Closing Doors <===
>
> Phil Kane -- K2ASP - Beaverton, Oregon
> PNW Milepost 754 ---Tillamook District

73 de Jim, N2EY

Wayne, Pa - MP 14, Harrisburg Line

461. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 13:49:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020305084910.11710.00001757@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 36451

>Subject: Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/4/2002 10:54 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020304235427.19003.00000387@mb-bd.aol.com>

>Each and every licensee is REQUIRED to
>operate his or her transmitter according to rather definite technical
>requirements.

"...definite technical requirements"...?!? And those "definte" technical
requirements are...?!?!

Part 97 requires some baseline spectral purity requirements and has
certain MINIMUM standards, but very little else is "definate".

>How about the continued use of the pejorative "putz?"

>...squarely aimed at an individual.

And well earned too, I might add.

>Apparently there is a great big hypocritical "standard" N2EY
>is using in here. His "newsgroup cop" vision is quite narrow.

No more narrower than yours, Your Putziness.

>>The bands are not so full of digital....
>
>...YET.

Probably NEVER "yet". Not keyboard digital, anyway. We have had
microprocessor supported modes for over 20 years now, and it wasn't until the
availability of PSK that anyone cared much...

And by the looks of things, it's hit it's plateau already...Everyone is
back to the mic modes again.

Not that YOU'D know, Your Licenselessness...no experience to make an
INFORMED opinion on the matter...AGAIN.

>>You ever see me "flame" anybody for an idea?
>
>Absolutely! By sheer volume of single replies! Been happening
>from radio station N2EY for at least three years.

Hmmmm...."sheer volume of replies" is flaming?

No...That volume of reples is in direct response to the bile spewed by one
incompetent ex technician who can't pass an Amateur Radio examination...NAMELY

Leonard H. Anderson.

>Some one-by-twos will NOT ALLOW anyone "under" them to talk back,
>or even contact their governments in using their citizenship rights.

Judging by YOUR "sheer volume" of trash, Your Inteptness, anyone reading th
foregoing paragraph by you can see what foolishness you expound.

As usual.

462. Once Again The Two Faced Fool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 14:06:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020305090641.11710.00001759@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 36452

>Subject: Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/4/2002 10:54 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020304235427.19003.00000387@mb-bd.aol.com>

>Some one-by-twos need a two-by-four harshly applied to them...

Ahhhh yes.......Thanks, Lennie.

The perpetual victim, always crying foul at any perceived "threat", making a suggestion of directly applied violence against Amateur Radio opeators.

Lennie, when will you ever come to the realization that YOU are your own greatest enemy?

You really do enjoy getting your nose rubbed in your own stupidity, don't you? Well, Your Putziness, you DO make it easy to do.

Thanks.

463. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 14:44:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C84D9B3.A72CBAE9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36453

Dick Carroll wrote:
> So you, Ed, the rest of the ARRL,the FCC and most everybody else believe that if
> you just ignore it all, it'll go away. And for darn sure you don't want anyone talking
> about it.

Prospective hams who memorize the Q&A without knowing the underlying material
are doing it the hard way, Dick. Please stop advertising that it is the easy
way. My Conditional exam in 1952 was a lot more difficult than my Advanced
or Extra exams because I didn't understand the material in 1952 and I did
understand the material in 1975 and 2000.

When you tell people that rote-memorizing the word associations is the easy
way out, you are encouraging them to do exactly that. The truth is that
rote-memorization of 1000 word associations is NOT the easy way. What you
are telling them is incorrect and you are encouraging them to do it the
wrong way.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

464. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 14:54:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C84DC09.9FDF62E5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36454

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > If an engineer
> > > who holds an Extra Lite doesn't know morse code to 20wpm, he holds a
> > > dumbed down license. Is that to deep for you?
> > >
> > > I still don't completely understand,
>
> Dint think you would.

I see that you edited out the embarrassing question that I asked and you refuse to answer. So I ask it again: How can studying and learning something new possibly have the effect of dumbing someone down? You have said it doesn't dumb down the individual ham but does dumb down the ARS. But the ARS is made up of individual hams so how can the ARS be dumbed-down if the individual hams are not dumbed-down?

Your error is in equating CW to some sort of smartening-up. The majority of the most brilliant people in the history of the world didn't ever know Morse code, Dick. Your premise is in error. You cannot gain smartness by learning Morse code. The FCC knows it and you cannot help but know it. Your delusions of smartness associated with Morse code just won't fly.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

465. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 14:58:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C84DD0A.6E1D53CB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36455

Mike Coslo wrote:
> I think that the slice of band should be appropriate to the mode and
> the number of users. CW has less bandwidth need and judging by what I
> hear, I can tune across the CW sections and hear traffic, but no jams
> except once in a while.

The problem is that the number of users varies with time. If allocations
are made based upon present use, they will soon be wrong and must be changed
periodically. The present HF division of narrow band modes Vs wider band
modes seems to adequately meet the needs, IMO.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

466. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 15:23:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020305102331.09750.00001220@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 36460

In article <20020304065625.16980.00001566@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>From: "XXXXX- Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>
>>Larry's too stupid to understand that a huge waste of time is spent trying
>>to make me feel in some way bad about my callsign. I like it.
>
>Actually, he is helping to give you lots of publicity for your call sign. I
>don't like your call, for pretty much the same reasons that Larry doesn't,
>but
>I believe that the FCC regulations are more important to Amateur Radio than
>my
>personal opinion.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

Who sez I'm giving any "publicity" to Kim's callsign?

73 de Larry, K3LT

K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT
K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT
K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT
K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT
K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT
K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT
K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT
K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT
K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT
K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT

(Kim's nightmare -- 100 K3LT's all in one place!)

467. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 15:23:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020305102332.09750.00001221@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 36457

In article <3C83106F.AB173E74@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >Are you willing to pick a year by which all of this will have happened
>> >and lay a substantial money bet on it?
>>
>> Sure -- 2105 and 5,000 dollars (US).
>
>I didn't think we could take you seriously.

Cecil:

I'm as serious as a coronary infaction. If the ARS is toast sometime
between now and 2105, I'll pay you 5 kilobucks -- but not BEFORE
Jan. 1, 2105! All you gotta do is be there to collect, assuming ham
radio is histoire by then!

73 de Larry, K3LT

468. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 15:23:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020305102332.09750.00001222@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 36458

In article <3C83112E.753AE656@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >Larry, you still have not explained how a person can be dumbed down
>> >simply by meeting the requirements for an amateur radio license.
>>
>> Maybe so, but I have, many times, stated that this "dumbing down"
>> is relative to previous, more stringent licensing requirements.
>
>But how does meeting the present requirements dumb a ham down
>compared to meeting the past requirements? Why is an Electrical
>Engineer, for instance, dumber today than an Electrical Engineer
>was a decade ago?

Cecil:

Because, a decade ago, an Electrical Engineer with an Amateur
Extra-class license also had to pass a 20 WPM code test, which
means there was a good chance that he was also a proficient CW
user in addition to whatever technical skills he brought to the hobby.
A present day E.E. with an Extra Lite most likely doesn't have
any useful proficiency in the code -- and is, therefore, "dumbed down"
compared to his antecessor.

73 de Larry, K3LT

469. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 15:23:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020305102333.09750.00001223@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 36456

In article <3C831187.3A4AD588@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> I've said it before, and I'll say it again...I would dearly love to be
>proved
>> wrong, but I don't have that kind of luck!
>
>You proved that you don't even believe it yourself, Larry, by setting the
>date of the bet to 2105, more than 100 years in the future.

Cecil:

103, to be exact! Whassamatta -- don't think you can make it?

73 de Larry, K3LT

470. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 15:23:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020305102333.09750.00001224@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 36461

In article <20020304064525.16980.00001562@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>Sure -- 2105 and 5,000 dollars (US). Only thing is, you have to be
>>alive to collect it personally if you win. Surely any 300,000 foot
>>alien should be able to live another 103 years.
>
>I think we can all infer from this how much confidence you have in your own
>words, Larry.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

Cecil asked me to pick a year and a substantial sum of money. If he doesn't think he can make it to 2105, that's his problem -- not mine! If he wants to keep wagering with people based on when things are going to happen, he should have probably taken better care of his health when he was younger! By the year 2105, the ARS may have been dead for 88 years or so, but that's when I pay off the bet, not one decade before!

73 de Larry, K3LT

471. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 15:23:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020305102334.09750.00001225@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 36459

In article <3C83FA4F.A9A954BE@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> > > I've said it before, and I'll say it again...I would dearly love to be
>proved
>> > > wrong, but I don't have that kind of luck!
>> > >
>> > You proved that you don't even believe it yourself, Larry, by setting the
>> > date of the bet to 2105, more than 100 years in the future.
>>
>> No, he just dodged another of your trolls.
>
>You guys just don't have the guts to put your money where your mouth is.

Cecil:

Nawwww -- you're just afraid you can't make it!

73 de Larry, K3LT

472. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 16:06:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C84ED1B.82778A4D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36462

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I'm as serious as a coronary infaction. If the ARS is toast sometime
> between now and 2105, I'll pay you 5 kilobucks -- but not BEFORE
> Jan. 1, 2105!

You've got the bet backwards. You are the one who is betting the ARS
will be toast. From what you say, I surmise that you do not think
the ARS will be toast during your lifetime. So I am assuming your
sky-is-falling rhetoric is so much hot air.

If the ARS won't be toast by 2010, I would say your predictions
are wrong.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

473. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 16:08:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C84ED82.90D7E316@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36463

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> By the year 2105, the ARS may have
> been dead for 88 years or so, but that's when I pay off the bet, not
> one decade before!

Which means that you don't believe the ARS will die during my
lifetime. That's exactly what I thought. Thanks for proving
my hunch.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

474. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 16:13:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C84EEB4.4CCEC807@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36464

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Because, a decade ago, an Electrical Engineer with an Amateur
> Extra-class license also had to pass a 20 WPM code test, which
> means there was a good chance that he was also a proficient CW
> user in addition to whatever technical skills he brought to the hobby.
> A present day E.E. with an Extra Lite most likely doesn't have
> any useful proficiency in the code -- and is, therefore, "dumbed down"
> compared to his antecessor.

Morse code has nothing to do with being dumb or being smart, Larry.
The FCC said so. Most of the great minds who have ever existed
didn't know Morse code. Einstein probably didn't know Morse code.

It is amazing that you can believe an Electrical Engineer can be
dumbed-down by passing an amateur radio exam. Exactly how many
IQ points does a person lose when he passes an amateur radio
exam? Does it happen during the exam? Or does it wait for him
to receive his ticket in the mail?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

475. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 16:14:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C84EEFF.CE76D822@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36465

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Whassamatta -- don't think you can make it?

Of course not. That tells me you don't believe what you say.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

476. Re: Beantown knows who's who

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 16:16:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C84EF48.BD7DF34F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36466

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT
> K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT
> K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT
> K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT
> K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT
> K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT
> K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT
> K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT
> K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT
> K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT K3LT

I still find your callsign to be obscene, Larry, and
I will keep bugging you until you choose to do the
right thing and change it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

477. Re: Gee, This Frequency Looks Open

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 16:49:57 UTC
From: AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <4mk98u8iokfeepqauku87s7ciptjpnhl64@4ax.com>
Source record: 36467

On 4 Mar 2002 18:03:33 GMT, Jammer <how@dumb.ny> wrote:

>
>
>February 15, 2002
>
>Mr. Thomas D. Batista
>10124 45 Avenue
>Corona, NY 11368
>
>Mr. Gerardo Arias
>278 Sharpe Avenue
>Staten Island, NY 10302
>
>RE: Amateur Radio licenses KC2DDD, N2IFU--Repeater Operation
>
>
>
>Dear Messrs Batista and Arias:
>
>It has come to our attention that you are operating an uncoordinated repeater
>with an output on 147.020 MHz and input on 143.020 MHz. The frequency 143.020
>MHz is not allocated to the Amateur Radio Service. Our information also
>indicates that you use this repeater as a reverse auto-patch, that it is not
>being identified, and that it is causing interference to coordinated
>repeaters
>
>Section 97.205 of the Commission's rules states that where there is
>interference between a coordinated and an uncoordinated repeater, "the
>licensee of the uncoordinated repeater has primary responsibility to resolve
>the interference." Operation on 143.020 MHz unlicensed is a violation of
>Section 312 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and will result in
>fine or imprisonment.
>
>Section 308(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C.
>Section 308(b), gives the Commission the authority to request information
>from a licensee regarding the operation of a radio station. Accordingly, you
>are requested to respond to this letter within 20 days from the above date,
>furnishing: 1) full details about the operation of the repeater; 2) the
>identity of control operators, if any; 3) the call signs of the users; 4)
>names and addresses of any unlicensed users; and 5) the location of the
>repeater. If the repeater is located on property that you do not own or rent,
>state the name and address of the landlord or site manager.
>

>Address your response to 1270 Fairfield Road at the above letterhead address,
>and please be advised that Congress has made punishable a willfully false or
>misleading reply to a letter of this type. See Title 18, Section 1001 of the
>United States Code.

Okay, so what's your POINT? Are you complaining about the FCC action?
Are you commenting on the above named licensees and their questionable
operating practices? What is the PURPOSE of submitting this notice?

Raymond Sirois AB2HR
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet:\\thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

478. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 16:58:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C84F932.15EFE0B7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 36468

```
Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020304081020.17584.00000355@mb-ct.aol.com...
> > In article <3c82e728_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
> >
> > >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >news:20020303211404.20827.00000336@mb-mj.aol.com...
> > >> In article <3c824edc_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"

> > >and artificial
> > >waiting periods are nothing more than an elitist pile of
> > >crap that discriminates against qualified newcomers.
> >
> > Why all the name calling over an IDEA?
>
> Because its such a BAD idea that it can't help but
> evoke an emotional response ... note, however, that
> the names were directed at the IDEA, not at individuals.

It always comes down to this: An idea not in keeping with your view of
ham radio nirvana is BAD. An idea put forth by you is a GOOD idea.
Your explanation of names being directed at an idea leaves much to be
desired. The idea can't understand or respond to your name calling.

> > >You're trying to "make up for" the loss of the Morse
> > >test by adding another unnecessary barrier, plain and
> > >simple.
> >
> > Nope. I just think practical experience should be part of the
> requirements.
> > You don't. Why all the fuss?
> > >
> > >I think the FCC will agree with me ...
> >
> > Probably. A newcomer could simply toss the license in the drawer for
> a
> > year. Plus it would increase the number of interactions with the FCC
> and VEs.
> >
> > >> > I *also*
```

> > >> >believe that the FCC would have problems with this in legal
> terms
> > >as
> > >> >a form of discriimination against otherwise qualified
> individuals.
> > >>
> > >> Why? How is it discriminatory to require some experience?
> > >
> > >Because it treats equally competent/qualified individuals
> > >differently on the basis of an arbitrary requirement.
> >
> > Depends how you measure competency. Which is a
> > subjective, opinion-based thing in the first place.
> >
> > >I think the FCC will agree with me ...
> >
> > They didn't agree for many years. And if they will agree, why are
> you
> > getting so worked up over a simple idea?
>
> Because I hate to see such bad ideas even tossed around
> because they will give prospective hams who may read them
> the (perhaps correct) idea that some hams would just as soon
> erect barriers to keep them out (or at least keep them down,
> below their level of ability/interest for as long as possible.)

A couple of times you've trotted out, "I think the FCC will agree with me", as if you and the FCC are great pals now. I don't believe that you have an inside track on thinking among those who regulate amateur radio.

> > >> I've been an Extra for 32 years, Carl.
> > >
> > >I've been an RF engineer for 32+ years ...
> >
> > You were an RF engineer when you were 19?
>
> Actually yes ... but the "+" was an error ... I think of
> myself in round numbers as 52, but won't have my
> birthday until later this year ... I skipped grades in
> school and entered the job market several years
> earlier than most ...

I tried that but Uncle Sam was ready to draft me so I entered the Air Force. How'd you manage to avoid being drafted, Carl?

> > >don't expect me to bow down to your "superiority."
> >
> > I don't - I was simply pointing out that I already "had mine", too.
>
> OK ... I already knew that ...
>

> > Don't expect me to "bow down" to your "superiority" either.
>
> That was not the intention of my retort ...

Man, it just had that ring to it.

> > >CW and other narrowband
> > >modes have shared the lower parts of the HF bands for many, many
> > >years.
> >
> > "we've always done it this way", you mean.
>
> I mean it's worked and there is no reason to assume
> that it won't continue to do so ... besides, flexible usage
> of the spectrum = good spectrum management.

...not necessarily. Lumping incompatible modes together in the same
portion of the spectrum doesn't make good sense.

> > >You just want to stifle the growth of digital modes because you
> > >know deep in your heart that Morse ultimately won't be as
> > >attractive and you want to "lock down" enough turf "all for
> yourself."
> >
> > Nope. I just want some room, that's all.
>
> You have room NOW ... you have access to ALL of the HF
> bands ... no need for a "Morse only setaside."

I think Jim is concerned about later rather than NOW. What' with the
caps?

> > > you're AFRAID
> > >that
> > >Morse can't cut the mustard, that's all.
> >
> > So all modes must compete as if in a battle? Why not simply allow
> all
> > modes everywhere?
>
> Why characterize it as a "battle?" Cecil has used the term
> "free market" ... as far as allowing all modes everywhere,
> that is actually the way MOST of the world does it ... and it
> really doesn't seem to have created any real problems.
> However, given the history here in the US it's probably not
> a politically practical option ... though it could result in better
> spectrum utilization from a technical/analytical standpoint.
> (Don't get excited ... I'm not proposing it ... I already said I
> would not support phone band expansion.)

Why state that someone is "AFRAID". Cecil's "free market of modes", as
I recall, dealt with doing away with mode-specific testing--not with

lumping all modes together in the same piece of spectrum.

> > >> Ah, I see."Nobody wants to ban CW", huh? Just take away the
> usable
> > >spectrum
> > >> for the mode a little at a time until the CW folks have nowhere
> to
> > >go.
> > >
> > >NOBODY is "taking ANYTHING away from" Morse ... I stated before
> > >that I would not support ANY reduction in the amount of spectrum
> > >where Morse is permitted in the HF bands. NONE, ZIP, NADA ...
> > >now you want to take 35% EXCLUSIVELY for Morse????
> > >I DON'T THINK SO!!!!!!

What's with all the caps? Does, "I DON'T THINK SO!!!!!!" mean you are
opposed to the idea?

> > The phone bands are effectively off-limits to routine Morse.
>
> While that is a matter of practice, it is not "the law" ... besides,
> the lower parts of the band are NOT so "full" with CW that the
> CW folks NEED to expand into the upper part of the bands.

I think Jim is concerned for the future. You know, when the digital
paradise comes to fruition.

> > So are the places where digital foks congregate.
>
> How so? It may bea matter of practice, but it is not "the law".
> Those frequencies are available for CW use, should you
> actually NEED them, as long as there is not already an ongoing
> QSO there ...
>
> > Then why are you so reluctant to even discuss change in a calm,
> > rational fashion? You're defending the status quo.
>
> It's not so much that I'm "defending the status quo" but
> that I'm incensed by your outrageous proposal to set
> aside 35% of the HF bands for CW ONLY.

You're kind of cute when you're outraged. I knew the old Carl would
take over from the new Carl sooner or later. "Sooner" is the winner.

> > Ever hear of "brainstorming", Carl? Where people just toss out ideas
> and
> > they get kicked around and maybe something useful pops out? One of
> the
> > key rules is that ALL ideas, no matter how weird, are discussed
> calmly. Most
> > brainstorm ideas are found to be impractical, of course, but the
> 'stormers are

> > not attacked for coming up with weird ideas.
>
> There's a BIG difference between "wierd ideas" and "just plain BAD
> ideas."
>
> > When I see "elitist pile of crap" and "wacky" and "smoking something
> funny",
> > it kinda makes me wonder...
>
> Sorry ... you really pushed a button ... but then, I guess you knew
> you would ... maybe it was just a troll to see how hard I'd bite ...

Hockey dad defense.

> > >> >The "phone bands" should NOT be expanded, but should allow the
> > >> >use of wider bandwidth digital techniques (digital voice,
> imaging,
> > >> >and higher speed data, for example) in addition to SSB/SSTV.
> > >>
> > >> Why? That would only add to the QRM.
>
> I think that that is a rather rash, unfounded assumption.

I think it to be a realistic prediction of outcome.

> > >> I see a double standard. On the one hand you don't want any
> > >"setasides" for
> > >> CW, but at the same time you don't want to widen the 'phone
> bands.
> > >> Makes no sense to me.
> > >
> > >Makes perfect sense ... it's called "dynamic frequency allocation."
> >
> > Not for the SSB/AM/SSTV folks.
>
> As I said, in purely technical terms, applying dynamic frequency
> selection might well be the best solution (it's the norm in the rest
> of the world and hasn't caused problems), but I recognize that,
> based on US history, it would be a politically unacceptable
> solution, at least for the foreseeable future.

In some areas of the world where there are few hams, it works quite
well. In some European countries, it hasn't worked well at all. The
hams of some European nations are embroiled in constant arguments over
the same thing you propose.

> > >You want to use Morse, listen for a clear frequency and have at it.
> >
> > I always do just that - or listen for a CQ.
> >
> > >You want to operate digital, your modem does the same thing.
> > >(In the digital world, it's called CSMA-CA.)

> >
> > Sure.
> > >
> > >> I say give each mode type its own backyard. If it's OK to fence
> in
> > >the
> > >> phone/image folks, then it's OK to fence in the digital folks
> too.
> > >
> > >I can see how you'd like that, seeing as how your proposal would
> > >grant Morse a HUGE, undeserved, unnecessary windfall at the
> > >expense of everyone else. The more I think about it, the crazier
> > >I think you must be to even have the cajones to even suggest such
> > >a thing.

> > Good to know that ideas can be tossed around without personal
> attacks.
>
> If I tossed out an absurd idea, I would expect to get flamed a bit
> for it ... (heck, I get flamed for good ideas :-)

Heck, I'm sure that you believe all your ideas are good ideas :-)
It is only those which do not fit in with your grand plan for amateur
radio which are worthy of drawing your ire.

> > But for simply suggesting these ideas, you call me "wacky", "smoking
> something
> > funny", "crazy", "apparently lost your mind". The ideas are
> dismissed as "an
> > elitist pile of crap", "undeserved", "absurd", "discriminatory" and
> a host of
> > other
> > pejoratives.
> >
> > All because you disagree.
> >
> > Interesting.
> >
> > Is this the example you want to set for newcomers?
>
> I admitted that you pushed my button ... I believe I said "I'm sorry"
> above ... if not, I'm saying it here ... congrats for a "gotcha."
>
> I would HOPE, however, that even newcomers would be able
> to recognize grossly bad ideas and object to them ...

Should be easy: All of you newcomers--be sure to look for the Carl,
WA6VSE signature so you'll know you are getting only the best in ideas.

Dave K8MN

479. Re: Morse as an "essential element" in emergencies (new thread title)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 17:01:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203050901.30f143a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 36469

Interesting reading on the subject of Wi-Fi for the average bloke:

http://www.salon.com/tech/feature/2002/03/05/wi_fi_nation/index.html

73 de Jim, N2EY

480. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 17:27:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203050927.11e7d1dc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 36470

Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<3C8301B7.C279E1B2@worldnet.att.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > In article <3C810A14.9AF1F3AA@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
> > <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:
> >
> > >N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > >> The point I was making, though, was that back in '58 the FCC wasn't
> satisfied
> > >> with what was going on in the ARS.
> > >
> > >And today, they couldn't care less.
> > >
> > Actually, I think the FCC does "care", to a certain extent. They just don't
> > want to get involved with directing the ARS via license requirements. That
> > way, they bear no responsibility for what happens to the ARS.
> >
> > For example, if don't use our VHF/UHF bands, or don't use them effectively,
> > the FCC can self-justify reallocating some of them.
> >
> > The basic point is that it's up to us hams. The FCC cares about the result.
>
> FCC cared what happened to the ARS when it instigated Incentive Licensing,
> and what it got for its trouble was a number of people who upgraded their
> knowledge and skills, but as well as a whole lot of harsh criticism.

Yup. Plus many of the trends they were concerned about, like reduced
homebrewing and increased "appliance" operating, did not diminish. And the
FCC had a ton more admin work to do without getting more resources to do it
with.

> I think that has a bearing on how they view the ARS today.

Sure. There was even a proposal to restore pre-incentive licensing Generals
and Advanceds to full privileges. I can imagine what the FCC thought of
THAT one!

> Why should they make a serious attempt to coddle the selfcentered whiners
> when they can hand it all off to the QPC and VE's and just let nature takes
> course?

That's part of it, but I think the main issue is simply lack of resources
at the FCC. They don't want more admin work, they don't want complex ARS
rules, and they DO want a "healthy" ARS. How one defines "healthy" is a

different issue.

I think one thing that may be driving FCC's thinking is the continued growth of "freebanders" and pirate stations. FCC may think that one way to control these folks is to make it easier for them to get ham licenses. If nothing else, enforcement against licensed folks is easier than against unlicensed ones.

Does this mean we will be "overrun by the unwashed hordes"? Maybe not, because those folks probably aren't going to be very eager to give the feds their SSN, address, etc., etc., then abide by a whole bunch of rules and regs.

> I think history will show what happens when there is no longer any
> challenge involved in an activity which thrives on it.

Good point! The FCC is leavving the challenge up to us. After all, anyone can submit questions for the tests to the QPC.

73 de Jim, N2EY

481. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 18:44:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C851202.88229C2C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36471

Dave Heil wrote:
> It always comes down to this: An idea not in keeping with your view of
> ham radio nirvana is BAD. An idea put forth by you is a GOOD idea.

Seems to me, that describes virtually everyone on the newsgroup, Dave,
including you.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

482. Re: Gee, This Frequency Looks Open

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 19:04:02 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <ED0E28CCA112AE9B.3B15012EA89B84FA.8760ECF342CDA1E9@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 36472

On 4 Mar 2002 18:03:33 GMT, Jammer <how@dumb.ny> wrote:

>Operation on 143.020 MHz unlicensed is a violation of
>Section 312 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and will result in
>fine or imprisonment.

Or just another letter from Riley, apparently.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

483. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 19:13:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C8518C7.F591455D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 36473

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > It always comes down to this: An idea not in keeping with your view of
> > ham radio nirvana is BAD. An idea put forth by you is a GOOD idea.
>
> Seems to me, that describes virtually everyone on the newsgroup, Dave,
> including you.

A LARGE DIFFERENCE is that not all resort to calling the ideas of others
ABSURD notions or products of a WARPED MIND. I DON'T THINK SO !!!!!!

Get my drift?

Dave K8MN

484. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 19:31:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C851CFD.37609627@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36474

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > It always comes down to this: An idea not in keeping with your view of
> > > ham radio nirvana is BAD. An idea put forth by you is a GOOD idea.
> >
> > Seems to me, that describes virtually everyone on the newsgroup, Dave,
> > including you.
>
> A LARGE DIFFERENCE is that not all resort to calling the ideas of others
> ABSURD notions or products of a WARPED MIND. I DON'T THINK SO !!!!!!

Seems to me, you have considered my notions absurd before. Am I
wrong?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

485. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 20:36:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020305153640.20266.00001221@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 36475

>Subject: Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 03/05/02 13:44 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C851202.88229C2C@IEEE.or

>Dave Heil wrote:
>> It always comes down to this: An idea not in keeping with your view of
>> ham radio nirvana is BAD. An idea put forth by you is a GOOD idea.
>
>Seems to me, that describes virtually everyone on the newsgroup, Dave,
>including you.

The problem is that those who THINK they have the good ideas are just in
the way of those of us who DO have the good ideas!

73 (and ducking for cover!)

Steve, K4YZ

486. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 20:43:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C852DEA.E16858E5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36476

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> The problem is that those who THINK they have the good ideas are just in
> the way of those of us who DO have the good ideas!

That reminds me of a bumper sticker that went something like this:
"Those of you who think you know everything are aggravating to
those of us who do."
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

487. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 21:28:53 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C853895.C7B121C2@uci.edu>
Source record: 36477

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > It always comes down to this: An idea not in keeping with your view of
> > > > ham radio nirvana is BAD. An idea put forth by you is a GOOD idea.
> > >
> > > Seems to me, that describes virtually everyone on the newsgroup, Dave,
> > > including you.
> >
> > A LARGE DIFFERENCE is that not all resort to calling the ideas of others
> > ABSURD notions or products of a WARPED MIND. I DON'T THINK SO !!!!!!
>
> Seems to me, you have considered my notions absurd before. Am I
> wrong?

Even you consider some of your ideas to be absurd, Cecil. You posted
one last week about thought police or some such thing.

488. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 21:31:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C84DFFA.B5DEAEED@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36478

Mike Coslo wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > In article <3C82B9F3.27A9DAE5@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >That idea must have escaped while I was looking the other way!
> >
> > It's just an idea.
>
> Ahh, not so much of a problem- an idea for discussion. I heard it being
> discussed, and wasn't sure if it was just an idea or something that was
> going to become law of the land!
>
> > > 35 percent of a band devoted to CW is pretty outrageous.
> >
> > Why?
> >
> > >Considering
> > >that CW has a smaller BW requirement, it is like setting aside *most* of
> > >the band for CW.
> >
> > So we should penalize the narrow modes by allowing them less space?
> >
> > If 35% is too much, what would be a reasonable number?
>
> I think that the slice of band should be appropriate to the mode and
> the number of users. CW has less bandwidth need and judging by what I
> hear, I can tune across the CW sections and hear traffic, but no jams
> except once in a while.
>
> This is in contrast to PSK 31, where I often have to wait or change
> bands, because there often isn't enough space to fit another signal.
>
> I don't do much ssb except in contests, so I wouldn't be much of a judge
> of that.
>
> > > I don't think it accounts for the increasing popularity of the digital
> > >modes like psk31 either.
> >
> > They get their own space, as described in the idea. PSK31 is perhaps 50 Hz
> > wide - how much band does it need?
>

????? You have lost me here, Mike. Unless you're using a single frequency transmitter, such as a Warbler which is crystal controlled that should never be happening. And even on a single
frequency with a 2400 hz bandpass, there's room for two QSO's in every 100 hz. While there
are sometimes signals quite close together I have never seen a time when there was no
place to dump another signal into the passband.
All that makes me wonder what you're using
as a software package. If it's Digipan (or some version of Digipan) it's quite easy to
find a slot to work in. (I like the "MIXwin 2.03" package since it has all the commonly used
digital modes in a single software load, and requires only the click of the mouse to change modes, unlike others where you have to dump one mode then load another). It makes it
very easy to change modes when you hear (or see) another signal that interests you. A
couple clicks of the mouse and you jump from PSK31 to Hellschreiber or RTTY, while retaining the 2400hz passband waterfall display. It's a spectral display for that range
and you soon learn what each mode signals look like.
You may be copying a PSK31 station and see a RTTY or PACTOR signal start to transmit up the band. Very neat. MIXwin even receives PACTOR, though it doesn't allow you to transmit.

Dick

> As described above, it gets crowded enough that you can't find a space
> to put out a signal.
> > >
> > > What exactly is the rationale for such a chunk of a band being set
> > >aside for this.
> >
> > Simple.
> >
> > - Without a code test, there will be lots of hams on the air who don't know
> > the code and can't tell that they are interfering with a Morse/CW station
> >
> > - Just as narrow and wide modes don't mix well, automated and manual modes
> > don't mix well.
>
> I can understand that, but I don't know how often that could happen.
> For PSK31, simply agreeing on one more frequency on each band to use
> would double the capacity of the mode, if you know what I mean.
>
> - Mike - KB3EIA

489. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 21:31:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C84E4EE.3D70E617@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36479

W1RFI wrote:

> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>
> >>The only "expectation" I have is for the ARRL to quit its
> >>schizophrenia of being an altruistic goods dealer with
> >>overtones of religious fanaticsm in being Big Brother.
>
> > Thanks, Anderscum. You never let us down.
>
> His statement is scarcely comprehensible. I can piece it together, but it sure
> is an odd way to say that he believes that ARRL is really just a publishing
> house pretending to be a membership services organization.

Not odd at all for Lennnie the Limp.

490. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 21:31:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C84E8E0.CC31EC9E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36480

W1RFI wrote:

>. Your warm and caring

> nature does not inspire such personal sharing, IMHO.

Which merely shows what your opinion is worth.

491. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 21:31:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C84EA61.63B83263@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36481

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >So you, Ed, the rest of the ARRL,the FCC and most everybody else believe that
> >if you just ignore it all, it'll go away. And for darn sure you don't want
> anyone talking about it.
>
> So they are all out to get you!

Nope. But you sure wish I'd shut up about it.

>
>
> The way you talk about it encourages people to use rote memorization instead of
> the easier and more effective route of learning the material.
>

What is so curious is that if what you say is true, the situation will take care of
itself.
If it's so much more difficult for persons with no technical training to learn the
material,
they will do so and will soon abandon rote memorization of word associations. This
being true, why so much fuss from you on the subject?

>
> Are you willing to add a single statement to your advice that tell prospective
> hams the word association memorization is not the easiest way to pass the ham
> tests?
>

Now you're suggesting I lie about it?

492. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 21:31:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C84EDEF.C014FE64@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36482

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> Why would you consider my telling newcomers that it is best, and easiest,
> >to
> >> learn the underlying material as a "troll?"
> >>
> > No, but I would consider your saying that I was giving them advice to be
> >trolling.
>
> That is not trolling, Dick; it is a difference of opinion. I note that you
> believe that everyone who disagrees with you is "trolling."

Only when they use that difference to begin a troll...Cecil does that routinely.
You
are beginning to follow his lead.

>
> I believe that the choice of words you use saying that prospective hams want to
> get their licenses the easiest way so they are using word association to
> memorize 300 questions 3 times is giving them advice that the easiest way to
> get their ham license is to use word association to memorize 300 questions 3
> times.

> What does it mean to you when you say that the easiest way for prospective hams
> to get their licenses is to use word association to memorize 300 questions 3
> times?

How does Gordon West train his students to pass the Tech test in a single weekend?
Does he screw off the tops of their heads and pour in knowledge, or does he teach
word associations? It wouldn't be a problem if it was limited to the entry level,
but they can
as easily do it the same way twice more to glom an Extra

>
>

> I believe that some prospective hams who read your words will see them as
> advice on what is the easiest way to pass the test. What do you think they will
> think of your telling them what you believe to be the easiest way to pass the
> test?
>

Those who know will see it as the truth, as opposed to the smoke you insist on
generating.

What's odd is that you think all that consists of me giving "advice" when what it really is
is nothing more than a distillation of several years of VE activity.

>
> I believe that your advice is wrong. You believe that to be "trolling."
>
> Have I summed it up accurately?
>

Need I say it?

493. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 21:31:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8500CA.7F953AE0@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36483

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > So you, Ed, the rest of the ARRL,the FCC and most everybody else believe that if
> > you just ignore it all, it'll go away. And for darn sure you don't want anyone talking
> > about it.
>
> Prospective hams who memorize the Q&A without knowing the underlying material
> are doing it the hard way, Dick.

For hams with a technical background, that is correct, as I have already stated several times. For those like Kim, who have no technical background, what you say is NOT correct. Ask Gordon West.

> Please stop advertising that it is the easy
> way. My Conditional exam in 1952 was a lot more difficult than my Advanced
> or Extra exams because I didn't understand the material in 1952 and I did
> understand the material in 1975 and 2000.
>

Of course. You didn't have the exact same questions with their exact same answers given in advance in the form of a pool to study before the test.

>
> When you tell people that rote-memorizing the word associations is the easy
> way out, you are encouraging them to do exactly that.

So stating facts is encouragement. It could as well be discouragement. I don't get to set the definition, nor any other part of it.

> The truth is that
> rote-memorization of 1000 word associations is NOT the easy way. What you
> are telling them is incorrect and you are encouraging them to do it the
> wrong way.

What you are telling us all is incorrect. For people with no technical background, rote word association is definitely easier than trying to learn material *from the question pool*.
If one sets out to learn the technical material he'll have to look well beyond the pool for much
of what he needs.

494. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 21:31:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C85018E.2D66A4A0@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36484

CAM wrote:

> > > I still don't completely understand,
> >
> > Dint think you would.
>
> I see that you edited out the embarrassing question that I asked and you
> refuse to answer. So I ask it again: How can studying and learning something
> new possibly have the effect of dumbing someone down?

The question is merely a diversion on your part, as usual.

> You have said it
> doesn't dumb down the individual ham but does dumb down the ARS. But the
> ARS is made up of individual hams so how can the ARS be dumbed-down if
> the individual hams are not dumbed-down?
>
> Your error is in equating CW to some sort of smartening-up.

Your error is in insisting that when hams don't know Morse code they are just
as
qualified as when they do. Wrong.

495. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 21:31:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C850341.37FCF79D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36485

CAM wrote:

> It is amazing that you can believe an Electrical Engineer can be
> dumbed-down by passing an amateur radio exam. Exactly how many
> IQ points does a person lose when he passes an amateur radio
> exam? Does it happen during the exam? Or does it wait for him
> to receive his ticket in the mail?

No problem with the answer to that one. It happens when FCC drops the
requirements
so that he can pass the exam without the necessary skill and knowledge. From
that day on
anyone getting that license is getting a dumbed down version of it. That
says less
about the person as about the service in total. There is nothing extra about
a
dumbed down Extra class license.

496. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 21:31:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C852667.9D8339C8@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36486

CAM wrote:

> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > It always comes down to this: An idea not in keeping with your view of
> > > > ham radio nirvana is BAD. An idea put forth by you is a GOOD idea.
> > >
> > > Seems to me, that describes virtually everyone on the newsgroup, Dave,
> > > including you.
> >
> > A LARGE DIFFERENCE is that not all resort to calling the ideas of others
> > ABSURD notions or products of a WARPED MIND. I DON'T THINK SO !!!!!!
>
> Seems to me, you have considered my notions absurd before. Am I
> wrong?

Even YOU consider some of your own notions to be warped. But then.
what is a troll to do?

497. Re: Bootleg Call signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 21:46:00 UTC
From: uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org
Message-ID: <ff37aa44.0203051346.7b95c000@posting.google.com>
Source record: 36487

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20020217131037.23121.00000018@mb-ch.aol.com>...
> All that's required to get an Extra-class license these days is to
> answer 70% of the questions correctly on a 10-question multiple-guess
> test based on a 5 minute, 5 WPM code transmission, or producing
> one minute of solid copy (which is about 25 characters).

Er, as of sometime last summer (4/15 maybe?) the ten question multiple
choice was changed to 10 question fill in the blank.

Makes it a bit harder to pass the test, but not much.

Sean.

498. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 22:16:55 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <rtbh8.122$2E4.29715632@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 36488

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C82FF3C.81AA6C4B@earthlink.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C826638.6CF5A4E4@earthlink.net...
> > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > > > Sure, Dave, pick on blind pigs. Do you want to go double or
nothing
> > and
> > > > > > make fun of blind hams while you're on a roll?
> > > > >
> > > > > Are there blind hams out looking for acorns?
> > > >
> > > You tell me. Since blind pigs weren't the topic, only you can tell
us
> > where
> > > > your point is going.
> > >
> > > I don't recall the old saying about blind hams finding acorns. The
only
> > > one I knew was about blind pigs. You brought up blind hams. Did you
> > > have a point?
>
> > I don't recall the old saying about blind pigs. I do recall a saying
about
> > a one-legged man in an ass kicking contest, but I'm not sure how it
went.
> >
> > So you didn't have a point?
>
> I did but it appears that you missed it.

You've probably forgotten it as well.

> > > I'm really close to giving up on you again, Brian. You bring up a
tale
> > > of an FR6 you used to QSO. I told you that I didn't recall that. It
> > > was of little significance to me then. It is of little significance
to
> > > me now. It isn't as if it'll show up as a Jeopardy clue.
> >
> > Dave, I don't know why it upset you so. Only you can answer that. If
you
> > can't recall why it prompted you to say that I didn't know much about

DX,
> > then we'll never know.
>
> I didn't state that it upset me. It would be hard to know that it would
> be something I'd need to remember. It mustn't have seemed important to
> me then and it doesn't seem important now. The fact that you've gone on
> and on about would indicate that it occupies an important place in your
> life.

Its right up there with my 1st communion.

> > > Yeah, like many DXers whose QSO totals are numbered in the tens of
> > > thousands for each operation, I had nothing to do with QSLing other
than
> > > sending logs to WA8JOC. Notify the QSLing police.
> >
> > Why? Did you do something wrong?
>
> According to you, I must have violated the QSLer's Oath in handing
> QSLing chores to WA8JOC.

Well, just let this be a lesson to you.

> > > That was for operation from Guinea-Bissau. I was active there from
Feb.
> > > 1988 through early Sept. 1989. It was one illustration of just how
> > > wealthy I became from QSLing proceeds. How about this one? I didn't
> > > have to QSL anyone at all. I just didn't think there was much purpose
> > > to getting on the air from a rare spot, making all of QSOs and then
not
> > > confirming the contacts.
> >
> > eQSL supposedly has the answer.
>
> Not for me. I'll not be having non-cards printed and mailed. There
> aren't many I need and my QSLing will decrease dramatically after
> finishing up work on 6m and 160m DXCCs.

Then why not release your logs from your various QTHs to e-QSL? You've
already gotten what you wanted out of them, right?

> > > > When the word spreads that you'll work them out of band, then follow
it
> > up
> > > > with a QSL card???
> > > > If anyone's in the market for something illegal, its not hard to
find
> > out
> > > > who the bootlegger or dealer is.
> > >
> > > I wasn't out of band nor did I have any knowledge that they were.
> >

> > Now Dave, you know that's not true. Our French ham on here told us what
the
> > French 6M authorization was. You simply chose to ignore it.
>
> What's not true--that I was not out of band? I don't care if a French
> ham breaks a French law. I only need concern myself with the radio regs
> in the country where I operate.

OK.

> > > Do
> > > you know the permitted 6m band allocation is in each country?
> >
> > A good DXer knows what the 160M authorizations are.
>
> I haven't memorized the 160m allocations in each country. I do give a
> nod to the JA's once in a while. Otherwise I scan the band.

Good grief. There's not an inch of give in you, is there?

> > Why is it different for
> > 6M? Are you aware that there's a different 6M calling freq in the
Pacific?
>
> I don't memorize every other countries 6m authorization either. As to
> the Pacific calling frequency, I'm not in the Pacific calling other
> Pacific stations. The V7 station I worked on 6m was at 50.080 CW. The
> numerous Pacific area stations I worked from Tanzania were around
> 50.110. Would you like me to supply a list of prefixes so you can check
> to see if any of those stations operated outside their assigned band
> segments?

I guess you're not the least bit familiar with either the 160m or 6m
authorizations. Too bad for you. I guess you'll get DXCC by dumb luck.

> > There's a lot to know if you want to be a DXer.
>
> Well, good luck.

Ditto.

> > > Do you go
> > > through your logs, looking for actual frequency and compare logs to a
> > > country's 6m frequency allocation. If you do, you'd be called
> > > obsessive-compulsive by medical folks.
> >
> > A French ham verified that his countrymen were operating out of band.
That
> > is good enough for me to at least check it out.
>
> Naw, it was good enough for you to work yourself into a dither over what
> I was doing in Tanzania about the "French Problem".

Illegal traffic isn't my problem.

> > > Other non-wealthy hams have traveled to North Korea and have obtained
> > > permission to operate. There are still no North Koreans hams. There
> > > are still no radio amateurs other than foreigners in many countries.
> >
> > Yes, I've noticed that only DXpeditions activate some populated
countries,
> > where they could have their own people on the air. Yet they don't.
>
> What are you going to do to alleviate the problem?

Nothing.

> > > > That was the thrust of my comment prior to you and/or Steve
misdirecting
> > it.
> > >
> > > Is that because you didn't have your facts straight and you went on a
> > > tangent arguing those facts? If so, you've given us much power over
> > > you. I guess we have the power to cloud men's minds.
> >
> > Yes, lets talk about Marty some more. What rig is he running?
Antennas?
> > How's he doing? Perhaps he's risen from mere salesman to VP by now? I
wish
> > him the best of luck in his career.
>
> I'll ask him when he visits the house for a couple of days after Dayton.
> Would you like him to phone you?

I'll probably see him there. If I miss him, do give a call.

> > > > Sounds fantastic. I'm tempted to turn in my life insurance for cash
> > value
> > > > and purchase a plot of land in south eastern Ohio to spend my
weekends.
> > A
> > > > 60 foot tower is my little dream. That's one solution.
> > >
> > > That's the BIG dream for many folks. It is a good idea. I'm sure you
> > > can find a spot high enough to give you nose bleed for not much loot.
> > > My VHF enthusiast friends in Hinton, West Virginia had a little wooden
> > > shack on top of a mountain across the New River. It was equipped with
a
> > > generator and a kerosene heater. They spent many weekends there since
> > > there was no way to work anyone except locals in town.
> >
> > I've got a deep cycle battery and a kerosene heater. Now I need to find
> > that hilltop.
> > I was looking in the paper today. Some of the "hunting/recreational"
> > property starts at about $2k/acre. Most is more.
>

> Such land can run as low as $1200 - $1500 per acre here though my
> neighbor's son is building his home about a 1/4 mile down the road on 27
> acres he obtained for $18k.

One of the agriculturists I work with said that farmland away from the city
was starting around 2K. He was amazed as I was that rough land commands the
same price.

> > > > Another is to go
> > > > mobile to public parks and state forests and do "field day" on big
> > contest
> > > > weekends. I've got a nice deep cycle battery. Paper logs aren't a
> > problem
> > > > for "hunt and pounce" that I'd be using.
> > >
> > > The antennas won't be as good though. I bought an old Grid 386, a
pile
> > > of batteries and an AC supply for peanuts at a hamfest some years
back.
> > > It is perfect for Field Day activity. Log-EQF doesn't know it is
> > > operating on an old, slow computer.
> >
> > That's a popular logger. My friend bundles it with his computer
interface
> > kit. And I haven't heard of Grid since using the weather UTC, "Quick
> > Reaction Communications Terminal" The Grid interfaced with a Transworld
> > briefcase HF and a piece of comsec. The laptop is the least of my
concerns
> > though. I need to get beyond mobile type antennas.
>
> My Grid came out of a Bradley and was labeled "unclassified only".

I was given a Wang that had the Order of Battle on it. The Army...

> > > > I've put two of the the mfj split ferrite kits on one of the
computers
> > and I
> > > > still get racket on my portable shortwave. That's six of them. My
work
> > > > laptop is quiet except when booting up, but I won't use it except
for
> > work.
> > > > Perhaps I need to trade off my old 300mhz machine for an older
laptop.
> > >
> > > I found that most of the crud emanating from my computer here in the
> > > shack came from the monitor. A monitor extension cable and ferrites
at
> > > both the monitor and the computer helped greatly. It is a pain but
> > > there are tempesting sprays available. You can take your monitor out
of

> > > the case and spray the interior of the case with the stuff. There'll
> > > still be some residual noise because of the large glass area. It
isn't
> > > much fun to read through copper screen.
> >
> > Like Yaesu did with the FT-747 plastic cased radio? Can you name the
> > product?
>
> Not off hand. There are a number of similar products out there.

I'll try the radio shack scratch and dent store off Hamilton road.

Brian/N0iMD

499. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 22:25:04 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a63gf80dr@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 36489

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020305102332.09750.00001222@mb-fc.aol.com...
> Cecil:
>
> Because, a decade ago, an Electrical Engineer with an Amateur
> Extra-class license also had to pass a 20 WPM code test, which
> means there was a good chance that he was also a proficient CW
> user in addition to whatever technical skills he brought to the hobby.
> A present day E.E. with an Extra Lite most likely doesn't have
> any useful proficiency in the code -- and is, therefore, "dumbed down"
> compared to his antecessor.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

I really wish you'd start adding "IMO" on your posts instead of stating
these things as if they are fact.

500. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-05 22:32:04 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a63gsd015r@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 36490

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C852667.9D8339C8@worldnet.att.net...
> > > A LARGE DIFFERENCE is that not all resort to calling the ideas of
others
> > > ABSURD notions or products of a WARPED MIND. I DON'T THINK SO !!!!!!
> >
> > Seems to me, you have considered my notions absurd before. Am I
> > wrong?
>
> Even YOU consider some of your own notions to be warped. But then.
> what is a troll to do?

Like I said before, if you think Cecil is such a troll, why do you keep
repsonding to him? Why don't you just killfile him? OOPS! I forgot. You've
got me killfiled, so you can't read this.

501. Rollerball's "jonathan" skates again...:-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 00:07:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020305190742.19003.00000419@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 36493

In article <a62do3$qu0$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv) <kf2ti@arrl.net> writes:

>> > >Remember Mark Morgan, KB9RQZ? He comes to mind.
>> >
>> > Remember Steve Adell, KF2TI? At least four pseudonyms, full
>> > pseudonyms with pretenses of being other radio amateurs? :-)
>>
>> What were the pseudonyms used by you? Avery Label? Leftover 21?
>> NOCWSKILLS? Were they all you, Len or just the other voices from within
>> you?

I've never used those screen names. I've always given my real name under any screen name. My real address has been printed in several electronics-oriented periodicals and publications.

>I must be ALL them!!!???!!

Who knows? :-)

Recorded Multiple Personality Disorder medical writings indicate as many as 31 within a single individual.

>Better yet, having perused some threads, why not produce some of the
>"stalker" information you supposedly supplied the LAPD last year about
>"me". Maybe a couple of taped phones calls? Coime on Lennie, this is
>better than Carl's smoking gun story.

That information is still on file with the Los Angeles Police Department along with copies to Pacific Bell Security. What they are doing as part of any investigation is not public information. The fact that I did file information and an accepted complaint is on the LAPD logs. That submission included an aircraft tail number (registry) which can be verified by police with the FAA. FAA tower communications have long been recorded. The LAPD has a special section to handle Internet fraud and general criminal behavior activities on the Internet.

I cannot know what Pacific Bell Security does in any detail other than Pacific Bell electronic switching computers keep an automatic record of all calls. That information is only supplied to authorities. Pacific Bell does provide a number of services such as "Privacy Manager" and "Caller ID" which do supply a caller's number directly regardless of whether it is answered or not. We have a rather complete record of ALL callers over a period of two years that our all-mode telephone terminal automatically provides. During the time we were gone

last year, that automatic log indicates the only anamoly as seven calls from the same number in the Anaheim area. At least one of those calls is indicated to have left a voice message. That message was not retained, dumped during our absence due to later voice messages received (digital message recording).

Pacific Bell security is vague on what they actually do. They did confirm the caller ID number recorded on our terminal and the general location but would not identify the exact nature of the calling terminal. They alleged but did not state that it is "like a pay phone." The calling number is not traceable through the ordinary "reverse" telephone number services. Pay telephones in this area are not traceable to any but authorities for rather obvious reasons.

That single telephone location used in probable harassment is over 30 miles from our residence, over 45 minutes driving time by the quickest route. Considering this is a "neighborhood watch" area, alarms work just fine, and our house sitter was dependable, there was no indication that "jonathan" was close to this "hood" as promised. Those promised "photos" (in another thread) never materialized anywhere except in someone's disturbed imagination.

Stalking, of any kind, is not something trivial around this metropolis. Police and other authorities actively look into all cases. Fortunately, most of them result in no illegal or harmful action, those started by meaningless posturing of over-imaginative disturbed individuals incapable of anger management. Such as this posting by steve-jonathan.

502. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 00:07:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020305190744.19003.00000420@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 36492

In article <20020305071401.16975.00001562@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>> Thanks, Anderscum. You never let us down.
>
>His statement is scarcely comprehensible.

It is comprehensible. There seems to be a problem in acceptance. Non-acceptance will appear as "incomprehensible." That's just denial.

>I can piece it together, but it
>sure is an odd way to say that he believes that ARRL is really just a publishing
>house pretending to be a membership services organization.

Incorrect and a failure to comprehend others' viewpoints.

Many perceive the ARRL as trying to be two kinds of organization at once, a "service" organization and a seller of goods to a specific market. The latter "serves" the market it purports to "represent?"

It is perfectly reasonable for others to assume a paid staffer, a manager, has a goodly amount of Loyalty to his employer. That is not lost to the general readers here. It is also perfectly reasonable that employers do not look with favor upon employees, especially those with management responsibility, to negatively criticize them.

The end result is the general readers' perception of bias, of spin in stating certain things about the employer. That perception is no longer "suspicion" but is out in the open. Continuous denial of such biased attitudes does not erase the perception but tends to enforce it.

There is no denial that the ARRL performs a service to its membership. There should be no denial that the ARRL makes a profit on reselling of goods or the sale of advertising space in its membership magazine. It should. The organization must sustain itself somehow. It becomes schizoid to others when the idealistic side is used as a vehicle to support the materialistic side and vice-versa. It becomes confused when both sides of this Janus claim the "only" "official" source of goods and services for "all radio amateurs."

Article two of "The Amateur's Code" demands membership organization loyalty solely to the ARRL. That has been in existance for at least 24 years. That isn't lost to all who have seen the opening pages of the (extra-cost) ARRL Radio Amateur's

Handbook for a quarter century.

While it may be uncomfortable to have such things repeated, it should be noted that ARRL membership remains less than a quarter of all licensed US radio amateurs.* That has remained so for at least a decade.

If the ARRL is so altruistic, so good, so noble as claimed continually in its own publications and official statements as well as claims of its employees, why hasn't the membership increased proportional to licensees?

The public and non-members are able to perceive things about the ARRL which the ARRL cannot. That is not a "fault" of the non-members.

---

* QST is a membership magazine, a monthly periodical. Because it is sold at retail outlets and by subscription to non-voting readers, it must have a public "Publisher's Statement." That statement gives the membership number total (wish some exclusions) as well as the number of printed copies, copies sold at retail outlets, and copies given away or destroyed. The Publisher's Statement is periodically printed in QST and is available on the ARRL website under the sub-pages of advertiser's information.

503. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 00:07:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020305190745.19003.00000421@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 36491

In article <3C84F932.15EFE0B7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> news:20020304081020.17584.00000355@mb-ct.aol.com...
>> > In article <3c82e728_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> > <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>It always comes down to this: An idea not in keeping with your view of
>ham radio nirvana is BAD. An idea put forth by you is a GOOD idea.
>Your explanation of names being directed at an idea leaves much to be
>desired. The idea can't understand or respond to your name calling.

OK, Fearless Leader has spoken. :-)

>A couple of times you've trotted out, "I think the FCC will agree with
>me", as if you and the FCC are great pals now. I don't believe that you
>have an inside track on thinking among those who regulate amateur radio.

Other than Fearless Leader working for State Department (ours or
another one?), anyone who appears in person for an ex parte
presentation should be as close as anyone can get unless they
were once IN the FCC.

That won't stop Fearless Leader, however... :-)

>I tried that but Uncle Sam was ready to draft me so I entered the Air
>Force. How'd you manage to avoid being drafted, Carl?

So, tell us all how the Luftwaffe was. Did you get to train in the US?

How come for why N2EY wasn't in any military service?

>In some areas of the world where there are few hams, it works quite
>well. In some European countries, it hasn't worked well at all. The
>hams of some European nations are embroiled in constant arguments over
>the same thing you propose.

Fearless Leader is from the State Department. He is here to help.

>> I would HOPE, however, that even newcomers would be able
>> to recognize grossly bad ideas and object to them ...
>
>Should be easy: All of you newcomers--be sure to look for the Carl,
>WA6VSE signature so you'll know you are getting only the best in ideas.

...and then Fearless Leader will come along and Show THE Way...

stay tuned, folks. :-)

504. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 00:10:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020305191028.17597.00002013@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 36494

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>>>So you, Ed, the rest of the ARRL,the FCC and most everybody else believe
>>>that if you just ignore it all, it'll go away. And for darn sure you don't
want
>> anyone talking about it.

>> So they are all out to get you!

> Nope. But you sure wish I'd shut up about it.

I don't know, Dick; do you think that I would engage you in conversations about
something I wanted you to shut up about?

>If it's so much more difficult for persons with no technical training to
>learn the material, they will do so and will soon abandon rote memorization
>of word associations. This being true, why so much fuss from you on the
> subject?

Because I don't think it is helpful if some of the experienced hams give
newcomers bad advice.

Do you think it is helpful for experienced hams to give newcomers bad advice?

If you really think that "this being true," why do YOU keep saying that it
easier to use word associations to pass the tests?

>> Are you willing to add a single statement to your advice that tell
>>prospective hams the word association memorization is not the easiest
>>way to pass the ham tests?

> Now you're suggesting I lie about it?

I don't get it; in one paragraph, you say that it is true that rote
memorization is not the easiest way to pass the tests, then you say that you
would be lying about it if you told newcomers that rote memorization is not the
easiest way to pass the tests.

Either way, if you are going to keep advising newcomers to rote memorize
material to pass the tests by telling them that doing so is the easiest way to
do it, then I will offer them my opinion that doing so is not the easiest way
to pass the tests.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
>

>
>
>
>
>
>

505. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 00:12:51 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020305191251.17597.00002016@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 36495

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Even YOU consider some of your own notions to be warped. But then.
>what is a troll to do?

To Dick, "Troll" means "doesn't tell Dick he is right." :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

506. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 00:20:16 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020305192016.17597.00002019@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 36496

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>For people with no technical background, rote
>word association is definitely easier than trying to learn material *from the
>question
>pool*.

Most hams buy one or more of the study guides and read the material, Dick.

Trying to rote-memorize the question pools would be much harder than reading
the supporting material in the study guides.

You are giving bad advice to newcomers.

I>If one sets out to learn the technical material he'll have to look well
>beyond the pool for
>much
>of what he needs.

Okay, so maybe you are turning around. Are you tellling newcomers that they
should look beyond the pool to learn what he or she needs to pass the test? If
so, I agree; this is the easiest and best way to do it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RF

507. Re: Rollerball's "jonathan" skates again...:-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 00:57:22 UTC
From: Steve Adell - KF2TI <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a63phr$9cu$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36497

In article <20020305190742.19003.00000419@mb-bd.aol.com>,
len6feetunder@aol.com drooled on the keys and bored everyone to tears
with...
> In article <a62do3$qu0$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, Steve Adell - KF2TI
> (Landing, NJ FN20qv) <kf2ti@arrl.net> writes:
>
> >> > >Remember Mark Morgan, KB9RQZ? He comes to mind.
> >> >
> >> > Remember Steve Adell, KF2TI? At least four pseudonyms, full
> >> > pseudonyms with pretenses of being other radio amateurs? :-)
> >>
> >> What were the pseudonyms used by you? Avery Label? Leftover 21?
> >> NOCWSKILLS? Were they all you, Len or just the other voices from within
> >> you?
>
> I've never used those screen names.

Get your attributes right old geezerly man. Dave stated that not me.
and BTW, your statement is total and complete bullshit.

> I've always given my real name
> under any screen name. My real address has been printed in
> several electronics-oriented periodicals and publications.

Liar liar I wish your pants were on fire.....

You started out with NOCWTEST and AVERYFINE without posting your name
until you were outed each time. If you're gonna tell falsehoods, keep
the stories straight,

In fact, here's one from 1998 Lennie...note no name at the bottom

In article <19981023225537.26961.00000326@ng-fb2.aol.com>,
erlpnk4yz@aol.com
(ERLPN K4YZ) writes:

>Subject: Re: Q: CW implies radio knowledge?
>From: erlpnk4yz@aol.com (ERLPN K4YZ)
>Date: 24 Oct 1998 02:55:37 GMT
>
>Bill and Group,
>
> >>What were the requirments for Part 95? Was code ever a part of Part
>95?
>NO. If code is ended in Part 97 as a requirement...will there still
be test

>requirements? YES.<<
>
> Obviously code was never a part of Part 95. But like any law, the
>inference of control and the spectre of punishment is what kept some
control
>over the populace. The controls were removed as was a major
expectation of
>punishment. (Not that is wasn't already sorry at the time the FCC
removed
>the requirement for a license, however simple it was to obtain one) The
results
>speak for themself.

PART 95 HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH THE DISCUSSION. Robeson should
go to the FCC website and download ANY radio service Part he wishes so
that he can learn what Part 95 contains. For that matter, he could
consult
any old FCC Rules and Regulations set to see that citizens band radio
service was NOT under Part 95 when it was created.

> >>NCI wants to end CODE testing. NCI fully supports retention of
>licensing and theory/regs testing.<<
>
> Geez...thanks. And make sure you send your yearly donation to the Dick
>Bash educational fund. We will be providing "test guides" to all High
School
>and collegiate students for their mid-terms and finals. We will also
be
>creating a placement service to get these grads into advance degree
programs
>such as med school. Consider that for a moment.

Consider that you are spouting off denigrations and pejorations without
addressing the SUBJECT.

The VEC system has been running for 15 years. The ARRL itself
publishes several radio amateur license study guides. Is the ARRL a
"Dick Bash" clone?

> >>Yes, just memorize 900 questions and answers to become a tech.
>Piece of cake, right?<<
>
> Judging by the growth in the Tech class license and the fact that Maia
>and Gordon seem to be making a good living off of the sale of such
publications,
>I'd say so!

Would Robeson be willing to name the sources and amounts of this alleged
"good living?" How much does the ARRL make from their study guides and
videotapes?

If Robeson does not like the present testing system, he can comment to the FCC. The time is ripe and Robeson is not on the ECFS list. Such Comments must be received by December 15. The clock is ticking.... tick....tick....tick....tick....

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Now here's one from Avery Fine that was so frigging long, you had to do it in 2 parts. Notice the fact that you as Avery was responding to Kim Kelly who was responding to Leno 21. So, Ken, you, under an ASSumed pseudonym was posting anonymously....

In article <39C00758.7BC211B8@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>Lenof21 wrote:
>> This is a POLICY newsgroup, not a half-assed "schoolroom" where
>> the "students" get to insult and demean the "instructor."
>
>Ahhh, so then it must be one where the "instructor" insults and demeans
>everyone else, including the "institution", and the "degree".

Taking a sentence out of context and using it in some sort of reply doesn't make any case except showing your own sensitivity to personally-held, over-exaggerated beliefs and delusions. I'll just have to answer that by a summation of the newsgroup scene and general amateur news content over the last three years. It is in two long parts and not a specific personal reply.

Amateur radio is first and foremost an avocation. It is not an occupation. It is not an emergency service. It is not a ready pool of trained technologists ready to aid the nation as if it is some virtual "minuteman" standing by for battle. It has long since abrogated any semblance to "pioneering the radio art" in the vast arena of the radio world.

snip snip snip (to the last paragraph of part 2) hhmmmmm no signature

By all means, stifle dissent, hold the status quo, raise the drawbridge of the isolated castle. Wrap yourselves in patriotic bunting, sing old, old radio hymns from the ARRL Hymnbook, proclaim only among yourselves that you are the greatest! I really doubt the radio regulators will see it that way. Behavior on the air or on the computer or in correspondence to the FCC is noted for what it is by the regulators. The grant of an amateur radio license does not make an individual "right" in opinions or behavior.

Anyone can call dissent "hate." They can call dissent anything they wish. They just can't call their definition as truth.

didit

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

>
> >I must be ALL them!!!???!!
>
> Who knows? :-)

Obviously you don't or you'd produce some piece of evidence. Case dismissed due to lack of evidence and total lack of credibility by the prosecution and the persecutor as well.

Len ANderson = Loser

>
> Recorded Multiple Personality Disorder medical writings indicate
> as many as 31 within a single individual.
>
> >Better yet, having perused some threads, why not produce some of the
> >"stalker" information you supposedly supplied the LAPD last year about
> >"me". Maybe a couple of taped phones calls? Coime on Lennie, this is
> >better than Carl's smoking gun story.
>
> That information is still on file with the Los Angeles Police
> Department along with copies to Pacific Bell Security. What
> they are doing as part of any investigation is not public
> information. The fact that I did file information and an accepted
> complaint is on the LAPD logs. That submission included an
> aircraft tail number (registry) which can be verified by police
> with the FAA. FAA tower communications have long been
> recorded. The LAPD has a special section to handle Internet
> fraud and general criminal behavior activities on the Internet.

OOOhhhhhh do they use secret decoder rings there DICK tracy??? And aircraft tail registry's...ohhhhh. perhaps from the mysterious black gliders that circle overhead???? ohhhhh the intrigue...the excitement.

>The rest of the incredible amount of words that amount to absolutely nothing to do with the original challenge have been deleted to preserve the precious bandwidth, so the the Old Geezer can type some more.

>Such as this posting by steve-jonathan.

And yet again, a referencee with no substantiation. So typicval Andersonian Thanks for not disappointing us there Old Len. A ton of words and absolutely nothing to say.

You're a fraud and not a very good one. In fact, I put it to you...You posted all those fakes. You have the track record, you have shown that you are capable of making up and posting under various pseudonyms. Therefore, you are are the mystery poster and there isn't one thing you have produced that prove otherwise..or you would have. Time to tap dance..the GEEZER WALTZ. Crank up the old victrola..Len's going out to the Hitler 2 step

Case closed

Again, Len loses

I remain, the one, the only Steve-KF2TI

and any attempts to prove I was anyone else are out and out lies.

508. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 02:18:02 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a63uu3nkh1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36500

Dick wrote:
> > You have said it
> > doesn't dumb down the individual ham but does dumb down the ARS. But the
> > ARS is made up of individual hams so how can the ARS be dumbed-down if
> > the individual hams are not dumbed-down?
> >
> > Your error is in equating CW to some sort of smartening-up.
>
> Your error is in insisting that when hams don't know Morse code they are
just
> as qualified as when they do. Wrong.

I agree....the ham that doesn't know code may, in fact, be far
more qualified as a ham than the ham that does know code...it
all depends on what their respective "other ham skills
and knowledge" are.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK
.

509. Re: K3LT was serious (was Re: K3LT wasn't serious (was Re: The tests that Rea...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 02:50:12 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020305215012.18506.00000038@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 36502

In article <20020305071151.16975.00001561@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>I'll consider it to be serious. Now each of
>>you can put up $5K...I'll hold it until 2105
>>and we'll decide the outcome then :-)
>
>I have reconsidered and I have concluded that Larry is correct. Removing the
>Morse code requirement will ensure that ham radio is not destroyed until
>2105.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

Well, in that case, I guess we'll all just have to wait and see, shall we?

73 de Larry, K3LT

510. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 02:50:13 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020305215013.18506.00000039@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 36501

In article <20020305071523.16975.00001563@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
>>> You proved that you don't even believe it yourself, Larry, by setting the
>>> date of the bet to 2105, more than 100 years in the future.
>>
>>No, he just dodged another of your trolls.
>
>By posting something he didn't believe was true just to get a reaction out
>Cecil and others here?
>
>I will take Larry at his word that he does not believe that removing the code
>test will destroy amateur radio for over 100 years.

Ed:

I don't recall saying that. I'm saying that removing the code test will destroy amateur radio *within* the next 103 years. It could happen tomorrow. I'm just not paying off on the bet until 2105. If Cecil is too impatient to wait that long (assuming we can determine that he won sometime between now and 2105), then he should not have proposed the wager.

Personally, I think I'm going to win -- and am more than willing to wait until 2105 for Cecil to pay me.

73 de Larry, K3LT

511. Re: ARRL Newsgroup?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 03:28:51 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <T1gh8.22251$FF7.3275982053@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 36503

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:QXJg8.414$rc.417228@monger.newsread.com...
>
> >
> > Ryan, I'd rather not see the name "ARRL" on any newsgroup not initiated
> and
> > moderated by the ARRL. There's already enough ARRL bashing out there.
> And
> > I believe that there are some SIG reflectors on the members only side of
> the
> > ARRL.org site. The ARRL also has a number of weekly reports and
> newsletters
> > that are available via e-mail.
> >
> Not any different than if they are mentioned in any other group or list???
> Do they authorize there too?
>
>
> Ryan

I don't understand you question. Brian

512. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 03:31:19 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020305223119.18506.00000040@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 36504

In article <a63gf80dr@enews3.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20020305102332.09750.00001222@mb-fc.aol.com...
>> Cecil:
>>
>> Because, a decade ago, an Electrical Engineer with an Amateur
>> Extra-class license also had to pass a 20 WPM code test, which
>> means there was a good chance that he was also a proficient CW
>> user in addition to whatever technical skills he brought to the hobby.
>> A present day E.E. with an Extra Lite most likely doesn't have
>> any useful proficiency in the code -- and is, therefore, "dumbed down"
>> compared to his antecessor.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>I really wish you'd start adding "IMO" on your posts instead of stating
>these things as if they are fact.

Krell:

No problemo. IMO, you're a wanker.

73 de Larry, K3LT

513. Re: Code Is Dead

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 03:40:06 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <qcgh8.22259$x_7.3277336807@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 36506

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020303231233.17754.00000787@mb-ba.aol.com...
> In article <6org8.20371$Vg3.2967346332@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian
P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> There you have it, folks! A perfect example of the value of the code
> >> testing requirements as a "LID filter." In his own poor attempt at a
> >> troll, Leadpipe has proven the value of the PCTA philosophy by having
> >> been "filtered out" of HF by one of the best secondary attributes of
> >> code testing! And when he does finally get his codeless HF privileges,
> >> I hope you enjoy his on-the-air antics, for I'm sure that was the one
> >> part of his message about which he was totally serious!
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >Larry, attention.
> >
> >This is obviously a troll, saying exactly the right things to get you
going.
> >How gullible you are.
>
> Brian:
>
> Snap to, yourself, and find the part where I say, "In his own poor attempt
> at a troll..." There you go. I knew you could do it.

Larry, is it a troll or merely a poor attempt at one? And if you so readily
recognize it as a troll, why the over reaction? Or is every Larry reaction
an over reaction?

> >As I said before the rule making, "What I fear most about restructuring
is a
> >lack of enforcement, and what I fear most about maintaining the status
quo
> >is a lack of enforcement." Code never has been a barrier to poor ham
> >behavior, at least it hasn't worked in your case.
>
> Don't look now, but I've said the same thing many times over.

No you haven't. Ever. You merely want Congress to reassign amateur
frequencies to some nobler purpose, like wideband cartoon network, or sports
reports on PDA's.

I've
> never claimed the code was an infallable "Lid filter," but it does have
> that secondary effect. Lids are usually activated by microphones,
> as opposed to being de-activated by CW keys. Trust me, there are
> an increasing number of Lids on the CW bands these days.

Gosh, all of your preconceived notions about CW just went out the window.

> >Meanwhile, we are supposed to have enforcement once again in the name of
> >Riley Hollingsworth.
>
> Actually, we DO have enforcement again, in the person of Riley
Hollingsworth.
> Do you doubt that he exists?

So why get so excited about the troll. Riley will take care of biddness.

> >As you were.
> >
> >Brian
>
> Very funny. I was sitting in my chair the whole time.

Sitting at attention, no doubt.

Have you run any more unannounced SET's lately?

Dismissed.

Brian

514. Re: Code Is Dead

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 03:41:57 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <9egh8.22260$4h.3278215346@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 36507

Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> blowed in message
news:3C830C75.2112DC66@worldnet.att.net...

> Egad, it's the Gadfly! He had something to say, too....Didn't he??? If so,
what
> was it??

Ogawd, it's the Blowfly...

515. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 03:45:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C8590F1.84429AD0@adelphia.net>
Source record: 36515

Maybe I am a tad lost here Dick. I've only ever operated PSK31 on the proposed frequencies: mostly 80 meters at 3580, 14070 for 20 meters, and 28120 on 10 meters.

While people can transmit at other frequencies, do they? I must admit I've never noticed the psk31 notes in other areas of the band. But perhaps I've just been provincial. 8^)

And as the waterfall display will tell you, there are a fair number of hams whose PSK31 signals are pretty atrocious, overdriving the audio and running too much power, and making it difficult to achieve the BW promise the mode can achieve.

I'll have to check out MixWin

Dick Carroll wrote:

> ????? You have lost me here, Mike. Unless you're using a single frequency
> transmitter, such as a Warbler which is crystal controlled that should never be
> happening. And even on a single
> frequency with a 2400 hz bandpass, there's room for two QSO's in every 100 hz. While
> there
> are sometimes signals quite close together I have never seen a time when there was
> no
> place to dump another signal into the passband.
> All that makes me wonder what you're using
> as a software package. If it's Digipan (or some version of Digipan) it's quite easy
> to
> find a slot to work in. (I like the "MIXwin 2.03" package since it has all the
> commonly used
> digital modes in a single software load, and requires only the click of the mouse to
> change modes, unlike others where you have to dump one mode then load another). It
> makes it
> very easy to change modes when you hear (or see) another signal that interests you.
> A
> couple clicks of the mouse and you jump from PSK31 to Hellschreiber or RTTY, while
> retaining the 2400hz passband waterfall display. It's a spectral display for that
> range
> and you soon learn what each mode signals look like.
> You may be copying a PSK31 station and see a RTTY or PACTOR signal start to
> transmit up the band. Very neat. MIXwin even receives PACTOR, though it doesn't
> allow you to transmit.
>
> Dick
>
> > As described above, it gets crowded enough that you can't find a space

> > to put out a signal.
> > > >
> > > > What exactly is the rationale for such a chunk of a band being set
> > > >aside for this.
> > >
> > > Simple.
> > >
> > > - Without a code test, there will be lots of hams on the air who don't know
> > > the code and can't tell that they are interfering with a Morse/CW station
> > >
> > > - Just as narrow and wide modes don't mix well, automated and manual modes
> > > don't mix well.
> >
> > I can understand that, but I don't know how often that could happen.
> > For PSK31, simply agreeing on one more frequency on each band to use
> > would double the capacity of the mode, if you know what I mean.
> >
> > - Mike - KB3EIA

516. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 03:54:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8566D4.83B71A65@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36508

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >For people with no technical background, rote
> >word association is definitely easier than trying to learn material *from the
> >question
> >pool*.
>
> Most hams buy one or more of the study guides and read the material, Dick.
>

Are you sure? Most of the study guides I've seen consist of the questions and the

exact answers, and some don't even include the distracters. I don't know how it's done these days but earlier the answers were even in the same order on the test as they were in the pools.

>
> Trying to rote-memorize the question pools would be much harder than reading
> the supporting material in the study guides.

Of course it would, and also of course I never said anyone memorizes the question pools.
Can you soak that up ED? What they memorize is work associations so they can recognize
and pair answers with questions where they have seen them paired before. Of course

studying the distracters just gets in the way.

>
> You are giving bad advice to newcomers.

How can I be giving advice when I'm merely stating what I see as fact? Why do you fool yourself into believing that this isn't already widely known?

>
> I>If one sets out to learn the technical material he'll have to look well
> >beyond the pool for
> >much
> >of what he needs.
>
> Okay, so maybe you are turning around. Are you tellling newcomers that they
> should look beyond the pool to learn what he or she needs to pass the test?

Nope. I'm telling y'all that if one is to actually learn the material with no prior background

most of it won't be learned from the question pools alone. Of course we both know
that
few with no technical background learn the material from the question pools,
anyway.
Don't we?

> If
> so, I agree; this is the easiest and best way to do it.

You sure do keep trying, I have changed my view none whatever, yet you keep
"insisting" that I have.

Oh, I noticed that you ignored my question about how Gordon West trains
newcomers
to pass the Tech exam in a weekend. Gives a money back guarantee, too, I
understand.
Still think they're learning the material?

517. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 03:57:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C8593BD.115E93C7@adelphia.net>
Source record: 36509

N2EY wrote:

> >> So we should penalize the narrow modes by allowing them less space?

When you put it like that!.....

I'm not actually suggesting anything, as I don't support anything
beside what is used today, space wise (do you have the percentage at
present?)

> OK - but that depends on the band and the time you listen.
>
> >This is in contrast to PSK 31, where I often have to wait or change
> >bands, because there often isn't enough space to fit another signal.
>
> ?? On what band(s)? PSK31 is not limited by law to just a few frequencies.
>
> Let's suppose just for a second that my idea was actually adopted. 15% of
> 80 meters is 75 kHz. Is that enough PSK31 space? If not, how much would
> be adequate?

I'll have to look for others using psk31 at other frequencies than the
well known ones. The nature of the mode tends to concentrate people in a
few, well known sections.

> Take 80 meters - lots of PSK31 around the colorburst freq. If there's a clear
> spot a kHz or so up or down, it's perfectly legal to use it for PSK31 if the
> colorburst freq is busy.

< a bunch of good stuff snipped>

I really enjoy your posts, Jim. It is enjoyable to get historical info.
In amonstg the arguing and name calling, it is the most enjjoyable and
educating part of this newsgroup.
- mike -

518. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 03:59:09 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c86e79f_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36592

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020306153124.17082.00000038@mb-mr.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)
> >From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
> >Date: 03/05/02 07:28 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3c860b64_1@newsa.ev1.net>
>
> >Why must someone be a radio amateur to comment and have opinion on
amateur
> >radio, Dave? That doesn't make sense at all.
>
> Sure it does. It makes all the sense in the world. Lennie the Loser
has
> NO experience (beyond the theoretical) from which to address matters
pertaining
> to Amateur radio policy or practice.
>
> NONE.
>

I just don't think that is reason enough to condone excluding someone from
expressing their opinion. The ARS is a "public" concern.

> >
> >Must one be in the medical
> >insurance industry before an opinion can be made that medical insurance
> >fails most people miserably and has made a mockery of the true nature of
> >being a doctor?
>
> First of all, with the exception of those names on the Social
Register or
> Fortune 500's folkest-with-the-mostest, name me someone in America who is
NOT
> affected by insurance matters.
>

Well, literally, name someone that is NOT affected by amateur radio. Just
because there are people who have never heard of amateur radio, they are
still affected by it--through the very allocation of frequencies provided by
the government, via the public service functions we engage in, etc., right?

> >
> > Must one be a teacher to realize they are underpaid?
>
> Or a nurse, or a chauffer, or a gardner, or a....But none of that's

> germane to discussing Amateur radio practice or policy, now is it?
>

I think it is in terms of whether someone should express an opinion on
something they don't "partake" of. Remember, I am not at all impressed with
Len Anderson. I think he's a drone incapable of seeing beyond the nose on
his face. But I am defending that he, or anyone else, is perfectly welcome
to express their opinion on amateur radio and I don't think it's right to
snuff them off just because they aren't licensed.

> >
> >Len may be totally off-base.
>
> "May" be...?!?! He openly lies and misleads, harrasses and
antagonizes.
> There's no "may" to it...!!!
>

I was attempting to be diplomatic. See above comments. You know, contrary
to popular opinion in this newsgroup, it is bad practice to bring personal
comments and feelings into a debate... 'nuff said.

> >
> >I am surprised you spend time
> >reading his posts; they all say the same thing.
>
> Yes. They are insulting and demeaning. But that does not mean that
they
> should not be blunted by countering comments. We have seen the results
of The
> Big Lie that was allowed to go unchallenged.
>

Whoa, wait a minute. You've just reversed the scene there, Steve. I am not
at all saying someone should not challenge another's comments. Not at all.
What I am saying is that anyone should be able to make them.

> >
> >However, that he is not a
> >licensed amateur radio operator has nothing to do with it.
>
> They have EVERYTHING to do with it, Kim. He has absolutely NO
background
> (beyond the theoretical) upon which to make his opinions and assertions.
His
> practical experience in Amateur radio is Zero-point-Zero minutes of
Amateur
> Radio time.
>

But, Len is a citizen of the United States and is affected by the decisions
that are made on behalf of the ARS. Every US citizen is affected by each

and every decision made by the US government.

>
> Shannon Faulkner has more military training than Lennie has in
Amateur
> Radio. His numerous anti-ham rants have all been disproven or laid bare
for
> what they are....mean, antagonistic bile for which there is NO excuse save
pure
> meaness.
>
> Until he either ceases his verbal carnage of his own volition or he
> strokes out, he will get that which he doles out.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>

Well, as I said, I have no challenge to responding to Len...go for it. I think Len=your adversary as Larry/Dick=mine. But, I'd never tell Dick or Larry they shouldn't say something.

73/88, Kim (ya didn't put an 88...?)

519. Re: Radio Policy-Emergencies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 04:11:28 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c86ea81_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 36599

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:a9Bh8.19119$106.1542300@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> Whatever one may think of digital modes, SSB or whatever, the
> 'infrastructure' to use a buzzword simply does not now exist on any mode
> but CW. If you tried it on SSB some dangling hemorrhoid would QRM the net
> and the digital people would have some pissing contest about legacy modes
> for months after the need passed into history.
>
> Seems that until the noCoders can handle the predictable case, bleating
> about the unpredictable ones is simple prattle.
>
> Dick N�BK
>
>

I agree with your comments on HW traffic. However, you leave out a considerable contribution to the public when you leave out the [probable] hundreds of hours spent each year on weather nets, public service nets (parades, county fairs, etc.); which are all mostly provided via common VHF/UHF communication modes. I think the contrast is in that major disasters are probably fairly well covered by our public agencies. However, the "local stuff" is not and the services provided by the ARS is the backbone of communication for such events.

It may be a CW/no CW issue for some. But it's not for the greater majority.

Kim W5TIT

520. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 04:24:28 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C859A02.2567D0DB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 36510

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > It always comes down to this: An idea not in keeping with your view of
> > > > ham radio nirvana is BAD. An idea put forth by you is a GOOD idea.
> > >
> > > Seems to me, that describes virtually everyone on the newsgroup, Dave,
> > > including you.
> >
> > A LARGE DIFFERENCE is that not all resort to calling the ideas of others
> > ABSURD notions or products of a WARPED MIND. I DON'T THINK SO !!!!!!
>
> Seems to me, you have considered my notions absurd before. Am I
> wrong?

Your memory is good. As a matter of fact, I've considered any number of
your ideas absurd.

Dave K8MN

521. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 04:46:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C859EDF.B9B0FD92@earthlink.net>
Source record: 36511

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C82FF3C.81AA6C4B@earthlink.net...
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C826638.6CF5A4E4@earthlink.net...
> > > > Brian P Burke wrote:

> > > eQSL supposedly has the answer.
> > >
> > Not for me. I'll not be having non-cards printed and mailed. There
> > aren't many I need and my QSLing will decrease dramatically after
> > finishing up work on 6m and 160m DXCCs.
>
> Then why not release your logs from your various QTHs to e-QSL? You've
> already gotten what you wanted out of them, right?

I guess my answer is that my logs are mine. They don't belong to e-QSL.
I've never put any of my logs online and never will. The logs are still
open for those who need a card from any of my operations and WA8JOC
still has plenty of blank cards. Direct cards with SASE or IRCs will
get a direct response. Others go via bureau. None will be confirmed
electronically.

> > > > When the word spreads that you'll work them out of band, then follow
> it
> > > up
> > > > with a QSL card???
> > > > If anyone's in the market for something illegal, its not hard to
> find
> > > out
> > > > who the bootlegger or dealer is.
> > > >
> > > I wasn't out of band nor did I have any knowledge that they were.
> > >
> > Now Dave, you know that's not true. Our French ham on here told us what
> the
> > French 6M authorization was. You simply chose to ignore it.
> >
> What's not true--that I was not out of band? I don't care if a French
> > ham breaks a French law. I only need concern myself with the radio regs
> > in the country where I operate.
>

> OK.
>
> > > > Do
> > > > you know the permitted 6m band allocation is in each country?
> > > >
> > > A good DXer knows what the 160M authorizations are.
> >
> > I haven't memorized the 160m allocations in each country. I do give a
> > nod to the JA's once in a while. Otherwise I scan the band.
>
> Good grief. There's not an inch of give in you, is there?

Not when I'm right. I don't know any DXer who has memorized all of the
band allocations for every country in the world.
>
> > > Why is it different for
> > > 6M? Are you aware that there's a different 6M calling freq in the
> Pacific?
> >
> > I don't memorize every other countries 6m authorization either. As to
> > the Pacific calling frequency, I'm not in the Pacific calling other
> > Pacific stations. The V7 station I worked on 6m was at 50.080 CW. The
> > numerous Pacific area stations I worked from Tanzania were around
> > 50.110. Would you like me to supply a list of prefixes so you can check
> > to see if any of those stations operated outside their assigned band
> > segments?
>
> I guess you're not the least bit familiar with either the 160m or 6m
> authorizations. Too bad for you. I guess you'll get DXCC by dumb luck.

I've never operated from the Pacific. Why would I have need of a
Pacific calling frequency. I've worked plenty of 6m DX which wasn't on
any calling frequency. One doesn't get to DXCC on 6m by sitting and
listening to 50.110. One doesn't get to DXCC on 160m by listening to
any one frequency. I have 108 worked (96 confirmed) on 160m and 72
worked (only about 40 confirmed) on 6m. Sometimes dumb luck pays off,
huh?

> > > There's a lot to know if you want to be a DXer.
> >
> > Well, good luck.
>
> Ditto.

I had really good intentions of memrorizing all of those allocations but
I got so busy working new ones that I never got around to it.

> > > > Do you go
> > > > through your logs, looking for actual frequency and compare logs to a
> > > > country's 6m frequency allocation. If you do, you'd be called
> > > > obsessive-compulsive by medical folks.
> > >

> > > A French ham verified that his countrymen were operating out of band.
> That
> > > is good enough for me to at least check it out.
> >
> > Naw, it was good enough for you to work yourself into a dither over what
> > I was doing in Tanzania about the "French Problem".
>
> Illegal traffic isn't my problem.

Oh, we didn't handle any traffic--just the usual exchange of reports and
perhaps a grid square. You were the guy worked up over the issue. In
fact, you were the only guy worked up over the issue.

> > > > Other non-wealthy hams have traveled to North Korea and have obtained
> > > > permission to operate. There are still no North Koreans hams. There
> > > > are still no radio amateurs other than foreigners in many countries.
> > >
> > > Yes, I've noticed that only DXpeditions activate some populated
> countries,
> > > where they could have their own people on the air. Yet they don't.
> >
> > What are you going to do to alleviate the problem?
>
> Nothing.

That's what's wrong with the youth of today. Some can see a problem but
don't wish to get involved. I did my part. It is time for you to step
up and do yours.

> > > > > That was the thrust of my comment prior to you and/or Steve
> misdirecting
> > > it.
> > > >
> > > > Is that because you didn't have your facts straight and you went on a
> > > > tangent arguing those facts? If so, you've given us much power over
> > > > you. I guess we have the power to cloud men's minds.
> > >
> > > Yes, lets talk about Marty some more. What rig is he running?
> Antennas?
> > > How's he doing? Perhaps he's risen from mere salesman to VP by now? I
> wish
> > > him the best of luck in his career.
> >
> > I'll ask him when he visits the house for a couple of days after Dayton.
> > Would you like him to phone you?
>
> I'll probably see him there. If I miss him, do give a call.

> One of the agriculturists I work with said that farmland away from the city
> was starting around 2K. He was amazed as I was that rough land commands the
> same price.

They aren't making any more of it! Sometimes I do my best Grandpa Joad from "The Grapes Of Wrath": "This here's my land. It ain't no good but it's mine!"

Dave K8MN

522. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 04:47:15 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a646u402g88@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 36514

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020305191251.17597.00002016@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Even YOU consider some of your own notions to be warped. But then.
> >what is a troll to do?
>
> To Dick, "Troll" means "doesn't tell Dick he is right." :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

That only applies to certain people. Dick admits that he has me, Len, and Kim killfiled. He still argues with Cecil, however, and continues to make at least one post per day (on average) in which he calls Cecil a "troll." It makes one think that he actually LIKES arguing with Cecil.

523. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 04:59:20 UTC
From: oneangryman@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <8c61e9d6.0203052059.2234c591@posting.google.com>
Source record: 36512

jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) wrote in message
news:<f7d9a152.0202141110.249424ab@posting.google.com>...
> Many defenders of the CW testing requirement imply that CW would die
> if the test were eliminated. (PLEASE stick to this particular
> argument in this thread.)
>
> Has interest in Morse Code been nosediving since the introduction of
> the No-Code Technician license or the restructuring of 2000? If the
> test were so crucial to preserving CW, then why is high-speed CW still
> popular among DX chasers, contesters, and QRPers?
>
> I think that if the Morse Code testing requirement is eliminated,
> interest in CW would actually increase. More people would operate on
> the HF frequencies, and a significant percentage of the newcomers
> would discover CW at some point in their ham careers. Those who
> become avid DX chasers, contesters, or QRPers would be more likely to
> turn to CW.
>
> In my opinion, CW should stand on its own merits and not require a
> testing requirement to "support" it. Given the popularity of CW,
> especially in certain parts of ham radio, I think it can. After all,
> SKYWARN, ARES, and RACES manage to survive without the "aid" of being
> mandatory for license privileges.
>
> Jason Hsu, AG4DG
> jason_hsu_802701@@@@yahoo.com
> http://www.jasonhsu.com/ham_radio.html

I for one hope that the code will grow in use after the code test has died.
I would love to learn code but it is stupid to have to take a code test
just to be able to "legally" talk to the drunks, nazis, and rednecks on HF.
I'd like to learn it _-ON THE AIR-_ using it not playing with a computer
program of some of MFJ's junk or code quick's "DOG DID IT"!

Did any one here learn to ride a bicycle by listening to tapes?
Or did anyone here have to ride a bicycle or drive an ox cart to
prove to the examiner at the DMV that they should be allowed to use
an automobile? If it was still 1917 then hell yes let's test for
morse code ability, but the last I checked it was 2002. Makes you
wonder if that guy that used to post here had it right,"welcome to
ham radio, set your watch back 40 years"!

All you OF's and PCTA's keep saying that you miss the "good ole days
of ham radio" well guess what, in 40 or so years TODAY will be
the _GOOD OLE DAYS_ of ham radio, code test or no code test!!!

R U SICK YET?

One Angry Man
President and only member of:
The NoCode Liberation Army (N.C.L.A.)
OneAngryMan@hotmail.com
BTW the email address is real, so feel free to flame me there!

524. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 05:00:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C85A25F.14D7BE48@earthlink.net>
Source record: 36513

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3C84F932.15EFE0B7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> >> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> news:20020304081020.17584.00000355@mb-ct.aol.com...
> >> > In article <3c82e728_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >> > <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>
> >It always comes down to this: An idea not in keeping with your view of
> >ham radio nirvana is BAD. An idea put forth by you is a GOOD idea.
> >Your explanation of names being directed at an idea leaves much to be
> >desired. The idea can't understand or respond to your name calling.
>
> OK, Fearless Leader has spoken. :-)

With which of my points do you disagree, Leonardo?

> >A couple of times you've trotted out, "I think the FCC will agree with
> >me", as if you and the FCC are great pals now. I don't believe that you
> >have an inside track on thinking among those who regulate amateur radio.
>
> Other than Fearless Leader working for State Department (ours or
> another one?), anyone who appears in person for an ex parte
> presentation should be as close as anyone can get unless they
> were once IN the FCC.

I don't think they hand out badges or ID cards and sign the participant
up for the FCC softball team.

> That won't stop Fearless Leader, however... :-)
>
> >I tried that but Uncle Sam was ready to draft me so I entered the Air
> >Force. How'd you manage to avoid being drafted, Carl?
>
> So, tell us all how the Luftwaffe was. Did you get to train in the US?

Do you ever tired of looking silly?

> How come for why N2EY wasn't in any military service?

Why are you asking me? For one thing, he's younger. The draft lottery
began not too long after I entered the Air Force. Carl and I are just

about the same age.

> >In some areas of the world where there are few hams, it works quite
> >well. In some European countries, it hasn't worked well at all. The
> >hams of some European nations are embroiled in constant arguments over
> >the same thing you propose.
>
> Fearless Leader is from the State Department. He is here to help.

With which of my statements do you disagree?

> >> I would HOPE, however, that even newcomers would be able
> >> to recognize grossly bad ideas and object to them ...
> >
> >Should be easy: All of you newcomers--be sure to look for the Carl,
> >WA6VSE signature so you'll know you are getting only the best in ideas.
>
> ...and then Fearless Leader will come along and Show THE Way...
>
> stay tuned, folks. :-)

...or we can sit on the veranda and tap our toes to pass the time before
some non-radio amateur mounts the soap box to advise mere amateurs about
the woeful state of amateur radio in this country.

Dave K8MN

525. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 05:08:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C85A443.462944A8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36516

Dick Carroll wrote:
> What you are telling us all is incorrect. For people with no technical background, rote
> word association is definitely easier than trying to learn material *from the question
> pool*.

The question pool is less than half of the ARRL License Manual. The Q&A
references sections in the theory material. It is easier to study the
theory material than rote-memorize 1000 Q&A.

> If one sets out to learn the technical material he'll have to look well beyond the pool
for
> much of what he needs.

The License Manual containing the Q&A in the back has most of the theory
material covered in the first part of the book. It would be nice if you
recommended studying the material instead of telling prospective hams
how easy it is to rote-memorize 1000 Q&A.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

526. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 05:19:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C85A6CE.4DAD516C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36517

Dick Carroll wrote:
> The question is merely a diversion on your part, as usual.

It's no diversion, Dick. I truly cannot understand how studying for and passing a ham exam can dumb anyone down. And when, exactly, does this dumbing-down occur? Do people who take and fail a ham exam avoid the dumbing-down process?

> Your error is in insisting that when hams don't know Morse code they are just
> as qualified as when they do. Wrong.

They *are* just as qualified for everything except CW, Dick. Some far exceed the minimum qualifications that you passed.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

527. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 05:21:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C85A760.33DBB9A4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36518

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > It is amazing that you can believe an Electrical Engineer can be
> > dumbed-down by passing an amateur radio exam. Exactly how many
> > IQ points does a person lose when he passes an amateur radio
> > exam? Does it happen during the exam? Or does it wait for him
> > to receive his ticket in the mail?
>
> No problem with the answer to that one. It happens when FCC drops the
> requirements
> so that he can pass the exam without the necessary skill and knowledge. From
> that day on
> anyone getting that license is getting a dumbed down version of it.

Exactly how many IQ points does a person lose when he gets his ham license?
Is that what happened to you?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

528. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 05:24:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C85A7F7.8430C873@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36519

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Personally, I think I'm going to win -- and am more than willing to
> wait until 2105 for Cecil to pay me.

If you thought you were right and were going to win, you would not
object to the year 2010. It seems to me that you don't really believe
what you write, Larry.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

529. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 05:29:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C85A920.CD7942AF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36520

Jim Kelley wrote:
> Even you consider some of your ideas to be absurd, Cecil. You posted
> one last week about thought police or some such thing.

It was a question, Jim. Someone thought that hams should feel a certain
way. In response to that statement, I asked if we should have the Feeling
Police to enforce what hams should feel.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

530. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 05:31:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C85A9B8.CB275EB6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36521

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > A LARGE DIFFERENCE is that not all resort to calling the ideas of others
> > > ABSURD notions or products of a WARPED MIND. I DON'T THINK SO !!!!!!
> >
> > Seems to me, you have considered my notions absurd before. Am I
> > wrong?
>
> Even YOU consider some of your own notions to be warped.

Doesn't matter. Dave implies that everyone who calls the ideas of
others ABSURD, is a bad person. Given that, virtually all r.r.a.p
posters are bad people.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

531. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 05:32:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C85AA01.95DDDB24@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36522

Krell wrote:
> Like I said before, if you think Cecil is such a troll, why do you keep
> repsonding to him?

Dick just cannot resist that hook, line, and sinker. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

532. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 05:39:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C85ABAF.9B357A84@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36523

Krell wrote:
> He still argues with Cecil, however, and continues to make at
> least one post per day (on average) in which he calls Cecil a "troll." It
> makes one think that he actually LIKES arguing with Cecil.

Why would Dick argue with me if he didn't enjoy it?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

533. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 07:39:17 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a65b3i022ga@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 36537

I think the ARS will be around by the time I am 88 years old (56 more years) I am quite sure. As with anything it may change or take different directions, but it will still be there. Unlike a few people seem to think and want, Amateur Radio will never return to what it is like in the 50's and the rest of the Ward and June Cleaver stereotypes. It will evolve.

Ryan

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3C84ED82.90D7E316@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > By the year 2105, the ARS may have
> > been dead for 88 years or so, but that's when I pay off the bet, not
> > one decade before!
>
> Which means that you don't believe the ARS will die during my
> lifetime. That's exactly what I thought. Thanks for proving
> my hunch.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

534. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 07:43:26 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a65b3j122ga@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 36538

I will put 100 bucks on the fact that amateur radio will still be around 2020. May not be identical as it is now but it will still be here. And most of the people will still be alive when that time rolls around. (aside from death from disease, accident etc.)

Ryan

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3C83FA4F.A9A954BE@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > > I've said it before, and I'll say it again...I would dearly love to be proved
> > > > wrong, but I don't have that kind of luck!
> > >
> > > You proved that you don't even believe it yourself, Larry, by setting the
> > > date of the bet to 2105, more than 100 years in the future.
> >
> > No, he just dodged another of your trolls.
>
> You guys just don't have the guts to put your money where your mouth is.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

535. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 10:46:55 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <zsmh8.17763$gK2.1315347@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36524

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C85A760.33DBB9A4@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Exactly how many IQ points does a person lose when he gets his ham
license?

> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Think you may have blundered into something here, Cecil. Should be worth
a couple of PhD dissertations at the very least if not the Nobel Prize.

Is bellowing CQ 20 equivalent to turning your cap backwards for IQ loss??
Hmmm. Does wanting to bellow CQ 20 cause the loss or does it take the act
to do it. Are people bellowing CQ 20 victims? Is bellowing CQ 20 a birth
defect?

If the latter, can we call them Cecil's Kids?

Dick, NBK

536. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 11:01:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020306060140.26465.00001817@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36525

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Most hams buy one or more of the study guides and read the material, Dick.

> Are you sure? Most of the study guides I've seen consist of the questions
>and the exact answers, and some don't even include the distracters.

The only study guide that comes close to that is the VIS set. That does indeed try to use word associations to memorize material. This may be the first mention of that publication ever on this newsgroup, showing that most hams do not consider this a good way to learn the material to pass the tests.

Why would hams buy a study guide that includes only the questions and not even the distractors? I think that such a study guide would be about 30 pages long. I know of no study guide that size, do you?
What you said sounds fabricated to me. Can you tell me what study guides are only 30 pages long that represent the "most you have seen?"

>I don't know how it's done these days but earlier the answers were even in the

>same order on the test as they were in the pools.

I don't know how long it has been so, but for as long as I have known anything about the way the ARRL VEC testing is done, the orders of the answer and distractors have been randomized. That is why none of the questions in the pool have "all of the above are correct" as an answer or distractor. The answer or distractor needs to be "all of these answers are correct."

>
>
>
>>
>> Trying to rote-memorize the question pools would be much harder than
>reading
>> the supporting material in the study guides.
>
> Of course it would, and also of course I never said anyone memorizes the
>question
>pools.
>Can you soak that up ED? What they memorize is work associations so they can
>recognize
>and pair answers with questions where they have seen them paired before. Of
>course
>
>studying the distracters just gets in the way.
>
>

>>
>> You are giving bad advice to newcomers.
>
>How can I be giving advice when I'm merely stating what I see as fact? Why do
>you
>fool yourself into believing that this isn't already widely known?
>
>
>>
>> I>If one sets out to learn the technical material he'll have to look well
>> >beyond the pool for
>> >much
>> >of what he needs.
>>
>> Okay, so maybe you are turning around. Are you tellling newcomers that they
>> should look beyond the pool to learn what he or she needs to pass the test?
>
> Nope. I'm telling y'all that if one is to actually learn the material with
>no
>prior background
>most of it won't be learned from the question pools alone. Of course we both
>know
>that
>few with no technical background learn the material from the question pools,
>anyway.
>Don't we?
>
>
>> If
>> so, I agree; this is the easiest and best way to do it.
>
> You sure do keep trying, I have changed my view none whatever, yet you keep
>"insisting" that I have.
>
> Oh, I noticed that you ignored my question about how Gordon West trains
>newcomers
>to pass the Tech exam in a weekend. Gives a money back guarantee, too, I
>understand.
>Still think they're learning the material?

> Oh, I noticed that you ignored my question about how Gordon West trains
>newcomers
>to pass the Tech exam in a weekend.

I don't read every one of your posts, Dick, but if you will call that
"ignoring," perhaps I need to start. I am sure I could have something to say
about every single one of them, if that will help you not feel ignored.

And your point is what? How many classroom hours does that represent? Lets say
15 hours, just to have a reasonable number. If he were teaching rote
memorization and word assocation, that would give him 3 minutes per question.

Could YOU memorize 300 things on a subject you know nothing about spending 3 minutes per question? I could not.

There are far fewer than 300 basic concepts in the exam pool, Dick, and 15 hours is ample time to cover them. I teach a course on RFI that takes 5 hours. That is a pretty complex subject, yet in those 5 hours, we are able to cover it in detail. I have taken professional 1- or 2-day courses that get into FAR more detail on a subject than necessary to pass a Tech exam. And how long would it have taken me to study for that Novice license I took back in 1963?

More examples, the ARRL educational courses cover a subject in great detail in about 15 to 20 hours of studying. Need more examples, or do you get the point now?

>Still think they're learning the material?

It is really funny. You act like memorizing 26 characters, 10 numbers, 4 punctuations and a few prosigns is a major effort, but seem to think that one cannot learn material in 15 hours of classroom teaching and that using word association to memorize 300 questions without understanding is trivial.

It just doesn't add up.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

537. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 11:02:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020306060245.26465.00001818@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36526

From: "Krell" krell1215@yahoo.com

> It makes one think that he actually LIKES arguing with Cecil.

Kinda' like the Larry and Kim mutual fascination thing, eh? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

538. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 11:03:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020306060324.21422.00000390@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 36527

In article <3C8593BD.115E93C7@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> >> So we should penalize the narrow modes by allowing them less space?
>
> When you put it like that!.....

It really comes down to a question of how we allocate a limited resource, and
what basis is used for that allocation. CW and narrowband digital signals like
PSK31 and PACTOR can fit several QSOs to the kHz while analog voice modes
need a couple of kHz to the QSO. But voice is more poplular. Where to put
the dividing line, or even if a dividing line is needed, is a subjective
decision.
>
> I'm not actually suggesting anything, as I don't support anything
>beside what is used today, space wise (do you have the percentage at
>present?)

It varies by band, but typically on the HF hambands it's about 50% 'phone and
50% CW/digital. 160 is wide open to all modes, 30 has no phone at all but it's
only 50 kHz wide and 10 meters is about 85% 'phone.

Complicating the whole mess is the question of digital voice. Is it a data
signal or
a voice signal? Seems to me the logical dividing line is the necessary
bandwidth.
>
>> OK - but that depends on the band and the time you listen.
>>
>> >This is in contrast to PSK 31, where I often have to wait or change
>> >bands, because there often isn't enough space to fit another signal.
>>
>> ?? On what band(s)? PSK31 is not limited by law to just a few frequencies.
>>
>> Let's suppose just for a second that my idea was actually adopted. 15% of
>> 80 meters is 75 kHz. Is that enough PSK31 space? If not, how much would
>> be adequate?
>
> I'll have to look for others using psk31 at other frequencies than the
>well known ones. The nature of the mode tends to concentrate people in a
>few, well known sections.

Also the nature of equipment used. The Warbler and other Small Wonder rigs
cause natural centers of activity. But PSK31 activity is not limited by law to

just those freqs. You can go 500 or 1000 Hz up or down and if the freq is not in use, jump in. But your chances of an answer are diminished because the folks running those little rigs cannot hear you.
>
> Take 80 meters - lots of PSK31 around the colorburst freq. If there's a
>clear
>> spot a kHz or so up or down, it's perfectly legal to use it for PSK31 if
>the
>> colorburst freq is busy.
>
>< a bunch of good stuff snipped>
>
> I really enjoy your posts, Jim.

Thanks!

> It is enjoyable to get historical info.
>In amonstg the arguing and name calling, it is the most enjjoyable and
>educating part of this newsgroup.

I think it's important to have a bit of knowledge of how we got where we are today. Sometimes the reasons for doing something no longer exist, while other times the reasons are still valid. Often the reasons for doing something are all but forgotten, and are rediscovered the hard way.

That reminds me, gotta get Part 3 posted....

539. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 11:10:16 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020306061016.26465.00001819@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36528

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>It is perfectly reasonable for others to assume a paid staffer, a
>manager, has a goodly amount of Loyalty to his employer.

That is why I choose to work at ARRL, Len; I believe that the work I do there is important.

>The end result is the general readers' perception of bias, of spin in
>stating certain things about the employer.

I am sure that the degree to which what I say is seen as "spin" varies from reader to reader. Some actually believe that I say what I actually believe.

>That perception is no
>longer "suspicion" but is out in the open.

To others, there will always be suspicion. To others yet, a need to create such suscpicion...

>There should be no denial that the ARRL makes a
>profit on reselling of goods or the sale of advertising space in its
>membership magazine.

As long as one also "doesn't deny" that ARRL has no stockholders to reap the benefit of that profit. The policy-setting arm of the ARRL, its Board of Directors and the non-corporate officers, by policy do not get to keep a dime of that profit.

> It becomes schizoid to others when the idealistic
>side is used as a vehicle to support the materialistic side and
>vice-versa.

There is no materialistic side, Len. All of those profits are used to fund the actions of the "idealistic" side.

>It becomes confused when both sides of this Janus
>claim the "only" "official" source of goods and services for "all
>radio amateurs."

If that is what you believe, I agree; it has become confused.
>Article two of "The Amateur's Code" demands membership
>organization loyalty solely to the ARRL.

"Solely?" Not in my handbook, nor is there any mention of that in the ARRL employee handbook, either.

>The public and non-members are able to perceive things about
>the ARRL which the ARRL cannot. That is not a "fault" of the

>non-members.

We are so lucky to have all-seeing Len to show us the light. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

540. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 11:11:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020306061135.26465.00001820@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36529

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>I don't recall saying that. I'm saying that removing the code test will
>destroy amateur radio *within* the next 103 years. It could happen
>tomorrow. I'm just not paying off on the bet until 2105.

And I think we can all infer from that just how seriously you mean what you say. Setting impossible conditions is a good way to weasle out of a proposed wager that you know you have no way of winning.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

541. Re: K3LT was serious (was Re: K3LT wasn't serious (was Re: The tests that Rea...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 11:12:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020306061248.26465.00001821@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36530

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Well, in that case, I guess we'll all just have to wait and see, shall we?

Those of us who have nothing better to do or better places to go will wait.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

542. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 11:15:10 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020306061510.26465.00001823@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 36531

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>The question pool is less than half of the ARRL License Manual. The Q&A
>references sections in the theory material. It is easier to study the
>theory material than rote-memorize 1000 Q&A.

And in the Gordon West tapes, the example that Dick gives often, I don't recall a single instance of Gordon offering word assocation memorization as the way to pass the test. It may be there; I have not seen the entire tape.

It is pretty evident that Dick hasn't, either, although he claims to know what goes on in Gordon's classes.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

543. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 11:57:05 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <lunh8.724$353.120574059@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 36532

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C859EDF.B9B0FD92@earthlink.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > Not for me. I'll not be having non-cards printed and mailed. There
> > > aren't many I need and my QSLing will decrease dramatically after
> > > finishing up work on 6m and 160m DXCCs.
> >
> > Then why not release your logs from your various QTHs to e-QSL? You've
> > already gotten what you wanted out of them, right?
>
> I guess my answer is that my logs are mine. They don't belong to e-QSL.
> I've never put any of my logs online and never will. The logs are still
> open for those who need a card from any of my operations and WA8JOC
> still has plenty of blank cards. Direct cards with SASE or IRCs will
> get a direct response. Others go via bureau. None will be confirmed
> electronically.

I see.

> > > > A good DXer knows what the 160M authorizations are.
> > >
> > > I haven't memorized the 160m allocations in each country. I do give a
> > > nod to the JA's once in a while. Otherwise I scan the band.
> >
> > Good grief. There's not an inch of give in you, is there?
>
> Not when I'm right. I don't know any DXer who has memorized all of the
> band allocations for every country in the world.

You're right. You don't know where to look on the bands for certain
countries.

> > > > Why is it different for
> > > > 6M? Are you aware that there's a different 6M calling freq in the
> > Pacific?
> > >
> > > I don't memorize every other countries 6m authorization either. As to
> > > the Pacific calling frequency, I'm not in the Pacific calling other
> > > Pacific stations. The V7 station I worked on 6m was at 50.080 CW.
The
> > > numerous Pacific area stations I worked from Tanzania were around
> > > 50.110. Would you like me to supply a list of prefixes so you can
check
> > > to see if any of those stations operated outside their assigned band
> > > segments?

> >
> > I guess you're not the least bit familiar with either the 160m or 6m
> > authorizations. Too bad for you. I guess you'll get DXCC by dumb luck.
>
> I've never operated from the Pacific. Why would I have need of a
> Pacific calling frequency.

It might be a place for you to *listen,* but no, you're right, just keep bumbling along. Or you might still be in the "I'm the DX" mode and expect them to find you. It might take you some more time on the noisy side of the pileup to figure that one out.

I've worked plenty of 6m DX which wasn't on
> any calling frequency. One doesn't get to DXCC on 6m by sitting and
> listening to 50.110. One doesn't get to DXCC on 160m by listening to
> any one frequency. I have 108 worked (96 confirmed) on 160m and 72
> worked (only about 40 confirmed) on 6m. Sometimes dumb luck pays off,
> huh?

Obviously.

> > > > There's a lot to know if you want to be a DXer.
> > >
> > > Well, good luck.
> >
> > Ditto.
>
> I had really good intentions of memrorizing all of those allocations but
> I got so busy working new ones that I never got around to it.

Lemme see. 108 on 160m and 72 on 6m. That's a total of 180 QSOs at (a generous) 60 seconds each. In the public schools that works out to three hours of being "busy working new ones," over about two years back in America.

You need a strategy.

> > > > > Do you go
> > > > > through your logs, looking for actual frequency and compare logs
to a
> > > > > country's 6m frequency allocation. If you do, you'd be called
> > > > > obsessive-compulsive by medical folks.
> > > >
> > > > A French ham verified that his countrymen were operating out of
band.
> > That
> > > > > is good enough for me to at least check it out.
> > >
> > > Naw, it was good enough for you to work yourself into a dither over
what
> > > I was doing in Tanzania about the "French Problem".
> >

> > Illegal traffic isn't my problem.
>
> Oh, we didn't handle any traffic--just the usual exchange of reports and
> perhaps a grid square. You were the guy worked up over the issue. In
> fact, you were the only guy worked up over the issue.

As you know, when you're right about something... So much for gertting
involved.

> > > What are you going to do to alleviate the problem?
> >
> > Nothing.
>
> That's what's wrong with the youth of today. Some can see a problem but
> don't wish to get involved. I did my part. It is time for you to step
> up and do yours.

Nope.

> > One of the agriculturists I work with said that farmland away from the
city
> > was starting around 2K. He was amazed as I was that rough land commands
the
> > same price.
>
> They aren't making any more of it! Sometimes I do my best Grandpa Joad
> from "The Grapes Of Wrath": "This here's my land. It ain't no good but
> it's mine!"

Hah! That's good.

Prices should get back to normal after the boomers die off. They're at
their peak earning years, the market has been good to them, and everything
is at a premium because there are so many dollars out there.

But of course, I'm a boomer too, and I've got to pay the price if I want a
piece of it. When I leave it to my kids it won't be worth a wooden nickel.

544. Re: Gee, This Frequency Looks Open

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 12:43:27 UTC
From: Harry Kline <radio76@theradioplacezzz.com>
Message-ID: <a652u3$4ba$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 36535

Ho Hum, just another one of Riley's meaningless letters that
he cranks out by the dozens with no intention of ever following
up on. Oh yes, here and there we can point to some follow up,
but overall, especially in some high-profile cases, Riley slinks
away with no follow up once the perp stands up to Riley and
won't be bullied by the little FCC geek. Oh yes, certain people
definitely will feel Riley's sting, but these are individuals Riley
has singled out for a vendetta and that Riley knows have limited
resources or contacts to fight him with. It's no secret that
Riley is not about to hold a series of FCC hearings to discipline
hams. Riley has been instructed by his bosses that this will not
happen. A few suspensions here and there and an endless stream
of stupid letters, that's the thrust of Riley's much vaunted
"enforcement" activities. What a joke! Meanwhile, some of the
highest profile violators in ham radio history continue on with
impunity. All of us could name at least one high-profile violator
who is still operating on the air to this day, with impunity and no
fear of little Riley. In the city where I am, we have a mental
case who should have had his license revoked years ago. Riley
cranked out the usual pile of letters to him, then forgot about the
guy. What a joke! The guy continues to this day violating FCC
rules and regulations with no fear of Riley or the FCC. Like I said
though, another guy might break a few rules and whamo, Riley will
pull the guy's ticket for the remainder of its term, but other guys can
break whatever rules they choose, with no fear of Riley or the FCC.
Riley is the best and worst case of Selective Enforcement there has
ever been! I have no respect for the man any more. Of course,
Riley could care less what I think of him. Riley goes on, knowing
that his fat taxpayer-provided pay check will be there waiting for him
every two weeks, followed by a generous federal retirement in a few
years. Riley's legacy will be nothing, nada, zip. Just another federal
bureaucrat who has ripped off the people who provide his pay check!

10-4 Good Buddy!

> >February 15, 2002
> >
> >Mr. Thomas D. Batista
> >10124 45 Avenue
> >Corona, NY 11368
> >
> >Mr. Gerardo Arias
> >278 Sharpe Avenue
> >Staten Island, NY 10302
> >

> >RE: Amateur Radio licenses KC2DDD, N2IFU--Repeater Operation
> >
> >
> >
> >Dear Messrs Batista and Arias:
> >
> >It has come to our attention that you are operating an uncoordinated
repeater
> >with an output on 147.020 MHz and input on 143.020 MHz. The frequency
143.020
> >MHz is not allocated to the Amateur Radio Service. Our information also
> >indicates that you use this repeater as a reverse auto-patch, that it is
not
> >being identified, and that it is causing interference to coordinated
> >repeaters
> >
> >Section 97.205 of the Commission's rules states that where there is
> >interference between a coordinated and an uncoordinated repeater, "the
> >licensee of the uncoordinated repeater has primary responsibility to
resolve
> >the interference." Operation on 143.020 MHz unlicensed is a violation of
> >Section 312 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and will
result in
> >fine or imprisonment.
> >
> >Section 308(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C.
> >Section 308(b), gives the Commission the authority to request information
> >from a licensee regarding the operation of a radio station. Accordingly,
you
> >are requested to respond to this letter within 20 days from the above
date,
> >furnishing: 1) full details about the operation of the repeater; 2) the
> >identity of control operators, if any; 3) the call signs of the users; 4)
> >names and addresses of any unlicensed users; and 5) the location of the
> >repeater. If the repeater is located on property that you do not own or
rent,
> >state the name and address of the landlord or site manager.
> >
> >Address your response to 1270 Fairfield Road at the above letterhead
address,
> >and please be advised that Congress has made punishable a willfully false
or
> >misleading reply to a letter of this type. See Title 18, Section 1001 of
the
> >United States Code.
>
>
> Okay, so what's your POINT? Are you complaining about the FCC action?
> Are you commenting on the above named licensees and their questionable
> operating practices? What is the PURPOSE of submitting this notice?

>
>
> Raymond Sirois AB2HR
> SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
> 607-733-5745
> telnet:\\thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

545. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 13:20:24 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a654ug01n2b@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 36536

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020306061510.26465.00001823@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >The question pool is less than half of the ARRL License Manual. The Q&A
> >references sections in the theory material. It is easier to study the
> >theory material than rote-memorize 1000 Q&A.
>
> And in the Gordon West tapes, the example that Dick gives often, I don't
recall
> a single instance of Gordon offering word assocation memorization as the
way to
> pass the test. It may be there; I have not seen the entire tape.
>
> It is pretty evident that Dick hasn't, either, although he claims to know
what
> goes on in Gordon's classes.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

I surprised that someone hasn't written a book that gives complete
instructions for memorizing 1000 Q&A. Memory experts such as Tony Buzan have
been doing this for years. I wonder how well such a book would sell.

546. I'm REALLY looking forward to Part III!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 17:11:03 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8ciccgtf1uh60@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 36539

Hello, Jim!

>That reminds me, gotta get Part 3 posted....

Thanks for putting these up!

Val Germann
Columbia, Missouri

**

547. Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 17:26:00 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8cj8hhjcni01c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 36540

Hello, all!

I'm a geezer (52) who has finally decided to take
the plunge into amateur radio. Back in the 1960s
I took a test to get on commercial radio. I had to
get to Kansas City (90 miles away) and take the
thing at an FCC office. Question pool? I don't
THINK so! That was a relatively easy test (Third-
Class Radiotelephone) and I passed it fine. But,
I was SWEATING BULLETS before-hand because
it was a PAIN just to take the thing, and failure would
have been awful, for a lot of reasons.

THAT was TESTING!

Quite frankly, I am shocked that I will have access
to the questions and answers on the tests that I
will take over the next month or two. I have some
technical background, which helps, but I got a couple
of those books from Radio Shack, and, er, ah, there
are the questions AND answers, right there!

Somehow, it seems like cheating, at least to me!

Are people simply memorizing the pool? They
HAVE to be, MANY of them! To believe otherwise
is just silly. I'm a college-level instructor and, hey,
my students would KILL for the questions and
answers! Why, if they had them they'd come to
my lectures only out of courtesy, and because I
do a good job, usually!

Val Germann
Columbia, Missouri

548. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 17:30:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203060930.51070202@posting.google.com>
Source record: 36541

oneangryman@hotmail.com (One Angry Man) wrote in message
news:<8c61e9d6.0203052059.2234c591@posting.google.com>...
> jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) wrote in message
news:<f7d9a152.0202141110.249424ab@posting.google.com>...
> > Many defenders of the CW testing requirement imply that CW would die
> > if the test were eliminated. (PLEASE stick to this particular
> > argument in this thread.)
> >
> > Has interest in Morse Code been nosediving since the introduction of
> > the No-Code Technician license or the restructuring of 2000? If the
> > test were so crucial to preserving CW, then why is high-speed CW still
> > popular among DX chasers, contesters, and QRPers?
> >
> > I think that if the Morse Code testing requirement is eliminated,
> > interest in CW would actually increase. More people would operate on
> > the HF frequencies, and a significant percentage of the newcomers
> > would discover CW at some point in their ham careers. Those who
> > become avid DX chasers, contesters, or QRPers would be more likely to
> > turn to CW.
> >
> > In my opinion, CW should stand on its own merits and not require a
> > testing requirement to "support" it. Given the popularity of CW,
> > especially in certain parts of ham radio, I think it can. After all,
> > SKYWARN, ARES, and RACES manage to survive without the "aid" of being
> > mandatory for license privileges.
> >
> > Jason Hsu, AG4DG
> > jason_hsu_802701@@@@yahoo.com
> > http://www.jasonhsu.com/ham_radio.html
>
>
>
> I for one hope that the code will grow in use after the code test has died.

Me, too!

> I would love to learn code but it is stupid to have to take a code test
> just to be able to "legally" talk to the drunks, nazis, and rednecks on HF.

If you'd love to learn it, go right ahead!

I can't recall ever running into any "drunks, nazis, and rednecks" on CW/Morse,
though.

> I'd like to learn it _-ON THE AIR-_ using it not playing with a computer
> program of some of MFJ's junk or code quick's "DOG DID IT"!

I learned code "on the air" by listening to other hams and W1AW. You can do the same.
>
> Did any one here learn to ride a bicycle by listening to tapes?

Not the same thing, or even similar.

> Or did anyone here have to ride a bicycle or drive an ox cart to
> prove to the examiner at the DMV that they should be allowed to use
> an automobile?

Not the same thing or even similar.

Try this one:

"Do you have to demonstrate stick-shift skill to pass a driver's license exam?"

That one makes a lot more sense and is a better analogy.

> If it was still 1917 then hell yes let's test for
> morse code ability, but the last I checked it was 2002.

Morse was widely used by other services for many years after 1917.
Still widely used by hams.

> Makes you
> wonder if that guy that used to post here had it right,"welcome to
> ham radio, set your watch back 40 years"!

He had it wrong.

All that's left of code testing is the 5 wpm test, and that's because the FCC won't violate the treaty provision that requires a code test. That treaty provision will probably (some folks say VERY probably) disappear in 2003. Then it will be simply a matter of govt. processing time to delete the test from the requirements.

Maybe we oughta have a pool on how long it takes the FCC to drop Element 1 after S25.5 goes away...

73 de Jim, N2EY

549. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 17:31:40 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c865294_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36542

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020304221032.19404.00000280@mb-cs.aol.com...
> In article <3c83b17d_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > besides, flexible usage
> >of the spectrum = good spectrum management.
>
> Sure. But at the same time, both of us and K3LT (!) oppose
> widening the 'phone bands. Don't you see the contradiction
> between saying that it's OK to have a setaside for narrowband
> modes but not OK to have a setaside for CW?

From a purely technical standpoint, yes. From a practical,
political standpoint, however, I realize that the history here
in the US would make it a VERY contentious subject, were
anyone to suggest that "SSB (all modes, in fact) be allowed
everywhere" ... I see no sense in stiring the pot on that one
because 1) it's not practical 2) it's not critically important,
and 3) it would be VERY devisive in the ham community at
a time when that sort of division would be a very bad thing.

However, I DO see a BIG difference between having
roughly 1/2 the bands allowing SBB/SSTV/etc. (wider band
modes) and the other 1/2 being restricted to narrower band
modes (CW/xxTOR/Clover/PSK31,RTTY,etc.) and your
proposal that would take 35% of the bands for CW ONLY
and force the future of ham radio into the remaining 15%.

>Or the contradiction
> that you want the users of the most popular HF/MF mode (for hams)
> to get only about half the band, and their crowding enforced by law,
> but scream and cuss because I only proposed 15% for digital?

The reality of the situation is that, left to itself, SSB would probably
over-run the HF bands to the virtual exclusion of other modes.
Keeping it restricted to the upper part does 2 things.
1) It forces some semblance of cooperative sharing and operating
efficiently on the users of SSB.
2) It assures that the CW folks and the digital folks have a reasonable
amount of spectrum to work in. (Sharing between the CW folks and
the digital folks also needs to be cooperative ... without any "I own
this part of the band exclusively" attitudes, in the interest of efficient
use of our spectrum, both now, and as usage patterns inevitably change
in the future.)
To artificially and arbitrarily allot 35% to CW ONLY and only 15%
to all of the other digital modes would be unwise, unfair, and counter

to our future best interests.
Since there is no good reason why CW and digital users cannot share
the lower 50%, there is no good justification for "hard-coding" boundaries
for usage by the various narrowband modes.

> >> >You just want to stifle the growth of digital modes because you
> >> >know deep in your heart that Morse ultimately won't be as
> >> >attractive and you want to "lock down" enough turf "all for
> >yourself."
> >>
> >> Nope. I just want some room, that's all.
> >
> >You have room NOW ...
>
> Sure.

So why are you suggesting a major "land grab" for more?

> >you have access to ALL of the HF
> >bands ...
>
> I've had all amateur privileges since the fall of 1970.
>
> >no need for a "Morse only setaside."
>
> Using Morse for routine operating in the 'phone bands is poor
> operating, so right away at least half of HF is off limits. Operating near
> digital folks may be construed as QRM, so it's poor operating to get too
> close - and they may not be able to tell me I'm too close. With the
> end of code testing it may get worse.
>
> You have already said 25 kHz CW only would be OK.

That 25 kHz was ALWAYS a "token gesture of good faith,"
don't try to expand it in an "ask for an inch, take a mile" sort
of maneuver ...

> Maybe a CW-only section is a workable idea, maybe not. Maybe a different
> percentage or a fixed number of kHz is a better way. Maybe there's no real
need
> for it.

I would assert in the strongest terms possible that:
1) A CW-onloy segment is NOT needed
2) Such a setaside would be bad spectrum management
3) Such a setaside would be bad public policy
4) Such a setaside would UNNECESSARILY limit the use of
spectrum long into the future, resulting in in efficienct use of
our spectrum and ultimately necessitating avoidable rules change
moves in the future as usage patterns changes

Carl - wa6vse

550. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 17:47:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C860666.9BA98A75@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36543

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> Most hams buy one or more of the study guides and read the material, Dick.
>
> > Are you sure? Most of the study guides I've seen consist of the questions
> >and the exact answers, and some don't even include the distracters.
>
> The only study guide that comes close to that is the VIS set. That does indeed
> try to use word associations to memorize material. This may be the first
> mention of that publication ever on this newsgroup, showing that most hams do
> not consider this a good way to learn the material to pass the tests.
>
> Why would hams buy a study guide that includes only the questions and not even
> the distractors? I think that such a study guide would be about 30 pages long.
> I know of no study guide that size, do you?
> What you said sounds fabricated to me. Can you tell me what study guides are
> only 30 pages long that represent the "most you have seen?"
>
> >I don't know how it's done these days but earlier the answers were even in the
>
> >same order on the test as they were in the pools.
>
> I don't know how long it has been so, but for as long as I have known anything
> about the way the ARRL VEC testing is done, the orders of the answer and
> distractors have been randomized. That is why none of the questions in the pool
> have "all of the above are correct" as an answer or distractor. The answer or
> distractor needs to be "all of these answers are correct."
>
> >
> >
> >
> >>
> >> Trying to rote-memorize the question pools would be much harder than
> >reading
> >> the supporting material in the study guides.
> >
> > Of course it would, and also of course I never said anyone memorizes the
> >question
> >pools.
> >Can you soak that up ED? What they memorize is work associations so they can
> >recognize
> >and pair answers with questions where they have seen them paired before. Of

> >course
> >
> >studying the distracters just gets in the way.
> >
> >
> >>
> >> You are giving bad advice to newcomers.
> >
> >How can I be giving advice when I'm merely stating what I see as fact? Why do
> >you
> >fool yourself into believing that this isn't already widely known?
> >
> >
> >>
> >> I>If one sets out to learn the technical material he'll have to look well
> >> >beyond the pool for
> >> >much
> >> >of what he needs.
> >>
> >> Okay, so maybe you are turning around. Are you tellling newcomers that they
> >> should look beyond the pool to learn what he or she needs to pass the test?
> >
> > Nope. I'm telling y'all that if one is to actually learn the material with
> >no
> >prior background
> >most of it won't be learned from the question pools alone. Of course we both
> >know
> >that
> >few with no technical background learn the material from the question pools,
> >anyway.
> >Don't we?
> >
> >
> >> If
> >> so, I agree; this is the easiest and best way to do it.
> >
> > You sure do keep trying, I have changed my view none whatever, yet you keep
> >"insisting" that I have.
> >
> > Oh, I noticed that you ignored my question about how Gordon West trains
> >newcomers
> >to pass the Tech exam in a weekend. Gives a money back guarantee, too, I
> >understand.
> >Still think they're learning the material?
>
> > Oh, I noticed that you ignored my question about how Gordon West trains
> >newcomers
> >to pass the Tech exam in a weekend.
>
> I don't read every one of your posts, Dick, but if you will call that

> "ignoring," perhaps I need to start. I am sure I could have something to say
> about every single one of them, if that will help you not feel ignored.
>
> And your point is what? How many classroom hours does that represent? Lets say
> 15 hours, just to have a reasonable number. If he were teaching rote
> memorization and word assocation, that would give him 3 minutes per question.
> Could YOU memorize 300 things on a subject you know nothing about spending 3
> minutes per question? I could not.
>
> There are far fewer than 300 basic concepts in the exam pool, Dick, and 15
> hours is ample time to cover them. I teach a course on RFI that takes 5 hours.
> That is a pretty complex subject, yet in those 5 hours, we are able to cover
> it in detail. I have taken professional 1- or 2-day courses that get into FAR
> more detail on a subject than necessary to pass a Tech exam. And how long would
> it have taken me to study for that Novice license I took back in 1963?
>
> More examples, the ARRL educational courses cover a subject in great detail in
> about 15 to 20 hours of studying. Need more examples, or do you get the point
> now?
>
> >Still think they're learning the material?
>
> It is really funny. You act like memorizing 26 characters, 10 numbers, 4
> punctuations and a few prosigns is a major effort, but seem to think that one
> cannot learn material in 15 hours of classroom teaching and that using word
> association to memorize 300 questions without understanding is trivial.
>
> It just doesn't add up.

And still not a word about Gordo West and his "Learn it all in a weekend,
moneyback
guaranteed" school. I hear it's standing room only.

551. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 17:47:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C860856.B9E3C1E4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36544

W1RFI wrote:

> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >The question pool is less than half of the ARRL License Manual. The Q&A
> >references sections in the theory material. It is easier to study the
> >theory material than rote-memorize 1000 Q&A.
>
> And in the Gordon West tapes, the example that Dick gives often, I don't recall
> a single instance of Gordon offering word assocation memorization as the way to
> pass the test. It may be there; I have not seen the entire tape.
>
> It is pretty evident that Dick hasn't, either, although he claims to know what
> goes on in Gordon's classes.
>

You're absolutely right, I haven't seen any of his stuff, only his 'cram school'
advertising which said "do it in a weekend". So now you will insist that anyone
can learn it all in a
weekend. Right.

552. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 17:47:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8608DC.CA1B558C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36545

Richard McCollum wrote:

> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C85A760.33DBB9A4@IEEE.org...
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Exactly how many IQ points does a person lose when he gets his ham
> license?
>
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> Think you may have blundered into something here, Cecil. Should be worth
> a couple of PhD dissertations at the very least if not the Nobel Prize.
>
> Is bellowing CQ 20 equivalent to turning your cap backwards for IQ loss??
> Hmmm. Does wanting to bellow CQ 20 cause the loss or does it take the act
> to do it. Are people bellowing CQ 20 victims? Is bellowing CQ 20 a birth
> defect?
>
> If the latter, can we call them Cecil's Kids?

No wonder Cecil's IQ is sky high. It was all that rote memorizing as a kid
for his
ham licenses, then even more for his EE. Fantastic! Maybe there's a good use
for it, after all.

553. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 17:47:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C860FC0.43430E06@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36546

Mike Coslo wrote:

> . I've only ever operated PSK31 on the
> proposed frequencies: mostly 80 meters at 3580, 14070 for 20 meters,
> and 28120 on 10 meters.

Most of mine is on 20, but the point was that when using DIGIPAN or one of its clones (MIXwin uses it) one sees the entire 2400 hz passband while a single signal is normally less]
than 50 hz wide, unless overmodulated as you noted. That overmodulation is another problem that isn't always easily resolved since you can't monitor your own signal without a scope set up to monitor the RF out of your transmitter, and most hams don't have one. Best way to set up the transmitter is to start a transmission with no audio input and slowly
increase the audio level until the transmitter output comes up to the point that it stops increasing, then reduce it slightly. (The details depend on your setup and transmitter).
Some adjustments are made to the computer sound card, others to the rig, depending, again, on the equipment. I always ask how my signal is, and always tell another station if he is overdriving his rig. Some avoid saying so, but that's the only way most people will know.

>
> While people can transmit at other frequencies, do they? I must admit
> I've never noticed the psk31 notes in other areas of the band. But
> perhaps I've just been provincial. 8^)

You'll see it scattered out a little, but it is concentrated near the "standard" frequencies.
With MIXwin you're not restricted to a single mode per software load and that makes it a lot more fun since you can jump from one mode to any of the others on the spur of the moment. I personally like the Hellschreiber mode really well, and using the waterfall display on the other modes is revealing and educational as well. You learn by visual comparison which modes are working well under weak signal conditions, by
varying your receiver RF gain you see how noise level and signal to noise ratio can play into the workings of the various modes. For instance on RTTY you can take a pretty weak signal that isn't copyable with the RF gain up, since the noise is being amplified to the point that it is causing 'hits' on the RTTY copy, then slightly reduce the RF gain so that the noise on the waterfall display drops (the noise level is visible as
white background on the display. You turn the RF gain down carefully so that the white just
disappears leaving only the visible signal on the blue background) and the RTTY print will

clear up. Makes learning
to carefully adjust the receiver for optimal reception easy. The waterfall
display works better for me these days than relying on hearing the difference!

>
>
> And as the waterfall display will tell you, there are a fair number of
> hams whose PSK31 signals are pretty atrocious, overdriving the audio and
> running too much power, and making it difficult to achieve the BW
> promise the mode can achieve.
>

Yep, that's easy to spot and easy to correct, but one has to know his equipment and what to do with it.

>
> I'll have to check out MixWin

It has become my favorite, though there are some others that I haven't tried.
Make sure you download version 2.03, there are still some older versions out there for download that don't have all the functionality that 2.03 has. Google search will show you where to download it, also the K4SET website has some info.

Dick

554. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 17:47:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C865604.64F2DE54@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36547

Valentine Germann wrote:

> Hello, all!
>
> I'm a geezer (52)

SHHHHH! Val, Carl Stevenson is 52, and he thinks he's a
kid. Gotta be at least 53 to reach geezerness.

> who has finally decided to take
> the plunge into amateur radio. Back in the 1960s
> I took a test to get on commercial radio. I had to
> get to Kansas City (90 miles away) and take the
> thing at an FCC office. Question pool? I don't
> THINK so! That was a relatively easy test (Third-
> Class Radiotelephone) and I passed it fine. But,
> I was SWEATING BULLETS before-hand because
> it was a PAIN just to take the thing, and failure would
> have been awful, for a lot of reasons.
>
> THAT was TESTING!

Welcome to the Brave New World. As for Kansas City, been
there
and done that, found it to be the same as you did. My tests
were
Extra class, and First Phone a few years earlier in New York
City.

>
>
> Quite frankly, I am shocked that I will have access
> to the questions and answers on the tests that I
> will take over the next month or two. I have some
> technical background, which helps, but I got a couple
> of those books from Radio Shack, and, er, ah, there
> are the questions AND answers, right there!
>
> Somehow, it seems like cheating, at least to me!

Aw, Come on Val! Haven't ya heard? All those "students" out
there don't
simply memorize!

>
>

> Are people simply memorizing the pool? They
> HAVE to be, MANY of them! To believe otherwise
> is just silly. I'm a college-level instructor and, hey,
> my students would KILL for the questions and
> answers! Why, if they had them they'd come to
> my lectures only out of courtesy, and because I
> do a good job, usually!
>

Val, I hate to have to be the one to break the news to you, but you
might as well get ready for major changes in the way you do things in
academia. When ARRL's Ed Hare finally gets the word out about
how question pools do a really fine job of qualifying all testees, your
present method is sure to fall.

In any event, from one Missourian to another, welcome to ham radio.
I hope you find it as interesting and as much fun as I have.

Dick Carroll, W0EX

W1RFI, the floor is yours.....

555. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 18:02:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203061002.21473a42@posting.google.com>
Source record: 36548

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c825eb2_2@news7.fast.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020303101045.21826.00000244@mb-cc.aol.com...
> > In article <3c81155c_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
> >
> > >"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > >news:MPG.16e9d56034df8eab9896a2@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> > >> However, it's not hard to see the potential advantage of CW in
> emergency
> > >> communications between stations at large distances.
> > >
> > >Sure it is ... PARTICULARLY since that's NOT the type of service
> > >that the emergency management folks WANT.
> > >
> > >They couldn't care LESS about NTS-like "radiograms", etc. They
> > >want tactical voice and data communications ... not Morse.
> >
> > Carl, considering the way you've described Morse/CW on this NG
> > and elsewhere, I doubt very much that anyone asking about the
> > mode would get an objective presentation.
>
> I'm merely stating the facts, based on years of dealing with
> emergency management folks through ARES/RACES ...

You're presenting your opinions of what others want, filtered through
your own likes and dislikes. Based on reading practically all of your
posts here for at least 4-1/2 years, I really have a hard time
believing that you would present Morse/CW in ANY sort of positive light
to anyone.

It's like having the chairman of PETA as spokesperson for fur coats and
premium beef.

> They DON'T want Morse radiograms ... they want/need what
> I've said ... tactical voice and data communications.

> > For a description of the use of Morse in a recent emergency
> situation,
> > go to google and dig up the first post in the thread "Hurricanes and
>
> > Emergencies". Posted 10/10/99 by KT4ST.
>
> First, if the most recent you can come up with dates to 1999,

> that in itself is evidence that Morse usage in emergencies is
> rare indeed.

It's simply a recent example that is easily accessible. Hurricane Floyd
came through EPA back then, but the damage and evacuations were highly
localized and communications were in good shape almost everywhere.
>
> Secondly, while I don't have the time to dig through google
> archives of ancient history,

You have enough time to post here, though. Looking up that post would take
a few minutes at most.

> I would strongly suspect that,
> as is virtually always the case, any use of Morse was a matter
> of operator choice, rather than operational necessity.

It was used when SSB failed.

> If it was,
> in fact, "the only mode available," that indicates a lack of good
> planning and preparation.

It was the only mode available that would get through under the conditions
experienced.

> > >The entire argument that "Morse is essential to emergency
> > >communications" is SO bogus that it's ridiculous, thus it
> > >doesn't hold water as "justification" for continued Morse testing.
> >
> > I would describe it this way:
> >
> > "What is the probability that a ham will be in an emergency
> situation where
> > Morse/CW is the ONLY available mode that will work?
>
> With reasonable planning and preparation, "VANISHINGLY SMALL."

What constitutes "reasonable planning and preparation"? Are YOU ready
for what KT4ST & Co. went through? I know I'm not, but I'm working on it.
>
> > Is that probability high enough to justify mandatory testing of ALL
> > hams as a precondition for a license?"
>
> Certainly not!!!!!
>
> > Those are the pertinent questions.
>
> I agree ... and I've provided sound, rational answers to both.

They are opinion questions, and the answers are subjective. In fact the
whole question of what belongs on the ham tests is an opinion question,
except perhaps for the most basic regs and safety issues.

My point in posing those questions
is to show that one doesn't have to use terms like "SO
bogus it's ridiculous" to get the opinion across.

73 de Jim, N2EY

556. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 18:28:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C865FCE.C365D81D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36549

Valentine Germann wrote:

Dick, is that you in disguise? Or your uncle there in
Missouri?

> Somehow, it seems like cheating, at least to me!

If so, people also cheat to get their pilot's license and
driver's license.

> Are people simply memorizing the pool? They
> HAVE to be, MANY of them!

Try memorizing the definitions of 1000 Russian words and
then get back to us.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

557. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 18:35:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C866175.757C2E51@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36550

Dick Carroll wrote:
> No wonder Cecil's IQ is sky high. It was all that rote memorizing as a kid
> for his ham licenses, then even more for his EE. Fantastic! Maybe there's
> a good use for it, after all.

A person uses what talents and skills he has to achieve the goal, Dick.
Mother Nature blessed me with a high IQ and a photographic memory for
numbers and graphs. I cannot take credit for those talents but I sure
did put them to good use in my life including gaining all amateur
frequency privileges when I was 14 years old. It didn't occur to me
at the time that there was additional material available besides
the ARRL License Manual. I was intelligent but very, very naive.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

558. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 18:37:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8661D3.F549BFBD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36551

KC8PMX wrote:
> I will put 100 bucks on the fact that amateur radio will still be around
> 2020.

I probably won't make it but I'll bet you're right.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

559. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 19:10:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C8669B8.5BB8F267@earthlink.net>
Source record: 36552

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C859EDF.B9B0FD92@earthlink.net...
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > > Not for me. I'll not be having non-cards printed and mailed. There
> > > > aren't many I need and my QSLing will decrease dramatically after
> > > > finishing up work on 6m and 160m DXCCs.
> > >
> > > Then why not release your logs from your various QTHs to e-QSL? You've
> > > already gotten what you wanted out of them, right?
> >
> > I guess my answer is that my logs are mine. They don't belong to e-QSL.
> > I've never put any of my logs online and never will. The logs are still
> > open for those who need a card from any of my operations and WA8JOC
> > still has plenty of blank cards. Direct cards with SASE or IRCs will
> > get a direct response. Others go via bureau. None will be confirmed
> > electronically.
>
> I see.
>
> > > > > A good DXer knows what the 160M authorizations are.
> > > >
> > > > I haven't memorized the 160m allocations in each country. I do give a
> > > > nod to the JA's once in a while. Otherwise I scan the band.
> > >
> > > Good grief. There's not an inch of give in you, is there?
> >
> > Not when I'm right. I don't know any DXer who has memorized all of the
> > band allocations for every country in the world.
>
> You're right. You don't know where to look on the bands for certain
> countries.

That isn't what I said. I told you that I haven't memorized them. Have
you?

> > > > > Why is it different for
> > > > > 6M? Are you aware that there's a different 6M calling freq in the
> > > Pacific?
> > > >
> > > > I don't memorize every other countries 6m authorization either. As to
> > > > the Pacific calling frequency, I'm not in the Pacific calling other
> > > > Pacific stations. The V7 station I worked on 6m was at 50.080 CW.
> The

> > > > numerous Pacific area stations I worked from Tanzania were around
> > > > 50.110. Would you like me to supply a list of prefixes so you can
> check
> > > > to see if any of those stations operated outside their assigned band
> > > > segments?
> > >
> > > I guess you're not the least bit familiar with either the 160m or 6m
> > > authorizations. Too bad for you. I guess you'll get DXCC by dumb luck.
> >
> > I've never operated from the Pacific. Why would I have need of a
> > Pacific calling frequency.
>
> It might be a place for you to *listen,* but no, you're right, just keep
> bumbling along.

I see that you've decided to take this beyond ridiculous.

> Or you might still be in the "I'm the DX" mode and expect
> them to find you. It might take you some more time on the noisy side of the
> pileup to figure that one out.
>
> I've worked plenty of 6m DX which wasn't on
> > any calling frequency. One doesn't get to DXCC on 6m by sitting and
> > listening to 50.110. One doesn't get to DXCC on 160m by listening to
> > any one frequency. I have 108 worked (96 confirmed) on 160m and 72
> > worked (only about 40 confirmed) on 6m. Sometimes dumb luck pays off,
> > huh?
>
> Obviously.

Tell us about your dumb luck on either or both of the bands under
discussion, Brian.

> > > > > There's a lot to know if you want to be a DXer.
> > > >
> > > > Well, good luck.
> > >
> > > Ditto.
> >
> > I had really good intentions of memrorizing all of those allocations but
> > I got so busy working new ones that I never got around to it.
>
> Lemme see. 108 on 160m and 72 on 6m. That's a total of 180 QSOs at (a
> generous) 60 seconds each. In the public schools that works out to three
> hours of being "busy working new ones," over about two years back in
> America.

You must have misunderstood. I didn't work any of 'em from the public
schools. Oh....you didn't think that's all I've done with my time back
in the U.S., did you?

> You need a strategy.

I have a really good one: They shows up. I works 'em.

> > > > What are you going to do to alleviate the problem?
> > >
> > > Nothing.
> >
> > That's what's wrong with the youth of today. Some can see a problem but
> > don't wish to get involved. I did my part. It is time for you to step
> > up and do yours.
>
> Nope.

Then your show of concern for potential hams in other countries was only
artificial at best.

> > > One of the agriculturists I work with said that farmland away from the
> city
> > > was starting around 2K. He was amazed as I was that rough land commands
> the
> > > same price.
> >
> > They aren't making any more of it! Sometimes I do my best Grandpa Joad
> > from "The Grapes Of Wrath": "This here's my land. It ain't no good but
> > it's mine!"
>
> Hah! That's good.
>
> Prices should get back to normal after the boomers die off. They're at
> their peak earning years, the market has been good to them, and everything
> is at a premium because there are so many dollars out there.

The one thing they are making more of is people. People generate demand
and demand increases prices. I don't see land getting any cheaper.
>
> But of course, I'm a boomer too, and I've got to pay the price if I want a
> piece of it. When I leave it to my kids it won't be worth a wooden nickel.

I think you and your kids might be surprised.

Dave K8MN

560. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 19:15:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C866ABD.4CF5746@earthlink.net>
Source record: 36554

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020304221032.19404.00000280@mb-cs.aol.com...
> > In article <3c83b17d_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"

> > You have already said 25 kHz CW only would be OK.
>
> That 25 kHz was ALWAYS a "token gesture of good faith,"
> don't try to expand it in an "ask for an inch, take a mile" sort
> of maneuver ...

What gave you the impression that the frequency segments under
discussion were yours to dispense or withhold?

Dave K8MN

561. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 19:29:08 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8cqf941egeb99@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 36553

Hello, all!

Some guy who goes by "CAM" scrawled, confusedly:

>Valentine Germann wrote:
>
>Dick, is that you in disguise? Or your uncle there in
>Missouri?

See the problem? This guy can't even follow UseNetiqette
and render proper attribution. That is, I did NOT write,
"Dick, is that you in Disguise? Or you uncle there in Missouri."
For one thing, I can construct complete sentences.

Now, I ** DID ** write the following sentence, in reference
to AMATEUR RADIO pool question TESTING:

>> Somehow, it seems like cheating, at least to me!

In a misguided response to the sentence above, this guy
"CAM" mewled:

>If so, people also cheat to get their pilot's license and
>driver's license.

But you see, I wasn't talking about those things. I was
talking about AMATEUR RADIO. And, er, ah, isn't it true
that you have to take other tests, not just a pool test, before
you can get your pilot's license or driver's license? I think
that's so, and it's a wise precaution, since pilots in the skies
with just a pool written test behind them would soon crater this
fair land with crashing airplanes from coast to coast and
sea to shining sea. As for what such testing would bring to
the roads of America, particularly where the CDL is con-
cerned, well, I dare not even THINK about THAT!

Then, this guy "CAM" spewed again, in response to this
statement of mine:

>> Are people simply memorizing the pool? They
>> HAVE to be, MANY of them!

That is, this guy "CAM" wrote:

>Try memorizing the definitions of 1000 Russian words and
>then get back to us.

I have to admit it, here I am at a loss to understand. The
AMATEUR RADIO tests are in ENGLISH, at least they are
in the books that I have bought. Also, there are three groups
of them which can be taken a section at a time. Now, I know
it might be hard for a third-rate intellect such as "CAM" to
believe, but it's going to be NO PROBLEM for me, if I want
to, to NAIL those tests based strictly on the books. That is,
this guy "CAM" may think that to be a mental feat beyond belief
but, trust me on this one, even college students could do it!

Cheers to you, too!

Val Germann
Columbia, Missouri
well, he's wrong.

**

562. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 19:34:12 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c866f38_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36555

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C866ABD.4CF5746@earthlink.net...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020304221032.19404.00000280@mb-cs.aol.com...
> > > In article <3c83b17d_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>
> > > You have already said 25 kHz CW only would be OK.
> >
> > That 25 kHz was ALWAYS a "token gesture of good faith,"
> > don't try to expand it in an "ask for an inch, take a mile" sort
> > of maneuver ...
>
> What gave you the impression that the frequency segments under
> discussion were yours to dispense or withhold?

Dave,

If you'd bother to read anything I say, rather than just immediately
criticizing because it was me who said it, you'd know that I said
something like "I could support ... 25 kHz ..."

I never said "the frequency segements were under my control."

You are so driven to criticize anything I say that you make a fool
of yourself by going off on things where you don't even know what
it was that I said.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPIZvK5e+N6+q84HiEQIUCwCbBZxxIe7I6Mj5x01T470x7WDWjBYAniUL
Y/wjt4rUEQWCgiktXbGztmFC
=dT4o
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

563. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 19:34:13 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C866F35.12E1E688@uci.edu>
Source record: 36557

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > Even you consider some of your ideas to be absurd, Cecil. You posted
> > one last week about thought police or some such thing.

> It was a question, Jim. Someone thought that hams should feel a certain
> way. In response to that statement, I asked if we should have the Feeling
> Police to enforce what hams should feel.

If it wasn't your idea to have thought police, who's was it? It
certainly wasn't mine. You did feel it was absurd, did you not?

564. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 19:36:14 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <a65r3e$2js4$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 36558

Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
>the moment. I personally like the Hellschreiber mode really well, and
>using the waterfall
>display on the other modes is revealing and educational as well. You
>learn by visual
>comparison which modes are working well under weak signal conditions, by
>varying your receiver RF gain you see how noise level and signal to
>noise ratio can
>play into the workings of the various modes. For instance on RTTY you can take a
>pretty weak signal that isn't copyable with the RF gain up, since the
>noise is being
>amplified to the point that it is causing 'hits' on the RTTY copy, then
>slightly reduce
>the RF gain so that the noise on the waterfall display drops (the noise
>level is visible
>as
>white background on the display. You turn the RF gain down carefully so
>that the white
>just
>disappears leaving only the visible signal on the blue background) and
>the RTTY print will
>
>clear up. Makes learning
>to carefully adjust the receiver for optimal reception easy. The waterfall
>display works better for me these days than relying on hearing the difference!

I wanted to point out that I think this is pretty neat. When I first
started occasionally paying attention to this group, one of the early
exchanges I followed was W1RFI asking W0EX questions about the operation
of a spectrum analyzer, with W0EX protesting that spectrum analyzers weren't
something that a ham, as opposed to a professional, would need to know about.
Now, while I'm paying attention again a few years later, I see W0EX explaining
how to do useful things with what is essentially a spectrum analyzer.

There's probably a lesson in there that I can't put my finger on about
how inaccurate impressions of people derived solely from Usenet discussions
can be, but it is certainly clear that one shouldn't underestimate the
ability of even old dogs to muster enough enthusiasm to learn new tricks.
I'm impressed.

Dennis Ferguson

565. A Matter of Editiing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 19:52:18 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8crqq4jgia72d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 36556

Hello, all!

In the message above, after my name and
address, you can disregard the line immediately
below, which was inadvertantly retained and was
written in reference to this "CAM" guy.

Sorry about that.

VG

566. Re: Gee, This Frequency Looks Open

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 20:19:42 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <yRuh8.18369$106.1483050@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36559

Don't know as I'd entirely agree ... you have a point, but bear in mind the idiots that either ignore him or dare him to do something are the ones that generally get smacked. Just be nice and say 'gee, my mistake. Won't happen again.' You'll likely be fine.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"Harry Kline" <radio76@theradioplacezzz.com> wrote in message news:a652u3$4ba$0@pita.alt.net...
> Ho Hum, just another one of Riley's meaningless letters that
> he cranks out by the dozens with no intention of ever following
> up on. Oh yes, here and there we can point to some follow up,
> but overall, especially in some high-profile cases, Riley slinks
> away with no follow up once the perp stands up to Riley and
> won't be bullied by the little FCC geek. Oh yes, certain people
> definitely will feel Riley's sting, but these are individuals Riley
> has singled out for a vendetta and that Riley knows have limited
> resources or contacts to fight him with. It's no secret that
> Riley is not about to hold a series of FCC hearings to discipline
> hams. Riley has been instructed by his bosses that this will not
> happen. A few suspensions here and there and an endless stream
> of stupid letters, that's the thrust of Riley's much vaunted
> "enforcement" activities. What a joke! Meanwhile, some of the
> highest profile violators in ham radio history continue on with
> impunity. All of us could name at least one high-profile violator
> who is still operating on the air to this day, with impunity and no
> fear of little Riley. In the city where I am, we have a mental
> case who should have had his license revoked years ago. Riley
> cranked out the usual pile of letters to him, then forgot about the
> guy. What a joke! The guy continues to this day violating FCC
> rules and regulations with no fear of Riley or the FCC. Like I said
> though, another guy might break a few rules and whamo, Riley will
> pull the guy's ticket for the remainder of its term, but other guys can
> break whatever rules they choose, with no fear of Riley or the FCC.
> Riley is the best and worst case of Selective Enforcement there has
> ever been! I have no respect for the man any more. Of course,
> Riley could care less what I think of him. Riley goes on, knowing
> that his fat taxpayer-provided pay check will be there waiting for him
> every two weeks, followed by a generous federal retirement in a few
> years. Riley's legacy will be nothing, nada, zip. Just another federal
> bureaucrat who has ripped off the people who provide his pay check!
>
> 10-4 Good Buddy!
>

>
> > >February 15, 2002
> > >
> > >Mr. Thomas D. Batista
> > >10124 45 Avenue
> > >Corona, NY 11368
> > >
> > >Mr. Gerardo Arias
> > >278 Sharpe Avenue
> > >Staten Island, NY 10302
> > >
> > >RE: Amateur Radio licenses KC2DDD, N2IFU--Repeater Operation
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >Dear Messrs Batista and Arias:
> > >
> > >It has come to our attention that you are operating an uncoordinated
> repeater
> > >with an output on 147.020 MHz and input on 143.020 MHz. The frequency
> 143.020
> > >MHz is not allocated to the Amateur Radio Service. Our information also
> > >indicates that you use this repeater as a reverse auto-patch, that it
is
> not
> > >being identified, and that it is causing interference to coordinated
> > >repeaters
> > >
> > >Section 97.205 of the Commission's rules states that where there is
> > >interference between a coordinated and an uncoordinated repeater, "the
> > >licensee of the uncoordinated repeater has primary responsibility to
> resolve
> > >the interference." Operation on 143.020 MHz unlicensed is a violation
of
> > >Section 312 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and will
> result in
> > >fine or imprisonment.
> > >
> > >Section 308(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C.
> > >Section 308(b), gives the Commission the authority to request
information
> > >from a licensee regarding the operation of a radio station.
Accordingly,
> you
> > >are requested to respond to this letter within 20 days from the above
> date,
> > >furnishing: 1) full details about the operation of the repeater; 2) the
> > >identity of control operators, if any; 3) the call signs of the users;
4)
> > >names and addresses of any unlicensed users; and 5) the location of the

> > >repeater. If the repeater is located on property that you do not own or
> rent,
> > >state the name and address of the landlord or site manager.
> > >
> > >Address your response to 1270 Fairfield Road at the above letterhead
> address,
> > >and please be advised that Congress has made punishable a willfully
false
> or
> > >misleading reply to a letter of this type. See Title 18, Section 1001
of
> the
> > >United States Code.
> >
> >
> > Okay, so what's your POINT? Are you complaining about the FCC action?
> > Are you commenting on the above named licensees and their questionable
> > operating practices? What is the PURPOSE of submitting this notice?
> >
> >
> > Raymond Sirois AB2HR
> > SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
> > 607-733-5745
> > telnet:\\thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000
>
>

567. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 20:31:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020306153124.17082.00000038@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 36560

>Subject: Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)
>From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>Date: 03/05/02 07:28 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <3c860b64_1@newsa.ev1.net>

>Why must someone be a radio amateur to comment and have opinion on amateur
>radio, Dave? That doesn't make sense at all.

Sure it does. It makes all the sense in the world. Lennie the Loser has
NO experience (beyond the theoretical) from which to address matters pertaining
to Amateur radio policy or practice.

NONE.

>Must one be in the medical
>insurance industry before an opinion can be made that medical insurance
>fails most people miserably and has made a mockery of the true nature of
>being a doctor?

First of all, with the exception of those names on the Social Register or
Fortune 500's folkest-with-the-mostest, name me someone in America who is NOT
affected by insurance matters.

> Must one be a teacher to realize they are underpaid?

Or a nurse, or a chauffer, or a gardner, or a....But none of that's
germane to discussing Amateur radio practice or policy, now is it?

>Len may be totally off-base.

"May" be...?!?! He openly lies and misleads, harrasses and antagonizes.
There's no "may" to it...!!!

>I am surprised you spend time
>reading his posts; they all say the same thing.

Yes. They are insulting and demeaning. But that does not mean that they
should not be blunted by countering comments. We have seen the results of The
Big Lie that was allowed to go unchallenged.

>However, that he is not a
>licensed amateur radio operator has nothing to do with it.

They have EVERYTHING to do with it, Kim. He has absolutely NO background
(beyond the theoretical) upon which to make his opinions and assertions. His
practical experience in Amateur radio is Zero-point-Zero minutes of Amateur
Radio time.

Shannon Faulkner has more military training than Lennie has in Amateur Radio. His numerous anti-ham rants have all been disproven or laid bare for what they are....mean, antagonistic bile for which there is NO excuse save pure meaness.

Until he either ceases his verbal carnage of his own volition or he strokes out, he will get that which he doles out.

73

Steve, K4YZ

568. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 20:39:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020306153938.17082.00000040@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 36561

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>Date: 03/05/02 17:16 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <rtbh8.122$2E4.29715632@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>

>> I don't memorize every other countries 6m authorization either. As to
>> the Pacific calling frequency, I'm not in the Pacific calling other
>> Pacific stations. The V7 station I worked on 6m was at 50.080 CW. The
>> numerous Pacific area stations I worked from Tanzania were around
>> 50.110. Would you like me to supply a list of prefixes so you can check
>> to see if any of those stations operated outside their assigned band
>> segments?
>
>I guess you're not the least bit familiar with either the 160m or 6m
>authorizations. Too bad for you. I guess you'll get DXCC by dumb luck.

Brian, I'd really like for you to explain how you managed to pull that bit of wisdom out from your otherwise dusty and ill-fitting hat.

CW on either of the frequencies he cited is legal, and nothing he stated was improper. Perhaps a bit of DX-envy?

Steve, K4YZ

569. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 20:42:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C867F29.9F4EDFC8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36562

Dennis Ferguson wrote:
> I wanted to point out that I think this is pretty neat. When I first
> started occasionally paying attention to this group, one of the early
> exchanges I followed was W1RFI asking W0EX questions about the operation
> of a spectrum analyzer, with W0EX protesting that spectrum analyzers weren't
> something that a ham, as opposed to a professional, would need to know about.
> Now, while I'm paying attention again a few years later, I see W0EX explaining
> how to do useful things with what is essentially a spectrum analyzer.
>
> There's probably a lesson in there that I can't put my finger on about
> how inaccurate impressions of people derived solely from Usenet discussions
> can be, but it is certainly clear that one shouldn't underestimate the
> ability of even old dogs to muster enough enthusiasm to learn new tricks.
> I'm impressed.

Psssssttt Dennis, don't tell him it is a spectrum analyzer. He'll never use
it again, damn it to hell, and re-protest to the world that amateurs don't
need spectrum analyzers.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

570. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 20:45:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C867FFB.7EF8935F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36563

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > Even you consider some of your ideas to be absurd, Cecil. You posted
> > > one last week about thought police or some such thing.
>
> > It was a question, Jim. Someone thought that hams should feel a certain
> > way. In response to that statement, I asked if we should have the Feeling
> > Police to enforce what hams should feel.
>
> If it wasn't your idea to have thought police, who's was it? It
> certainly wasn't mine. You did feel it was absurd, did you not?

Of course, it was absurd. Otherwise, I never would have asked that
tongue-in-cheek rhetorical question. I think it was Larry's idea for
hams to have to feel a certain way but I might be wrong about that.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

571. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 20:55:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C86823F.BE4740FD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36564

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> Hello, all!
>
> Some guy who goes by "CAM" scrawled, confusedly:
>
> >Valentine Germann wrote:
> >
> >Dick, is that you in disguise? Or your uncle there in
> >Missouri?
>
> See the problem? This guy can't even follow UseNetiqette
> and render proper attribution. That is, I did NOT write,
> "Dick, is that you in Disguise? Or you uncle there in Missouri."
> For one thing, I can construct complete sentences.

It is your newsreader that is screwing up, not mine. The author's
name is at one level of nesting below his postings. You, sir,
just forged an attribution and that is certainly against netnews
rules. You should be reported to your ISP for that violation.

> >If so, people also cheat to get their pilot's license and
> >driver's license.
>
> But you see, I wasn't talking about those things. I was
> talking about AMATEUR RADIO.

Aha Dick, it is you. Come on, don't deny it. You have subscribed
to one of the direct news servers, like I did except I have the
balls to post my real name.

> >Try memorizing the definitions of 1000 Russian words and
> >then get back to us.
>
> I have to admit it, here I am at a loss to understand. The
> AMATEUR RADIO tests are in ENGLISH, at least they are
> in the books that I have bought.

Don't play stupid. If it is easy to memorize the Q&A for 1000
English amateur questions, then it should be no problem to
memorize 1000 definitions for Russians words. Let us know
whan you have accomplished that trivial task.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

572. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 21:08:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020306160846.03941.00000697@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 36567

In article <20020306061016.26465.00001819@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>It is perfectly reasonable for others to assume a paid staffer, a
>>manager, has a goodly amount of Loyalty to his employer.
>
>That is why I choose to work at ARRL, Len; I believe that the work I do there
>is important.

That's almost a macro compared to what you have written before.

Define the "that." Did you choose to work there on the basis of loyalty? For pay? For title? Are those the only reasons?

I did not define my quoted sentence as pertaining to specifically Ed Hare.

The quoted sentence was written to show that personal bias towards an employer is common to most employees reasonably or well-satisfied with their job. Are you in disagreement with this immediately-preceding sentence?

>>The end result is the general readers' perception of bias, of spin in
>>stating certain things about the employer.
>
>I am sure that the degree to which what I say is seen as "spin" varies from
>reader to reader. Some actually believe that I say what I actually believe.

My original post concerned the ARRL as a whole and its continued spin output over the last half-century. In this newsgroup Ed Hare presumed this was some sort of direct inferrence on his newsgroup writings and became defensive. The connection of group-to-personal is an indication of personal involvement and probable bias.

>To others, there will always be suspicion. To others yet, a need to create
>such suscpicion...

Such suspicion is not unfounded. It seems there is always a single apologist for the ARRL present in this newsgroup with a managerial title.

I'm rather sure that all readers are familiar with an oft-quoted phrase "I did not have sex with that woman." That was spoken by a President of the United States, a title somewhat higher than anything bestowable by the ARRL.

To believe one and not the other indicates a very personal bias.

>>There should be no denial that the ARRL makes a
>>profit on reselling of goods or the sale of advertising space in its
>>membership magazine.
>
>As long as one also "doesn't deny" that ARRL has no stockholders to reap the
>benefit of that profit. The policy-setting arm of the ARRL, its Board of
>Directors and the non-corporate officers, by policy do not get to keep a dime
>of that profit.

None that is reported. What about the paid employees? Do they also
receive minimum wages? Minimum employee benefits?

What about the travel, food, and lodging reimbursements? Are there
any for all those out-of-NE board meetings? Are those meeting room
charges obtained gratis?

What are the billing charges for professional legal representation
in DC? Are those for free?

Why does the ARRL ask for more money for certain activities from
time to time?

>There is no materialistic side, Len. All of those profits are used to fund
>the actions of the "idealistic" side.

How is that so "idealistic" when the ARRL attempts to control/influence
government on certain regulations when there is NO credible
confirmation that the membership actually approves of the "board's"
decisions? The only "confirmation" of the ARRL's actions comes from
the ARRL itself.

Why does the ARRL demand more money for goods sold directly
relative to the same goods sold at retail outlets?

>>It becomes confused when both sides of this Janus
>>claim the "only" "official" source of goods and services for "all
>>radio amateurs."
>
>If that is what you believe, I agree; it has become confused.

I acknowledge agreement on this one point.

>>Article two of "The Amateur's Code" demands membership
>>organization loyalty solely to the ARRL.
>
>"Solely?" Not in my handbook, nor is there any mention of that in the ARRL
>employee handbook, either.

Direct quote from my 1978 "The Radio Amateur's Handbook," sub-
titled "The Standard Manual of Amateur Radio Communication." -

"TWO
The Amateur is Loyal . . . He offers his loyalty, encour-

agement and support to his fellow radio amateurs, his local
club and to the American Radio Relay League, through
which amateur radio is represented."

Some time after that Paul Segal's 1928 original was revised. In
the 1999 CD-ROM version that article had become:

"LOYAL...offers loyalty, encouragement and support to other amateurs,
local clubs, and the American Radio Relay League, through which
Amateur Radio in the United States is represented nationally and
internationally."

Solely to ONE membership organization, the ARRL. All anyone
can quibble about is "club" which is not defined nor detailed. The
ARRL is rather explicitly self-defined, isn't it?

>>The public and non-members are able to perceive things about
>>the ARRL which the ARRL cannot. That is not a "fault" of the
>>non-members.
>
>We are so lucky to have all-seeing Len to show us the light. :-)

Are "we" also lucky to have a paid manager and employee of the
ARRL to show "us" another light?

ARRL membership is still less than a quarter of all licensed US
radio amateurs.

573. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 21:08:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020306160848.03941.00000698@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 36566

In article <a65b3i022ga@enews1.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>I think the ARS will be around by the time I am 88 years old (56 more years)
>I am quite sure. As with anything it may change or take different
>directions, but it will still be there. Unlike a few people seem to think
>and want, Amateur Radio will never return to what it is like in the 50's and
>the rest of the Ward and June Cleaver stereotypes. It will evolve.
>
>Ryan

Heh. Refusal or inability to adapt killed the dinosaurs... :-)

There's a lot of raptor-wannabees buzzing around in here demanding
a "return with us now to the days of yesterday"* in everything from
jargon, procedure, testing (1930s) to technical arts (1950s) and the
ever-present public service jingoism of "ready for any emergency"
(since the Titanic disaster of 1912). They seem to be unable to
think outside of the box prepared for them by even-older long-timers.

Amateur radio has, by evidence, always been about RECREATION
involving radio. Individual recreation. The hungry raptor-wannabees
keep insisting that all, newcomers or oldcomers, should enjoy the
hobby their way...that all should hunt bravely for sustenance "for the
good of the community" as if they were some paragon of virtue in
their own very personal preference activities. They bring nothing to
the table, no food, only great volumes of hot air. Exhortations of
nobility, of service, of dedication, etc., etc., etc. are filling but have
no real nutritional value.

"Recreation" seems to be a pejorative. Our nation has a great
number of national parks maintained for the enjoyment and
recreation of its citizens and quite a few foreign tourists. Millions
of dollars are spent by governments to maintain them yet such
parks and preserves return nothing direct except enjoyment of
nature. Many of these parks and preserves take up land that
could be used for other purposes. Going to a park or preserve
for enjoyment does not make anyone an expert ecologist,
botanist, or land-history-historian...recreationists don't return
anything directly insofar as "a service to their country" or "being
ready for emergencies." They just enjoy themselves IN nature.

The EM spectrum is also a part of nature. As a whole but it is
divided up, regulated, allocated, very much used by different radio
services. Here and there are little parks and preserves in the
spectrum which are open for recreation and enjoyment. Some of

those parks are allocated to radio amateurs, others are open to anyone.

Some radio amateurs tenaciously fight for "their land" as if they owned it, preserved it, even invented it. They wish to force all to obey them and their associates to meet their terms of entry and occupation, maintaining rigid order and discipline within their ranks as if it were a military service. All must do things their way "for the good of the service." They erect barriers, fly banners, exhort their Way Of Life as the "only way" yet they own nothing of that ephemeral spectrum.

The evolution of radio has been on-going for 106 years and the public has been allowed into many of the recreation places in the EM spectrum...from CB to model radio control to FRS to various appliances that make life easier, more enjoyable. The Academy of Model Aeronautics has never attempted any jingoism of model hobbyists being any great "pool of aeronautical techniques for the nation" or anything else than a hobby. But the AMA membership is on par with that of the ARRL. AMA members just enjoy their hobby without pretense of grandeur, have fun in many diverse ways, don't propagandize within themselves about their great importance to the nation or their community. But, modelers have succeeded in getting reserved EM spectrum "park space" just for their hobby purposes, for enjoyment, for recreation. In later years despite the AMA being established in 1936 well before most of these newsgroupies were born.

Some of the raptors in the radio amateur "community" demand a rigid adherence to standards and tradition established before they were born, a temporal allegience to a bygone era that also existed before their life experience began. That's odd, almost perverse, that they so treasure and adore the archaic that they demand all those who began life well after they did to follow their examples, of retaining testing and a guild-unionism within a "tradecraft" that is a hobby in a constantly-evolving technology. Why? It only satisfies the little raptors' hunger for size and importance. They do not grow bigger, only meaner and more spiteful.

Another revolution in radio began quietly about 1991. The SDR or Software Defined Radio technology. Defined, not just controlled by software. The first such complete SDRs appeared in 2001. The possibilities of a fantastic advance of radio technology are as good now as the dawning of the solid-state era of the 1960s. The "ecology" of radio is once more changing, evolving. The little raptors cannot see this, do not want to see it. Fixated in ancient technology, they remain inflexible, locked into a narrowband world of half-century-old standards and practices.

I personally cannot see this love for a half century ago. I was there as an adult then and grew out of it. Nostalgia is fine, a trip back in time to remember the good times with contemporaries

who were there too. Fixed, legislated nostalgia is wrong, and that is what makes up too much of US radio amateur regulations, standards, and practices...unless the definitions of amateur radio are changed.

The little raptors snarl and object to the "ARS" defined as Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service. Yet that is what they champion. They wonder why no one appreciates their glory and majesty and noble presence when they are only two inches tall, enthroned on molehills in a land of mountains. :-)

---

* Opening line of an old radio show, "The Lone Ranger," popular in the 1940s BTV (Before TeleVision).

574. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 21:08:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020306160849.03941.00000699@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 36565

In article <3c865294_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020304221032.19404.00000280@mb-cs.aol.com...
>> In article <3c83b17d_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"

>That 25 kHz was ALWAYS a "token gesture of good faith,"
>don't try to expand it in an "ask for an inch, take a mile" sort
>of maneuver ...

"Give a man an inch and he thinks he's a ruler..." :-)

575. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 21:14:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203061314.1c349469@posting.google.com>
Source record: 36568

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c825bb7_1@news7.fast.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020303101044.21826.00000243@mb-cc.aol.com...
> > In article <a5lmeu010as@enews3.newsguy.com>, "Krell"
> <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> > writes:
> >
> > >"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > >news:3C7E4EB2.E32AA759@worldnet.att.net...
> > >> The answer should be so obvious that it isn't even needed, at
> all.
> > >> As you well know, this isn't about me. It's about all those
> future hams
> > >> who will NOT be learning to use radio's most basic mode.
> > >
> > >Walking and bicycling are basic modes of transportation, yet skill
> in
> > >neither is required for a driver's license.
> >
> > True - because the potential danger to others from walkers and
> cyclists
> > is pretty low. Sidewalks are provided for walkers, too.
>
> And there is no danger posed to Morse-proficient hams (or
> the public in general) by non-Morse-proficient hams ... except
> perhaps the "danger" that Morse enthusiasts will have to pro-
> actively recruit new Morse enthusiasts instead of relying on the
> "Morse welfare state" of mandatory Morse proficiency testing ...

The danger is interference.
>
> > What's wrong with walking and bike riding? They conserve natural
> > resources, reduce pollution, and are healthy exercise. If there's
> > anything wrong with those modes of transportation, it's that too
> > few Americans use them. Lack of exercise is directly linked to
> > many of the top causes of death in the USA.
>
> There's nothing wrong with walking or bike riding ... but they
> are not required elements of a drivers' license test ...

Krell talked about the technology of walking and bicycling in
a disparaging way, because they are old and basic means of transportation.

The comparison is a poor one. Much better is Bill Sohl's question of
"is stick-shift skill necessary for a driver's license?"

> neither
> is there anything wrong with Morse usage (by choice),

Agreed!

> but
> likewise, Morse proficiency no longer has a place as a required
> element of amateur tests (except for the legal requirement of
> S25.5, for now)

Obviously your opinion, and also the FCC's. They made it clear
they don't want code testing, but their hands are tied as long
as S25.5 stays as it is.

73 de Jim, N2EY

576. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 21:34:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C868B7B.BAC47B33@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36570

Len Over 21 wrote:
> Refusal or inability to adapt killed the dinosaurs... :-)

What do you think a similar celestial event would do to us?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

577. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 21:36:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C868BD0.30CED05@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36571

Valentine Germann wrote:
> . . . have been right all along. You really ARE worthless!
> But I had to make completely sure, in real time, for myself.
> Thanks for removing any doubts I might have had! :-)

Who cares? You don't have to balls to post your real name.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

578. Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 21:38:03 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8d214ejom2l7e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 36569

. . . have been right all along. You really ARE worthless!
But I had to make completely sure, in real time, for myself.
Thanks for removing any doubts I might have had! :-)

Val Germann
Columbia, Missouri

579. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 21:48:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020306164842.04549.00001863@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 36572

>Subject: Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/06/02 16:08 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020306160846.03941.00000697@mb-ck.aol.com

>That's almost a macro compared to what you have written before.

YOU have ABSOLUTELY no business what-so-ever berating ANYONE for posting a
"macro" compared to ANYTHING. To do so is the ultimate hipocracy.

>Are "we" also lucky to have a paid manager and employee of the
>ARRL to show "us" another light.

There is no "we" where YOU are concerned, Your Flippantness.

Putz.

580. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 21:50:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203061350.63b59ab1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 36573

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020305075213.03226.00001641@mb-cv.aol.com>...
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >> >and artificial waiting periods are nothing more than an elitist pile of
> >> >crap that discriminates against qualified newcomers.
>
> >> Why all the name calling over an IDEA?
>
> >Because its such a BAD idea that it can't help but
> >evoke an emotional response ... note, however, that
> >the names were directed at the IDEA, not at individuals.
>
> Many years ago, one had to be a General for a year or two before becoming an
> Extra.

That ended in the mid-1970s.

The old Class A/Advanced had a one-year experience requirement. When the Extra was (re)created in 1951, it had a two-year expereience requirement, which was reduced to one year about 1974 and eliminated entirely about 1976. (See my posts in another thread for exact dates).

> The premise was, IMHO, that there is learning that comes from being an
> active ham that is not necessarily going to show up in a written exam.

Yup - also a bit of maturity. But since there is no activity requirement, the license could sit unused for that time, too.

> That
> premise is valid, but the difficulty of having a VE system keep track of it
> makes it an unworkable good idea.

What difficulty? All that would be required is for the ham who wants to upgrade to present a copy of his/her current license. Which has to be done anyway to get credit for elements already taken. No need for VEs to keep any records or other stuff - just check the issue date on the existing license.

> It is probably also an unnecessary good idea.
> I don't see any major problems in the Amateur Radio Service that would be
> solved by a waiting period to upgrade. Minor problems, perhaps, because new
> hams tend to make mistakes that annoy old timers, but that is not sufficient
> cause, IMHO, to try to install such a system.

All comes down to opinion about what constitutes a reasonable requirement.

> For the most part, but calling an idea elitist does imply that you feel the
> person posing that idea is elitist. It would have been more effective to
> simply call it a bad idea and explain why you felt it was not necessary. The
> "own worst enemy" syndrome can strike at any time! :-)
>
Ayup.
> >>
> >> So all modes must compete as if in a battle? Why not simply allow
> all
> >> modes everywhere?
> >
> >Why characterize it as a "battle?" Cecil has used the term
> >"free market" ... as far as allowing all modes everywhere,
> >that is actually the way MOST of the world does it ... and it
> >really doesn't seem to have created any real problems.

Most of the world has a tiny ham population, spread very thin. Many
other countries with significant ham populations have subbands.

> >However, given the history here in the US it's probably not
> >a politically practical option ... though it could result in better
> >spectrum utilization from a technical/analytical standpoint.

I sure hope so.

I see a contradiction, though. On the one hand, Carl wants analog 'phone/image
subbands to remain as they are, to keep space open for digital modes.
In other words, digital modes need protection from 'phone encroachment.
But the idea of CW getting the same sort of protection from digital by
means of a subband is unacceptable to him. Double standard? Maybe,
maybe not. But it does seem odd that the digital modes are seen to deserve
"protection" but CW doesn't.

Yes, CW can be used anywhere on the amateur HF/MF bands (unless you count the
special Alaska freq), but in practice the routine use of CW in the 'phone
bands is rare and frowned upon.

> Jim does not troll, and no one pushes an emotional button that we do not help
> them push. If someone "pushes our button," our response is still our personal
> responsibility.

Thanks, Ed.

73 de Jim, N2EY

581. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 22:49:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020306174907.04549.00001886@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 36574

>Subject: Re: The tests that Real Hams took
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/06/02 16:08 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020306160848.03941.00000698@mb-ck.aol.com>

>There's a lot of raptor-wannabees buzzing around in here demanding
>a "return with us now to the days of yesterday"* in everything from
>jargon, procedure, testing (1930s) to technical arts (1950s) and the
>ever-present public service jingoism of "ready for any emergency"
>(since the Titanic disaster of 1912).

Led, however incapably, by His Licenselessness, Lennie The Lost. Lost in time, that is, as he repeatedly retells the story of the 1.2 million messages that HE transmitted or relayed from an Army communications outpost in backwater Asia in the post Korean War days.

>They seem to be unable to
>think outside of the box prepared for them by even-older long-timers.

At least it beats the (colostomy) bag that you seem to have YOUR head in, Your Foolishness. And your wife kisses that face? Whew!

>Amateur radio has, by evidence, always been about RECREATION
>involving radio.

And again Leonard H. Anderson, a "person" who neither holds licensure in nor participates directly with Amateur Radio, tries to tell us what Amateur Radio is or does.

No expericence = UN-informed opinion....silly at best.

>Some radio amateurs tenaciously fight for "their land" as if they
>owned it, preserved it, even invented it. They wish to force all to
>obey them and their associates to meet their terms of entry and
>occupation, maintaining rigid order and discipline within their
>ranks as if it were a military service.

Witness the foregoing.

>All must do things their
>way "for the good of the service." They erect barriers, fly banners,
>exhort their Way Of Life as the "only way" yet they own nothing
>of that ephemeral spectrum.

And this. If it were any more rediculous, we'd have people dying from terminal laughter. The problem is that creeps like Lennie the Lizard can keep repeating this trash over and over and SOMEONE, with a similar LACK of experience or knowledge base in that of which he speaks, may come to think it

has some merit.

It doesn't, save for in the minds of the timid, the weak or the foolish.

>The Academy
>of Model Aeronautics has never attempted any jingoism of model
>hobbyists being any great "pool of aeronautical techniques for the
>nation" or anything else than a hobby.

Lennie has yet to answer the challenge put to him to make good on his claims of organizations of similar size/intent to the ARRL being as proactive in their administration or lobbying efforts to protect thier interests.

However Lennie DOES like to make reference to them as if model aircraft flying has any relevence to Amateur Radio. The only common interest is the use by modellers of some portion of the electromagnetic spectum to control thier models. Very specific channels using very specific techniques and very limited power.

Thier needs are addresed in Part 95 of the Federal Communications Commissions' Rules and Regulations, no part of which places any responsibility upon the user to meet certain expectations of the Commission nor of the public.

Part 97, however DOES place certain expectations on the Amateur Radio SERVICE, one of which is providing emergency communications.

Lennie, despite reams of evidence to the contrary, insists otherwise.

This is what a lack of experience or knowledge base does for you.

>But the AMA membership is on par with that of the ARRL.

Facts, please...?!?!

>AMA members just enjoy their
>hobby without pretense of grandeur, have fun in many diverse
>ways, don't propagandize within themselves about their great
>importance to the nation or their community.

Lennie's true reason for being an antagonistic twit is evident herein...Lennie can't stand it that "amateurs", unpaid, self-taught and LICENSED radio operator volunteers, DO have a "great importance" to thier nation, whether he cares to like it or not.

It is a fact. It has been attested to by federal and private organizations and agencies alike. Too bad for Lennie.

> ....don't propagandize within themselves about their great
>importance to the nation or their community.

Maybe when AMA members start flying models in support of disaster relief? Use their models as homing pigeons? Use them ala-MASH evacuations?

>Some of the raptors in the radio amateur "community" demand a
>rigid adherence to standards and tradition established before they

>were born......

Please quote the demands, Your Foolishness...names...specific quotes..?!?!

>They do not grow bigger, only meaner and more spiteful.

Yes, you do, Lennie.

>I personally cannot see this love for a half century ago. I was
>there as an adult then and grew out of it. Nostalgia is fine, a
>trip back in time to remember the good times with contemporaries
>who were there too.

You've grown out of nothing. You still whine and cry over things that you
don't understand or cannot master. You are given knowledge and skills, but do
nothing with either.

THAT is a loser.

>Fixed, legislated nostalgia is wrong, and that
>is what makes up too much of US radio amateur regulations,
>standards, and practices...unless the definitions of amateur radio
>are changed.

You would LIKE for the "definitions" of Amatuer Radio to be different.
Then perhaps you could mold it into your rants.

Amateur Radio continues to be viable, dynamic and of great value to both
the individual and the nation. That you choose to be it's single most vile
antagonist does not negate any of that.

Sorry if the facts don't fit your rants.

>The little raptors snarl and object to the "ARS" defined as
>Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service. Yet that is what they champion.

Keep reciting this in public, Lennie. You only further your own
foolishness. It is, afterall, a great lie.

>They wonder why no one appreciates their glory and majesty
>and noble presence when they are only two inches tall, enthroned
>on molehills in a land of mountains

"We" have no such wonderment, Lennie. Glory and majesty are not
adjectives that are applicable, but that "we" are appreciated is but one of the
numerous reasons why Amateur Radio thrives today, as much as that galls you.

Troll-on my wayward Son, there'll be peace when your troll is done. Lay
your lying mouth to rest, Don't you cry no more.

With SINCERE apologies to "KANSAS".

Steve

582. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 23:05:26 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C86A0B6.24F994F0@uci.edu>
Source record: 36575

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > If it wasn't your idea to have thought police, who's was it? It
> > certainly wasn't mine. You did feel it was absurd, did you not?
>
> Of course, it was absurd. Otherwise, I never would have asked that
> tongue-in-cheek rhetorical question. I think it was Larry's idea for
> hams to have to feel a certain way but I might be wrong about that.

No. I simply observed that hams have feelings, and think different ways
about things, and you came up with your brilliant idea in response.

583. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 23:38:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203061538.43ddaf1b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 36576

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c865294_2@news7.fast.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020304221032.19404.00000280@mb-cs.aol.com...
> > In article <3c83b17d_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > > besides, flexible usage
> > >of the spectrum = good spectrum management.
> >
> > Sure. But at the same time, both of us and K3LT (!) oppose
> > widening the 'phone bands. Don't you see the contradiction
> > between saying that it's OK to have a setaside for narrowband
> > modes but not OK to have a setaside for CW?
>
> From a purely technical standpoint, yes. From a practical,
> political standpoint, however, I realize that the history here
> in the US would make it a VERY contentious subject, were
> anyone to suggest that "SSB (all modes, in fact) be allowed
> everywhere" ...

It's been suggested several times here and elsewhere. Some folks
interpret the phrase "free market of modes" to mean no
subbands-by-mode.

> I see no sense in stiring the pot on that one
> because 1) it's not practical 2) it's not critically important,
> and 3) it would be VERY devisive in the ham community at
> a time when that sort of division would be a very bad thing.

Some folks (not me!) say that limiting the spectrum available to the
most popular HF/MF mode (SSB) is divisive.
>
> However, I DO see a BIG difference between having
> roughly 1/2 the bands allowing SBB/SSTV/etc. (wider band
> modes) and the other 1/2 being restricted to narrower band
> modes (CW/xxTOR/Clover/PSK31,RTTY,etc.) and your
> proposal that would take 35% of the bands for CW ONLY
> and force the future of ham radio into the remaining 15%.

Of course there's a big difference.
>
> >Or the contradiction
> > that you want the users of the most popular HF/MF mode (for hams)
> > to get only about half the band, and their crowding enforced by law,
> > but scream and cuss because I only proposed 15% for digital?
>

> The reality of the situation is that, left to itself, SSB would probably
> over-run the HF bands to the virtual exclusion of other modes.

Hmmmm - in previous posts you wrote that most of the world has no mode restrictions and didn't seem to have any problems, but now you seem to have changed your mind.

I agree that having no mode restrictions would probably result in lots of
SSB and AM voice all over the place.

> Keeping it restricted to the upper part does 2 things.
> 1) It forces some semblance of cooperative sharing and operating
> efficiently on the users of SSB.
> 2) It assures that the CW folks and the digital folks have a reasonable
> amount of spectrum to work in.

Agreed on both points, to an extent. There are still battles between AM and
SSB folks.

There are at least two other effects:

3) The crowding of the 'phone bands acts as an incentive for hams to use
other modes, such as PACTOR, PSK31 or CW, that are more spectrum-efficient and
are allowed where 'phone is not. In other words, "welfare for nonvoice modes" ;-)

4) A precedent is set to allocate spectrum space by criteria other than popularity of a mode.

>(Sharing between the CW folks and
> the digital folks also needs to be cooperative ... without any "I own
> this part of the band exclusively" attitudes, in the interest of efficient
> use of our spectrum, both now, and as usage patterns inevitably change
> in the future.)

Sure. And if that could be guaranteed, there's no problem. But one of the
problems of having a growing number of digital modes and no code test is the
inability of their users to inter-communicate. The PSK31 user cannot understand the PACTOR user that is trying to say "the frequency is in use" unless the PSK31
user is also equipped with PACTOR. And vice versa. Same for CW vs other modes.

> To artificially and arbitrarily allot 35% to CW ONLY and only 15%
> to all of the other digital modes would be unwise, unfair, and counter
> to our future best interests.

Unfair to whom? How many hams are using all these modes, that 15%
isn't enough?

Consider FD 2001. The number of CW QSOs reported was MUCH greater than
the number of digital QSOs reported, even though digital QSOs score
the same and
digital is a separate "band" for FD. QST and the other ham mags have
been
shouting the praises of PSK31 and other digital modes in practically
every
issue for years, yet they have not achieved even the usage of CW.

> Since there is no good reason why CW and digital users cannot share
> the lower 50%, there is no good justification for "hard-coding" boundaries
> for usage by the various narrowband modes.

Maybe. Maybe not.
>
> > >> >You just want to stifle the growth of digital modes because you
> > >> >know deep in your heart that Morse ultimately won't be as
> > >> >attractive and you want to "lock down" enough turf "all for
> yourself."
> > >>
> > >> Nope. I just want some room, that's all.
> > >
> > >You have room NOW ...
> >
> > Sure.
>
> So why are you suggesting a major "land grab" for more?

Not a "land grab" - just an idea.
>
> > >you have access to ALL of the HF
> > >bands ...
> >
> > I've had all amateur privileges since the fall of 1970.
> >
> > >no need for a "Morse only setaside."
> >
> > Using Morse for routine operating in the 'phone bands is poor
> > operating, so right away at least half of HF is off limits. Operating near
> > digital folks may be construed as QRM, so it's poor operating to get too
> > close - and they may not be able to tell me I'm too close. With the
> > end of code testing it may get worse.
> >
> > You have already said 25 kHz CW only would be OK.
>
> That 25 kHz was ALWAYS a "token gesture of good faith,"
> don't try to expand it in an "ask for an inch, take a mile" sort
> of maneuver ...

It's called negotiating, Carl. Gotta allow some negotiating room.

It could be said that the "token" of 25 kHz is a "land grab" for
digital.
I can see it now: "Don't come up above 7026 - you've got exclusive
spectrum
below 7025!"
>
> > Maybe a CW-only section is a workable idea, maybe not. Maybe a different
> > percentage or a fixed number of kHz is a better way. Maybe there's no real
> need
> > for it.
>
> I would assert in the strongest terms possible that:
> 1) A CW-onloy segment is NOT needed
> 2) Such a setaside would be bad spectrum management
> 3) Such a setaside would be bad public policy
> 4) Such a setaside would UNNECESSARILY limit the use of
> spectrum long into the future, resulting in in efficienct use of
> our spectrum and ultimately necessitating avoidable rules change
> moves in the future as usage patterns changes

The only reasons I've seen supporting all the above are based on
assumptions:

1) It's assumed that digital and CW need and deserve protection from
'phone,
but CW does not need nor deserve protection from digital.
2) It's assumed that the future of amateur radio HF is digital modes
and that
usage of those modes will rapidly expand in the future.
3) It's assumed that if spectrum needs change in the future, the rules
cannot
be changed quickly enough to accomodate them.

--

However, we may both be out in the cold on this one. I would not be
surprised
if our objections to 'phone band expansion are ignored by the FCC and
the
'phone subbands are widened in the near future, as proposed by the
ARRL BoD.
This will push the foreign 'phones still lower in the band to get away
from stateside QRM, and afford even less space for CW and digital. If
the use of
'phone HF by US hams increases dramatically in the future, the
pressure to
widen the 'phone bands still more may carry the day against objections
from
both digital and CW users.

73 de Jim, N2EY

584. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-06 23:49:39 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c86ab34_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36577

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0203061314.1c349469@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c825bb7_1@news7.fast.net>...
> >
> > And there is no danger posed to Morse-proficient hams (or
> > the public in general) by non-Morse-proficient hams ... except
> > perhaps the "danger" that Morse enthusiasts will have to pro-
> > actively recruit new Morse enthusiasts instead of relying on the
> > "Morse welfare state" of mandatory Morse proficiency testing ...
>
> The danger is interference.

I keep hearing that, but I don't buy it ... there is NO reason that
anyone needs to be able to COPY Morse to be able to tell
that it's there and avoid transmitting on top of it ... any more
than a Morse op needs to be able to copy PSK31 or RTTY
in his head to be able to tell the signal is there and avoid it.

I think you're grasping at straws ..

Carl - wa6vse

585. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 00:12:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C86B083.A99252A8@adelphia.net>
Source record: 36578

Dick Carroll wrote:

> Some adjustments are made to the computer sound card, others to the rig, depending,
again,
> on the equipment. I always ask how my signal is, and always tell another station if he is
> overdriving his rig. Some avoid saying so, but that's the only way most people will know.

They have probably been stung by some people getting defensive about
it. I always thank someone for a signal report, especially if it is not
a good one. But one helpful ham from Colorado one night helped me tune
my soundcard and rig for a good signal.

> >
> > While people can transmit at other frequencies, do they? I must admit
> > I've never noticed the psk31 notes in other areas of the band. But
> > perhaps I've just been provincial. 8^)

> You'll see it scattered out a little, but it is concentrated near the "standard"
> frequencies.
> With MIXwin you're not restricted to a single mode per software load and that makes
> it a lot more fun since you can jump from one mode to any of the others on the spur of
> the moment. I personally like the Hellschreiber mode really well, and using the waterfall
> display on the other modes is revealing and educational as well. You learn by visual
> comparison which modes are working well under weak signal conditions, by
> varying your receiver RF gain you see how noise level and signal to noise ratio can
> play into the workings of the various modes. For instance on RTTY you can take a
> pretty weak signal that isn't copyable with the RF gain up, since the noise is being
> amplified to the point that it is causing 'hits' on the RTTY copy, then slightly reduce
> the RF gain so that the noise on the waterfall display drops (the noise level is visible
> as white background on the display. You turn the RF gain down carefully so that the white
> just disappears leaving only the visible signal on the blue background) and the RTTY
print will
>
> clear up. Makes learning to carefully adjust the receiver for optimal reception easy. The
waterfall
> display works better for me these days than relying on hearing the difference!

Ahh! Thanks for that bit of advice, Dick. No one locally that I know of
uses RTTY, and I've been messing with it a bit with MMTTY without
success. I'll try this and see how it works. I'll do the search and
download MixWin too.

73 - Mike - KB3EIA

586. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 00:14:15 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c86b100_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36579

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0203061350.63b59ab1@posting.google.com...
>
> I see a contradiction, though. On the one hand, Carl wants analog
'phone/image
> subbands to remain as they are, to keep space open for digital modes.
> In other words, digital modes need protection from 'phone encroachment.
> But the idea of CW getting the same sort of protection from digital by
> means of a subband is unacceptable to him. Double standard? Maybe,
> maybe not. But it does seem odd that the digital modes are seen to deserve
> "protection" but CW doesn't.

Jim, you twist what I say to make it sound like I "want to protect digital
modes from SSB, but not Morse." That's not true ... I am suggesting
that, by leaving the separation between wide and narrow bandwidth
modes as it is, SSB will not over-run either Morse or the other digital
modes ... which can all share dynamically in what is left over outside
of the "phone bands" ... no need for a separate setaside for Morse
only ... let alone anything like the 35% of the bands that you suggested,
Jim ...

Let's face it ... SSB voice is by far the most popular mode on HF.
But, it's over 50 years old and I'd hate to see it over-run the digital
bands to the degree that it inhibits the growth of the new modes
that are the future of ham radio.

CW and (other) digital modes (digital INCLUDES Morse) can
coexist better with each other than they could if the whole works
was over-run with SSB. Again, no need for a Morse only setaside,
let the usage patterns determine things as the traffic offered changes.

Too darned many people don't "get it" that we share our frequencies
with each other and want to "stake out their 'own' turf" and defend it
against others, even though they only USE it a small part of the time.

Carl - wa6vse

587. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 00:22:45 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C86B2D5.F76FA61@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 36580

Dick Carroll wrote:

>
>
> Your error is in insisting that when hams don't know Morse code they are just
> as
> qualified as when they do. Wrong.

The FCC has decided that 5wpm is sufficient for the extra class license. And the FCC decides what the requirements are for a ham license. Besides, how many hobbies require a government license anyway? Maybe general aviation pilots, scuba divers, hunting, and other dangerous activities. But no license is needed for
stamp collecting, chess playing, antique collecting and such. Why should the FCC be in the business of handing out gold stars?

588. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 00:28:46 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C86B43E.5B2260F2@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 36581

>
> No problem with the answer to that one. It happens when FCC drops the
> requirements
> so that he can pass the exam without the necessary skill and knowledge. From

^^^^^^^^^^

But the FCC is the organization that decides what is necessary. They decided
that
20wpm is no longer necessary. So an "extra-lite" (I'm one) still has the
necessary
skills and knowledge to pass the tests as given.

>
> that day on
> anyone getting that license is getting a dumbed down version of it. That
> says less
> about the person as about the service in total. There is nothing extra about
> a
> dumbed down Extra class license.

It's extra enough for the funny cookie corporation.....

589. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 00:29:23 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C86B468.753D2E2E@adelphia.net>
Source record: 36585

Here you are, Lenny. Another person who would appear to agree with you:

http://www.dirtball.com/code.html

He changed the second article. Still attibutes it to the original writer tho'.

Interesting how different people interpret the same thing:

"LOYAL...offers loyalty, encouragement and support to other amateurs, local clubs, and the American Radio Relay League, through which Amateur Radio in the United States is represented nationally and internationally."

Whereas you read it as loyalty to the ARRL, I read it as support to the ARRL. A different thing entirely. And I do know enough of history to understand the contex within which it was written, in 1928.

- Mike -

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20020305071401.16975.00001562@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >> Thanks, Anderscum. You never let us down.
> > >
> > >His statement is scarcely comprehensible.
>
> It is comprehensible. There seems to be a problem in acceptance.
> Non-acceptance will appear as "incomprehensible." That's just
> denial.
>
> >I can piece it together, but it
> >sure is an odd way to say that he believes that ARRL is really just a
> publishing
> >house pretending to be a membership services organization.
>
> Incorrect and a failure to comprehend others' viewpoints.
>
> Many perceive the ARRL as trying to be two kinds of organization
> at once, a "service" organization and a seller of goods to a specific
> market. The latter "serves" the market it purports to "represent?"
>
> It is perfectly reasonable for others to assume a paid staffer, a
> manager, has a goodly amount of Loyalty to his employer. That

> is not lost to the general readers here. It is also perfectly reasonable
> that employers do not look with favor upon employees, especially
> those with management responsibility, to negatively criticize them.
>
> The end result is the general readers' perception of bias, of spin in
> stating certain things about the employer. That perception is no
> longer "suspicion" but is out in the open. Continuous denial of such
> biased attitudes does not erase the perception but tends to enforce it.
>
> There is no denial that the ARRL performs a service to its
> membership. There should be no denial that the ARRL makes a
> profit on reselling of goods or the sale of advertising space in its
> membership magazine. It should. The organization must sustain
> itself somehow. It becomes schizoid to others when the idealistic
> side is used as a vehicle to support the materialistic side and
> vice-versa. It becomes confused when both sides of this Janus
> claim the "only" "official" source of goods and services for "all
> radio amateurs."
>
> Article two of "The Amateur's Code" demands membership
> organization loyalty solely to the ARRL. That has been in
> existance for at least 24 years. That isn't lost to all who have
> seen the opening pages of the (extra-cost) ARRL Radio Amateur's
> Handbook for a quarter century.
>
> While it may be uncomfortable to have such things repeated, it
> should be noted that ARRL membership remains less than a
> quarter of all licensed US radio amateurs.* That has remained
> so for at least a decade.
>
> If the ARRL is so altruistic, so good, so noble as claimed
> continually in its own publications and official statements as
> well as claims of its employees, why hasn't the membership
> increased proportional to licensees?
>
> The public and non-members are able to perceive things about
> the ARRL which the ARRL cannot. That is not a "fault" of the
> non-members.
>
> ----------
>
> * QST is a membership magazine, a monthly periodical. Because
> it is sold at retail outlets and by subscription to non-voting readers,
> it must have a public "Publisher's Statement." That statement
> gives the membership number total (wish some exclusions) as well
> as the number of printed copies, copies sold at retail outlets, and
> copies given away or destroyed. The Publisher's Statement is
> periodically printed in QST and is available on the ARRL website
> under the sub-pages of advertiser's information.

590. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 00:31:34 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C86B4E6.EF64352C@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 36582

CAM wrote:

>
>
> Exactly how many IQ points does a person lose when he gets his ham license?
> Is that what happened to you?

Well, my IQ is in the middle of the 2 meter band..... :-) Too bad we lost
220-222 MHz....

591. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 00:35:29 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C86B5D6.72CC7007@adelphia.net>
Source record: 36583

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

> >It becomes confused when both sides of this Janus
> >claim the "only" "official" source of goods and services for "all
> >radio amateurs."
>
> If that is what you believe, I agree; it has become confused.
> >Article two of "The Amateur's Code" demands membership
> >organization loyalty solely to the ARRL.
>
> "Solely?" Not in my handbook, nor is there any mention of that in the ARRL
> employee handbook, either.

I am sure that you know it, Ed, but for others who may not, the quote
is:

"LOYAL...offers loyalty, encouragement and support to other amateurs,
local clubs, and the American Radio Relay League, through which Amateur
Radio in the United States is represented nationally and
internationally."

Different people see the same thing, and see such different things.

- Mike -

592. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 00:36:54 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C86B626.E46E6071@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 36584

>
>
> I should have pointed out, though, that one of the test elements DOES require
> rote memorization.
>
> >I used the Extra pool questions as a study guide. Any answer I got
> >wrong on the initial go round was researched by myself to find how to
> >get the correct answer.
>
> You couldn't have done that, because Dick claims it doesn't happen. :-)
>
>

I did it when I was practicing for my extra. I was getting some of the
questions on RLC circuit "Q" wrong and found out what the theory was that
I was goofing up.

593. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 00:46:40 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c86b89c_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36586

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0203061538.43ddaf1b@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c865294_2@news7.fast.net>...
>
> > The reality of the situation is that, left to itself, SSB would probably
> > over-run the HF bands to the virtual exclusion of other modes.
>
> Hmmmm - in previous posts you wrote that most of the world has no mode
> restrictions and didn't seem to have any problems, but now you seem to
> have changed your mind.

I guess to be perfectly honest, I've got a lot less faith in the
ability/willingness of US hams to behave as reasonably as
our counterparts from other countries do in the sort of "here
are the band edges, you guys behave yourselves" sort of
environment that they are USED to operating in ...

It is TRUE that most of the world has no sub-band by mode
restrictions and that it HASN'T caused any real problems.

> I agree that having no mode restrictions would probably result in lots
> of SSB and AM voice all over the place.

That's because of cultural differences, IMHO ... in other cultures,
there is a much greater spirit of cooperation and desire for
harmony ... in our culture, unfortunately, too many people are
"just out for themselves" and want to "stake out their turf and
defend it" rather than sharing equitably.

> > Keeping it restricted to the upper part does 2 things.
> > 1) It forces some semblance of cooperative sharing and operating
> > efficiently on the users of SSB.
> > 2) It assures that the CW folks and the digital folks have a reasonable
> > amount of spectrum to work in.
>
> Agreed on both points, to an extent. There are still battles between
> AM and SSB folks.

The "turf wars" phenomenon I referred to ... I think it's rather
uniquely a US phenomenon. (Mixed blessing ... unfortunate
that it's so predominant and we're to blame for it, fortunate
that it's not like that throughout the world's ham population.)

I see it as sort of the ham radio equivalent of the classical
"ugly American" tourist ....

> There are at least two other effects:
>
> 3) The crowding of the 'phone bands acts as an incentive for hams to
> use
> other modes, such as PACTOR, PSK31 or CW, that are more
> spectrum-efficient and
> are allowed where 'phone is not. In other words, "welfare for nonvoice
> modes" ;-)

Give me a break ... WHAT "crowding on the 'phone bands" ???

Even last weekend with the DX contest, I was able to find space
to operate in the phone bands without any real problem ... I was
NOT "forced to retreat to where SSB was not allowed" ...
"welfare for nonvoice modes" ??? ROTFLMAO!

It's not that the phone bands are so crowded that they can't
support more users ... the PROBLEM is that too many folks
want "their own frequency" (to stake out, protect, and not
share reasonably with others ...) THAT is why I think that US
hams would spread SSB throughout the lower parts of the
bands if allowed to do so ... THAT is why I don't support
"phone band expansion."

> 4) A precedent is set to allocate spectrum space by criteria other
> than popularity of a mode.
>
> >(Sharing between the CW folks and
> > the digital folks also needs to be cooperative ... without any "I own
> > this part of the band exclusively" attitudes, in the interest of
efficient
> > use of our spectrum, both now, and as usage patterns inevitably change
> > in the future.)
>
> Sure. And if that could be guaranteed, there's no problem. But one of
> the
> problems of having a growing number of digital modes and no code test
> is the
> inability of their users to inter-communicate. The PSK31 user cannot
> understand the PACTOR user that is trying to say "the frequency is in
> use" unless the PSK31
> user is also equipped with PACTOR. And vice versa. Same for CW vs
> other modes.

DECENT implementations of any digital mode would allow users
to detect the presence of users of other modes (including CW)
and avoid them.

Period, end of story, no excuses.

The idea that one must be able to copy Morse to be able to
avoid it is about as inaccurate as to say that one must be
able to speak Spanish in order to recognize that a Spanish-

speaking person is speaking to someone else in a public
place and to avoid interrupting him. One doesn't have to
understand WHAT he's saying, just that he's speaking, in
order to wait until he's finished and avoid rudly interrupting him.

> > > You have already said 25 kHz CW only would be OK.
> >
> > That 25 kHz was ALWAYS a "token gesture of good faith,"
> > don't try to expand it in an "ask for an inch, take a mile" sort
> > of maneuver ...
>
> It's called negotiating, Carl. Gotta allow some negotiating room.
>
> It could be said that the "token" of 25 kHz is a "land grab" for
> digital.

ROTFLMAO!!!!!!!!!! All digital modes, including CW, are
presently on an equal footing ... how could you POSSIBLY
construe a "give-away" of 25 kHz of EXCLUSIVE CW
spectrum as "a 'land grab' for digital"??? THAT's REALLY
funny!!!

> However, we may both be out in the cold on this one. I would not be
> surprised
> if our objections to 'phone band expansion are ignored by the FCC and
> the
> 'phone subbands are widened in the near future, as proposed by the
> ARRL BoD.
> This will push the foreign 'phones still lower in the band to get away
> from stateside QRM, and afford even less space for CW and digital. If
> the use of
> 'phone HF by US hams increases dramatically in the future, the
> pressure to
> widen the 'phone bands still more may carry the day against objections
> from
> both digital and CW users.

I'll lobby against phone band expansion with you ... OK???

Carl - wa6vse

594. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 00:55:55 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C86BA9B.2A22CF67@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 36587

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > I must agree. Ham radio seems to be fairly stable at the moment,
> > from a standpoint of numbers of licensees. However, after the
> > final chapter of dumbing-down is written, and the 5 WPM code test
> > goes away, the chaos on the HF phone bands will be so bad that
> > it won't be resolved by any amount of "refarming" of spectrum.

Some people say that 5wpm is essentially "no-code". And the FCC
itself observed that since restructuring there has been no increase in
bad behavior on HF. The 14.313 and such were all 13wpm and higher
licensees because that mess existed before restructuring. So CW as a
lid filter doesn't work.... Oh, I'm sure there was a fair amount of
"newby" errors made by newly minted general and extra "lites" (I had
my share) but that doesn't make them lids unless they don't learn and
correct the bad operating. And it's the oldtimers who realize that and
also the newbys who also realize that they may need to learn correct
ways to operate and accept the corrections gladly. This has existed
even when newly minted 13wpm generals and advanceds and 20wpm
extra upgrades from tech or even novice first got on HF. It happens when
new HF ops realize that it is entirely possible to interfere with other ops

on the same freq that he cannot himself hear. Like the guy with the
kilowatt
QRMing a distant QSO using 100w rigs he can't hear.

595. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 00:57:25 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C86BAF5.EA3A5D38@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 36588

By then that will be bus fare..... :-)

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
>
> Cecil:
>
> I'm as serious as a coronary infaction. If the ARS is toast sometime
> between now and 2105, I'll pay you 5 kilobucks -- but not BEFORE
> Jan. 1, 2105! All you gotta do is be there to collect, assuming ham
> radio is histoire by then!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

596. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 02:09:57 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16f06b02c22e00ba9896a7@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36589

In article <3C868BD0.30CED05@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > . . . have been right all along. You really ARE worthless!
> > But I had to make completely sure, in real time, for myself.
> > Thanks for removing any doubts I might have had! :-)
>
> Who cares? You don't have to balls to post your real name.

I would say that Cecil will at some point apologize for this major faux
pas. However....

joshua houk
ac7ri

597. Re: Radio Policy-Emergencies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 03:30:14 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <a9Bh8.19119$106.1542300@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36590

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0203061002.21473a42@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c825eb2_2@news7.fast.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020303101045.21826.00000244@mb-cc.aol.com...
> > > In article <3c81155c_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > > <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
> > >
> > > >"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > >news:MPG.16e9d56034df8eab9896a2@netnews.worldnet.att.net...

> > I agree ... and I've provided sound, rational answers to both.
>
> They are opinion questions, and the answers are subjective. In fact the
> whole question of what belongs on the ham tests is an opinion question,
> except perhaps for the most basic regs and safety issues.
>
> My point in posing those questions
> is to show that one doesn't have to use terms like "SO
> bogus it's ridiculous" to get the opinion across.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

This thread has revolved around emergencies where the ham is hanging by the rig on a belt or keyboard on a belt playing Batman or flunky to some Emergency Management type. And now and again these things do happen. But the major PREDICTABLE contribution of the ARS to these things has been Health and Welfare traffic, freeing the locals to do what needs doing while getting a message to Aunt Matilda. They also serve who shuffle paper.

Perhaps the clearest example was some years ago in Guatemala where an earthquake did a number on the country and there were not enough functioning hams in the country to do much and they had better things to do. The Red Cross did the report taking and shipped replies and paper into New Orleans on Pan Am where the local volunteers matched it and put it out on the National Traffic System, a mostly CW caper.

The fact that it was done in CW is not so interesting as the fact that it was done within an existing organization of ops and an existing structure of nets to handle it. This thing could have been done in packet, PSK31, RTTY, or nearly anything known to man; it was not the mode but the people who did it in an organized, disciplined manner that earned everyone's amazement. And yes, there are lo-speed nets. And, via the word count, a

form of error correction even. All in a day's work.

Whatever one may think of digital modes, SSB or whatever, the 'infrastructure' to use a buzzword simply does not now exist on any mode but CW. If you tried it on SSB some dangling hemorrhoid would QRM the net and the digital people would have some pissing contest about legacy modes for months after the need passed into history.

Seems that until the noCoders can handle the predictable case, bleating about the unpredictable ones is simple prattle.

Dick N&#65533;BK

598. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 03:59:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020306225933.08443.00000521@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 36591

In article <3C86B468.753D2E2E@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>He changed the second article. Still attibutes it to the original writer
>tho'.

I quoted what was in "The Amateur's Code" of the 1999 CD-ROM.
Some unidentified person revised it from the 1978 printed handbook.
I cannot identify the "he" of "he changed it..."

>Interesting how different people interpret the same thing:
>
>"LOYAL...offers loyalty, encouragement and support to other amateurs,
>local clubs, and the American Radio Relay League, through which Amateur
>Radio in the United States is represented nationally and
>internationally."
>
>Whereas you read it as loyalty to the ARRL, I read it as support to the
>ARRL. A different thing entirely. And I do know enough of history to
>understand the contex within which it was written, in 1928.

The editors and phrasemakers at the ARRL are very good at what
they do. If they had meant "support" they would have reworded
article two. Article two still has "LOYAL" in full caps as its first
word. If you wish to "read it" as "support" then you are charged
with inability to fully comprehend written English words.

As to the reworded article two, "representing [US amateur radio]
internationally," let me remind you that the ARRL opposed the
rewording of S25.5 by the IARU to be brought up at WRC-03.

Does the ARRL support any unlicensed-in-the-amateur-radio-
service individual? No. Should it? Doesn't have to. Yet the
ARRL has consistently opposed dropping all morse code testing
for an amateur radio license. That affects all who might be
interested but not yet licensed. The ARRL has thus tried to
exercise minority control on just GETTING INTO amateur radio.
The ARRL does NOT represent "amateur radio" anywhere
except for already-licensed amateurs who are voting members.

Since the membership of the ARRL is less than a quarter of all
licensed US radio amateurs, that rather implicitly and without
doubt spells out clearly minority control. As a US citizen, born
in the MidWest, and a veteran, I'm not too keen about a minority
controlling whatever I do and then saying they "represent my
interests." Am I supposed to vow LOYALTY to a minority just

because they make a lot of claims?

"Loyalty" means being faithful to one's country, friends, ideals.
"Supporters" give jock itch.

599. Re: Radio Policy-Emergencies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 04:09:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020306230936.27846.00000434@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 36593

In article <a9Bh8.19119$106.1542300@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>Perhaps the clearest example was some years ago in Guatemala where an
>earthquake did a number on the country and there were not enough
>functioning hams in the country to do much and they had better things to
>do. The Red Cross did the report taking and shipped replies and paper
>into New Orleans on Pan Am where the local volunteers matched it and put
>it out on the National Traffic System, a mostly CW caper.

Would you like a reminder of 1994 and the Northridge Earthquake
that affected at least ten million? Regardless of what you may
think (or snarl), that took place within the United States.

The only evidence of any amateur radio volunteerism came long after
the fact. It seems to have gone unobserved by the few millions IN
the affected area.

600. Re: Code Is Dead

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 04:12:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020306231246.05142.00000247@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 36594

In article <qcgh8.22259$x_7.3277336807@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>Sitting at attention, no doubt.

Brian:

Actually, it was more like doubled over in laughter at your "Attention" crap! Very funny!

>Have you run any more unannounced SET's lately?

No, the results of the first one were pretty conclusive.

>Dismissed.

Don't look now, but I'm still here! How can that be, if I'm "dismissed?" However, I definitely "dismiss" you!

73 de Larry, K3LT

601. Re: K3LT was serious (was Re: K3LT wasn't serious (was Re: The tests that Rea..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 04:12:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020306231246.05142.00000248@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 36595

In article <20020306061248.26465.00001821@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>Well, in that case, I guess we'll all just have to wait and see, shall we?
>
>Those of us who have nothing better to do or better places to go will wait.

Except for those of us who know how to store our newsgroup posts
and refer to them at a later date. Seems like you've just lost a few
points on the technical superiority index!

73 de Larry, K3LT

602. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 04:12:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020306231247.05142.00000249@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 36596

In article <3c858ce3_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>
>I don't think Larry has much faith in his prediction and is taking the safe
>way out, as is usual with him.
>
>Kim W5TIT

And, as usual, this finally dawns on Kim after several other people
have said the same thing. Funny how that works, isn't it?

73 de Larry, K3LT

603. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 04:12:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020306231247.05142.00000251@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 36597

In article <3C85A7F7.8430C873@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Personally, I think I'm going to win -- and am more than willing to
>> wait until 2105 for Cecil to pay me.
>
>If you thought you were right and were going to win, you would not
>object to the year 2010. It seems to me that you don't really believe
>what you write, Larry.

Cecil:

2010 is OK with me, but we'll have to re-index that 5 grand according
to the CPI. That makes the amount of the bet around 28 bucks.

73 de Larry, K3LT

604. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 04:12:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020306231247.05142.00000250@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 36598

In article <3c856f99$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>
>Aren't you a little on the chunky side to be saying things like you'll pay
>someone money in 2105? You just don't look all that healthy, Larry. Unless
>you're talking about some kind of "trust" you'll establish for Cecil in the
>event of your demise.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

I'm 49 years old, 5'11" tall, and weigh 175 lbs. You're what -- 5'5" and
flatten the bathroom scale at 210? If I were you, I'd be a bit careful about
calling people "chunky." Unfortunately, I can't say I'd be willing to bet
that you'll be around in 2105.

73 de Larry, K3LT

605. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 04:34:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C86EDE7.7C599E1B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36600

Joshua Houk wrote:
>
> In article <3C868BD0.30CED05@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...
> > Valentine Germann wrote:
> > > . . . have been right all along. You really ARE worthless!
> > > But I had to make completely sure, in real time, for myself.
> > > Thanks for removing any doubts I might have had! :-)
> >
> > Who cares? You don't have to balls to post your real name.
>
> I would say that Cecil will at some point apologize for this major faux
> pas. However....

He called me worthless and you want me to apologize?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

606. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 04:58:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C86F381.53504C99@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36601

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > If it wasn't your idea to have thought police, who's was it? It
> > > certainly wasn't mine. You did feel it was absurd, did you not?
> > >
> > Of course, it was absurd. Otherwise, I never would have asked that
> > tongue-in-cheek rhetorical question. I think it was Larry's idea for
> > hams to have to feel a certain way but I might be wrong about that.
>
> No. I simply observed that hams have feelings, and think different ways
> about things, and you came up with your brilliant idea in response.

That's not how it happened. Here's what was actually said:
****
Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > Nor do I, although if, as Dick says, new hams are memorizing a question pool of
> > over a thousand questions, can we not feel that the unwritten "work ethic" rule
> > has been satisfied?
>
> I guess it all depends on how the 'memorizer' feels about it.

Maybe we need a gang of Feeling Police? If someone doesn't feel
correctly about their license, they don't get one?
****
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

607. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 05:03:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307000310.09214.00000114@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 36602

>Subject: Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/06/02 22:59 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020306225933.08443.00000521@mb-fk.aol.com>

>As to the reworded article two, "representing [US amateur radio]
>internationally," let me remind you that the ARRL opposed the
>rewording of S25.5 by the IARU to be brought up at WRC-03.

The operative word there being "opposed", ie: past tense.

>Does the ARRL support any unlicensed-in-the-amateur-radio-
>service individual? No. Should it? Doesn't have to.

Then why the following rant:

>Yet the ARRL has consistently opposed dropping all morse code testing
>for an amateur radio license.

Hmmmmm....COULD it be because the ARRL >>IS<< a "membership" organization,
and until recently, it was the concensus of that membership that the ARRL
oppose such changes?

Is that not the way of representitive organizations, that they REPRESENT
the views of thier members in an organized voice?

>The ARRL has thus tried to
>exercise minority control on just GETTING INTO amateur radio.

No, Your Lyingness, they didn't. They represented the MAJORITY opinions
of thier members.

League membership has never been resricted to any Amateur. All have been
able to join and subsequently voice thier opinions at the various board
meetings and elections.

Unlike the "Silent Majority" tactic of the early 70's, the League
represents the VOTING majority.

Unless YOU have FACTS to present that prove otherwise?

>As a US citizen, born
>in the MidWest, and a veteran, I'm not too keen about a minority
>controlling whatever I do and then saying they "represent my
>interests."

There you go with that geopolitical bigotry thing again. What's being
from the midwest have to do with anything? That's supposed to impress us?

And guess what, Lennie..?!?! If the ARRL folded up it's tents tomorrow, you'd STILL be "controlled" by a monority.

>"Loyalty" means being faithful to one's country, friends, ideals.

And what would you know of any of that?

>"Supporters" give jock itch.

Maybe yours does, Lennie, but I launder mine on a regular basis and it's never given me a moment's problem.

Perhaps if you tried a bit of topically applied Monistat?

Steve

608. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 06:13:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C86EBD3.6BE022AE@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36603

Dennis Ferguson wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
> >the moment. I personally like the Hellschreiber mode really well, and
> >using the waterfall
> >display on the other modes is revealing and educational as well. You
> >learn by visual
> >comparison which modes are working well under weak signal conditions, by
> >varying your receiver RF gain you see how noise level and signal to
> >noise ratio can
> >play into the workings of the various modes. For instance on RTTY you can take a
> >pretty weak signal that isn't copyable with the RF gain up, since the
> >noise is being
> >amplified to the point that it is causing 'hits' on the RTTY copy, then
> >slightly reduce
> >the RF gain so that the noise on the waterfall display drops (the noise
> >level is visible
> >as
> >white background on the display. You turn the RF gain down carefully so
> >that the white
> >just
> >disappears leaving only the visible signal on the blue background) and
> >the RTTY print will
> >
> >clear up. Makes learning
> >to carefully adjust the receiver for optimal reception easy. The waterfall
> >display works better for me these days than relying on hearing the difference!
>
> I wanted to point out that I think this is pretty neat. When I first
> started occasionally paying attention to this group, one of the early
> exchanges I followed was W1RFI asking W0EX questions about the operation
> of a spectrum analyzer, with W0EX protesting that spectrum analyzers weren't
> something that a ham, as opposed to a professional, would need to know about.

Dennis, I remember that conversation a bit differently, though I may be wrong. I
thought I
said that a spectrum analyzer was something that few hams would be likely to have
available
for use in the shack, and surely most would not know much about them. And the other
ham was WA4STJ, wasn't it?
I happen to have been the exception since I used one at work and also have
a couple old ones in my shop at home.
But in reality, for operation on the HF ham bands, the waterfall display is much
more useful,
in my opinion.

>
>

609. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 06:13:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C86EEF1.EA5763C1@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36604

CAM wrote:

> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > > . . . have been right all along. You really ARE worthless!
> > > But I had to make completely sure, in real time, for myself.
> > > Thanks for removing any doubts I might have had! :-)
> >
> > Who cares? You don't have to balls to post your real name.

You having a very senior moment, Cecil? What's that above the text of
his post?

610. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 06:14:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C87056B.FD5C8A44@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36605

CAM wrote:

> Valentine Germann wrote:
> >
> > Hello, all!
> >
> > Some guy who goes by "CAM" scrawled, confusedly:
> >
> > >Valentine Germann wrote:
> > >
> > >Dick, is that you in disguise? Or your uncle there in
> > >Missouri?
> >
> > See the problem? This guy can't even follow UseNetiqette
> > and render proper attribution. That is, I did NOT write,
> > "Dick, is that you in Disguise? Or you uncle there in Missouri."
> > For one thing, I can construct complete sentences.
>
> It is your newsreader that is screwing up, not mine. The author's
> name is at one level of nesting below his postings. You, sir,
> just forged an attribution and that is certainly against netnews
> rules. You should be reported to your ISP for that violation.
>
> > >If so, people also cheat to get their pilot's license and
> > >driver's license.
> >
> > But you see, I wasn't talking about those things. I was
> > talking about AMATEUR RADIO.
>
> Aha Dick, it is you. Come on, don't deny it

Deny it? I'm ROFL*M*AO this time. You really stepped on it this time,
Old Troll

611. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 06:20:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8706A2.61057E6F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36606

Valentine Germann wrote:

> . . . have been right all along. You really ARE worthless!

Naw, Val, let's give the old devil his due, he's not worthless. At least when he's
not in his Troll personna. Sometimes he even comes up with a good antenna idea
over in the .antenna group. He sure can be a aggravating old buxxard, though.

Dick

612. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 07:21:43 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a67pvv21htj@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 36623

Why Cecil..... In the pic on the Qrz.com site for your callsign, you look like a healthly looking individual! :) I would guess around the age of the young 50's. If there is any persons I would actually like to meet from these various newsgroups, you are one of about the top 10 people I respect from here and other ham newsgroups.

Keep healthy my friend, I will be doing some traveling in the next 5 years and would thoroughly enjoy a chat with you over coffee when I do make it to TX.

Ryan KC8PMX

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C8661D3.F549BFBD@IEEE.org...
> KC8PMX wrote:
> > I will put 100 bucks on the fact that amateur radio will still be around
> > 2020.
>
> I probably won't make it but I'll bet you're right.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

613. Re: ARRL Newsgroup?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 07:32:40 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a67q0031htj@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 36624

> > >
> > > Ryan, I'd rather not see the name "ARRL" on any newsgroup not
initiated
> > and
> > > moderated by the ARRL. There's already enough ARRL bashing out there.
> > And
> > > I believe that there are some SIG reflectors on the members only side
of
> > the
> > > ARRL.org site. The ARRL also has a number of weekly reports and
> > newsletters
> > > that are available via e-mail.
> > >
> > Not any different than if they are mentioned in any other group or
list???
> > Do they authorize there too?
> >
> >
> > Ryan
>
> I don't understand you question. Brian
>

I don't see the ARRL controlling what is happening here and other newsgroups where ARRL discussion (for and against) occurs. Why would they automatically have that right? As far as corporations and organizations, there is plenty of other newgroups discussing the corporations and organizations and I don't see the corporations "controlling" those newsgroups. Or is the reason why you want the ARRL to control an ARRL newsgroup tied to some form restriction of the freedom of speech? I just thought the newsgroup idea would be nice for people on both sides of the fence. (for and against)

Ryan

614. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 10:48:47 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307054847.06023.00000167@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36607

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>And, as usual, this finally dawns on Kim after several other people
>have said the same thing. Funny how that works, isn't it?

Can we infer from this that it has finally dawned on you, too?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

615. SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took))

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 10:52:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307055241.06023.00000168@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36608

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>Let's face it ... SSB voice is by far the most popular mode on HF.
>But, it's over 50 years old and I'd hate to see it over-run the digital
>bands to the degree that it inhibits the growth of the new modes
>that are the future of ham radio.

"Voice" is not limited to SSB on HF, Carl. There is plenty of need for amateur experimentation and innovation on the HF voice bands, too.

http://www.arrl.org/survey.php3

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

616. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 10:58:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307055840.06023.00000169@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36609

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Don't play stupid. If it is easy to memorize the Q&A for 1000
>English amateur questions, then it should be no problem to
>memorize 1000 definitions for Russians words.

You should add that the premise of those who say that people are memorizing
1000 questions and correct answers is that they do so with no understanding.
Your Russian analogy is intended to present an example where memorizing would
occur without understanding.

The best response I have seen to date is that the Russian premise is
ridiculous. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

617. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 10:59:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307055941.06023.00000170@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36610

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Valentine Germann wrote:

>> . . . have been right all along. You really ARE worthless!
>> But I had to make completely sure, in real time, for myself.
>> Thanks for removing any doubts I might have had! :-)

>Who cares? You don't have to balls to post your real name.

How do you know that Valentine Germann is not a real name?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

618. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 11:01:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307060117.06023.00000171@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36611

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>He sure can be a aggravating old buxxard,
>though.

As compared to your kind and courteous demeanor, eh? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

619. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 11:03:39 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307060339.06023.00000172@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36612

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>It was the only mode available that would get through under the conditions
>experienced.

In most cases, it is a much better choice to change frequencies than to change modes. Perhaps that is what we should be teaching new hams.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

620. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 11:06:46 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307060646.06023.00000173@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36613

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Psssssttt Dennis, don't tell him it is a spectrum analyzer. He'll never use
>it again, damn it to hell, and re-protest to the world that amateurs don't
>need spectrum analyzers.

And he should have been around for the thread where Dick argued incessantly
that the field strength from a radiating antenna decreased as the inverse
distance squared in the far field in free space. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

621. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 11:10:34 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307061034.06023.00000174@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36614

From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net

>I will put 100 bucks on the fact that amateur radio will still be around
>2020.

And I will stake my entire career on it! :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

622. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 11:14:09 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307061409.06023.00000175@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36615

From: "Krell" krell1215@yahoo.com

>I surprised that someone hasn't written a book that gives complete
>instructions for memorizing 1000 Q&A. Memory experts such as Tony Buzan have
>been doing this for years. I wonder how well such a book would sell.

The VIS study guides do just that, although probably not as well as Buzan could
do.

The are not the best selling of the study guides. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

623. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 11:18:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307061818.06023.00000176@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36616

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> You're absolutely right, I haven't seen any of his stuff, only his 'cram
>school'
>advertising which said "do it in a weekend". So now you will insist that
>anyone
>can learn it all in a
>weekend. Right.

Right. The amount of material that one has to learn to pass the Tech exam has always been learnable in a weekend.

This is really funny. You insist that people can't learn enough to pass the tests after 15 hours of classroom study, but that they can memorize 300 questions with less than 3 minutes per question available, but that they can't memorize 26 letters, 10 numbers, 4 punctuations and prosigns without a lot of work.

Right.

Dick, those 300 questions are interelated, so what is not possible -- rote memorization -- is possible if one spends time on the learning behind those questions.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

624. Re: K3LT was serious (was Re: K3LT wasn't serious (was Re: The tests that Rea..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 11:19:50 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307061950.06023.00000177@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36617

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>>Well, in that case, I guess we'll all just have to wait and see, shall we?

>>Those of us who have nothing better to do or better places to go will wait.

>Except for those of us who know how to store our newsgroup posts
>and refer to them at a later date. Seems like you've just lost a few
>points on the technical superiority index!

You missed the point altogether Larry. It was subtle.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

625. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 11:22:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307062205.06023.00000178@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36618

From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net

>Whereas you read it as loyalty to the ARRL, I read it as support to the
>ARRL.

He read it as loyalty solely to the ARRL, in spite of that fact that the order or presentation put one's fellow hams and one's local clubs first.

I think I am beginning to see why he thinks everyone else "spins," too.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

626. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 11:25:46 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307062546.06023.00000179@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36619

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> And still not a word about Gordo West and his "Learn it all in a weekend,
>moneyback
>guaranteed" school. I hear it's standing room only.

Uh, Dick, this is from the post you just responded to. Try to keep up...

>> > Oh, I noticed that you ignored my question about how Gordon West trains
>> >newcomers
>> >to pass the Tech exam in a weekend. Gives a money back guarantee, too, I
>> >understand.
>> >Still think they're learning the material?
>>
>> > Oh, I noticed that you ignored my question about how Gordon West trains
>> >newcomers
>> >to pass the Tech exam in a weekend.
>>
>> I don't read every one of your posts, Dick, but if you will call that
>> "ignoring," perhaps I need to start. I am sure I could have something to
>say
>> about every single one of them, if that will help you not feel ignored.
>>
>> And your point is what? How many classroom hours does that represent? Lets
>say
>> 15 hours, just to have a reasonable number. If he were teaching rote
>> memorization and word assocation, that would give him 3 minutes per
>question.
>> Could YOU memorize 300 things on a subject you know nothing about spending
>3
>> minutes per question? I could not.
>>
>> There are far fewer than 300 basic concepts in the exam pool, Dick, and 15
>> hours is ample time to cover them. I teach a course on RFI that takes 5
>hours.
>> That is a pretty complex subject, yet in those 5 hours, we are able to
>cover
>> it in detail. I have taken professional 1- or 2-day courses that get into
>FAR
>> more detail on a subject than necessary to pass a Tech exam. And how long
>would
>> it have taken me to study for that Novice license I took back in 1963?
>>
>> More examples, the ARRL educational courses cover a subject in great detail
>in

>> about 15 to 20 hours of studying. Need more examples, or do you get the
>point
>> now?
>>
>> >Still think they're learning the material?
>>
>> It is really funny. You act like memorizing 26 characters, 10 numbers, 4
>> punctuations and a few prosigns is a major effort, but seem to think that
>one
>> cannot learn material in 15 hours of classroom teaching and that using word
>> association to memorize 300 questions without understanding is trivial.
>>
>> It just doesn't add up.

627. Re: Whorass Admits his wife is a fat sow with sagging breasts and a dog's ass for a face

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 12:43:22 UTC
From: Ham Radio <hr@hrforallnowradio.org>
Message-ID: <a67nbv$3s6$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 36620
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"AB8MQ" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message:

> > > you obviously don't have a clue or a brain for that matter.
> Says the functional illiterate who huffs gas fumes, OBVIOUSLY.
>
>
Roger,
Many in this NG hope that you seek the professional help
you so desperately need. The subject line in this thread illustrates
the depth of your mental condition. We request once again that
you cease posting child pornography abut Mr. Grimm's children.
We in this NG find your obscene references to Mr. Grimm's
children very offensive and not at all amusing. Please seek help
Roger. We wish you well, but please, cease the posting this
extremely offensive filth about Mr. Grimm's children. There is no
excuse whatsoever for your sick and depraved attacks on Grimm's
children.

HR

628. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 13:34:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307083419.08795.00000307@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36621

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>The editors and phrasemakers at the ARRL are very good at what
>they do. If they had meant "support" they would have reworded
>article two.

Do you think they are good enough at what they do to have said "unconditionally loyal" or "obedient?" Do you think they were good enough at what they do that they intended to use the words encouragement and support to expand on what they meant by the term "loyal?" Do you think they intended anything when they put such loyalty to other amateurs and local radio clubs first.

Do you still think the intent of the point in the code of conduct is to be loyal "solely" to ARRL?

Is this another one of those "what was said, what was heard" sort of things?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

629. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 13:41:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307084107.08795.00000308@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36622

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>As to the reworded article two, "representing [US amateur radio]
>internationally," let me remind you that the ARRL opposed the
>rewording of S25.5 by the IARU to be brought up at WRC-03.

ARRL has a policy decision that it will not oppose changes that would remove Morse code testing as an international treaty requirement.

Is this another one of those "what was said, what was heard" sort of things?

>ARRL has consistently opposed dropping all morse code testing
>for an amateur radio license.

ARRL has a policy decision that it will not oppose changes that would remove Morse code testing as an international treaty requirement.

Is this another one of those "what was said, what was heard" sort of things?

>As a US citizen, born
>in the MidWest, and a veteran, I'm not too keen about a minority
>controlling whatever I do and then saying they "represent my
>interests."

The ARRL does not control what you do, Len, at least not anywhere other than in your imagination. The FCC sets the requirements for Amateur Radio licenses. ARRL has done no more than make its views known to the FCC. You always rail at ARRL and amateur operators for somehow denying you that right, but you appear to be saying that ARRL's making its views known to the FCC somehow controls you.

Is this another one of those "do as I say, not do as I do" sort of things?

> Am I supposed to vow LOYALTY to a minority just
>because they make a lot of claims?

You do not have to take such a vow, Len, even to become a ham, or even - gasp - to become an ARRL member.

The "control" exists only in your mind, or in the spin you want to try to make other hams believe. :-)

> "Loyalty" means being faithful to one's country, friends, ideals.

According to you, if ARRL asks ham to be loyal, it means being in control.

Perhaps this is one of those what you said, what you heard yourself say sort of things. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI>

630. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 14:14:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C876F87.212AD11B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36625

W1RFI wrote:

> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Don't play stupid. If it is easy to memorize the Q&A for 1000
> >English amateur questions, then it should be no problem to
> >memorize 1000 definitions for Russians words.
>
> You should add that the premise of those who say that people are memorizing
> 1000 questions and correct answers is that they do so with no understanding.
> Your Russian analogy is intended to present an example where memorizing would
> occur without understanding.
>
> The best response I have seen to date is that the Russian premise is
> ridiculous. :-)

It's ridiculous because it is pointless. Who needs a license in memorized
Russian?

Of course the same set of facts don't cover the ham radio tests. So that takes it
to
well beyond ridiculous.

631. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 14:14:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C87702A.2922C307@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36626

W1RFI wrote:

> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> >> . . . have been right all along. You really ARE worthless!
> >> But I had to make completely sure, in real time, for myself.
> >> Thanks for removing any doubts I might have had! :-)
>
> >Who cares? You don't have to balls to post your real name.
>
> How do you know that Valentine Germann is not a real name?

He thinks it's me, ghostwriting. Wonder it the black helo has landed in
his yard yet.
It's been circling for awhile.

632. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 14:14:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8770C8.6D487F44@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36627

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >He sure can be a aggravating old buxxard,
> >though.
>
> As compared to your kind and courteous demeanor, eh? :-)
>

Just so you'll know, I DO have a kind and courteous manner. I have
learned not to waste it on certain types of people.

633. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 14:14:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C877337.CB5471AD@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36628

W1RFI wrote:

> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >It was the only mode available that would get through under the conditions
> >experienced.
>
> In most cases, it is a much better choice to change frequencies than to change
> modes. Perhaps that is what we should be teaching new hams.

I don't really agree with that statement. If propagation on 40 mtrs drops out, we should then
plan on automatically changing bands to 75? That opens up a whole set of problems.

In a hurricane setting, chances are that atmospheric static levels will be far too high on 75
for it to be useful at all. Then there's the different antenna requirement. You surely don't
plan to work 75 on a 40 meter antenna. When faced with that set of circumstances, I believe I'd hold the band that's working at them moment and change modes.

If you've ever changed bands under those circumstances, you'll understand. I have.

What usually happens is the two stations lose each other, and wind up back on the same frequency trying to make a dying circuit work, absent better previous planning.

Lets make it very clear here. No one is suggesting the use of CW in emergencies as
anything other than a backup mode. *of course* it's much better to use the most efficient mode available, and one would hope that in an emergency he would have something better than either CW or SSB. But too often circumstances dictate the mode.

634. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 14:14:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8773D4.24339E40@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36629

W1RFI wrote:

> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Psssssttt Dennis, don't tell him it is a spectrum analyzer. He'll never use
> >it again, damn it to hell, and re-protest to the world that amateurs don't
> >need spectrum analyzers.
>
> And he should have been around for the thread where Dick argued incessantly
> that the field strength from a radiating antenna decreased as the inverse
> distance squared in the far field in free space. :-)

And you, sir, should stick to what is written instead of modifying it to meet
your need
to criticize. You *are* becoming more like Cecil. That's really too bad.

635. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 14:14:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8774DA.3DF45C43@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36630

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > You're absolutely right, I haven't seen any of his stuff, only his 'cram
> >school'
> >advertising which said "do it in a weekend". So now you will insist that
> >anyone
> >can learn it all in a
> >weekend. Right.
>
> Right. The amount of material that one has to learn to pass the Tech exam has
> always been learnable in a weekend.
>
> This is really funny. You insist that people can't learn enough to pass the
> tests after 15 hours of classroom study, but that they can memorize 300
> questions with less than 3 minutes per question available, but that they can't
> memorize 26 letters, 10 numbers, 4 punctuations and prosigns without a lot of
> work.
>
> Right.
>
> Dick, those 300 questions are interelated, so what is not possible -- rote
> memorization -- is possible if one spends time on the learning behind those
> questions.

This really IS funny! You insist that the material to pass a ham radio exam can
be
absorbed and learned in two settings, and that the word associations needed to
pass the same tests can't be. WRONG. Dick Bash must be laughing his ass off.

636. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 14:19:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8776F7.587640BE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36631

KC8PMX wrote:
> Why Cecil..... In the pic on the Qrz.com site for your callsign, you look
> like a healthly looking individual! :) I would guess around the age of the
> young 50's.

I was 59-60 when that picture was taken. I'm 64 now. 64 + 18 = 82. My Dad
is 89 but he wasn't wild and crazy in his younger days. Drop me an email
when you come to TX.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

637. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 14:27:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8778C3.61D20DC5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36632

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Valentine Germann wrote:
> > > . . . have been right all along. You really ARE worthless!
> > > But I had to make completely sure, in real time, for myself.
> > > Thanks for removing any doubts I might have had! :-)
> > >
> > Who cares? You don't have to balls to post your real name.
>
> You having a very senior moment, Cecil? What's that above the text of
> his post?

There are seven Germann's in the QRZ data base, none from Missouri.
Are you trying to tell me that Valentine Germann is the real name
of a Missouri ham? Do you still have that Missouri ocean front
property for sale?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

638. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 14:30:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C877978.B6223EA2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36633

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> >> . . . have been right all along. You really ARE worthless!
> >> But I had to make completely sure, in real time, for myself.
> >> Thanks for removing any doubts I might have had! :-)
>
> >Who cares? You don't have to balls to post your real name.
>
> How do you know that Valentine Germann is not a real name?

Odds. Valentine Germann would be a total stranger to me. This
guy is no stranger.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

639. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 14:32:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8779F1.30E850B3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36634

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Aha Dick, it is you. Come on, don't deny it
>
> Deny it? I'm ROFL*M*AO this time. You really stepped on it this time,
> Old Troll

If you're not him, he must be your twin brother. You two think alike
and talk alike. I note that you didn't deny it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

640. Re: W0EX gives bad advice to newcomers (was Re: Would Morse Code die

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 14:37:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C877B17.82CCA47A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36635

Dick Carroll wrote:
> This really IS funny! You insist that the material to pass a ham radio exam can
> be absorbed and learned in two settings, and that the word associations needed to
> pass the same tests can't be. WRONG. Dick Bash must be laughing his ass off.

All you have to do to prove you are right is to memorize those 1000 Russian word
definitions. Since you so far have refused to do so, we can only assume that
you are wrong and cannot do it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

641. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 14:39:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C877BB8.1D93035A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36636

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > How do you know that Valentine Germann is not a real name?
>
> He thinks it's me, ghostwriting. Wonder it the black helo has landed in
> his yard yet. It's been circling for awhile.

Please swear on your word of honor that it isn't you, Dick. "Val" is
much too familiar with me to be a stranger. He thinks exactly like
you and even constructs sentences exactly like you using the same
words that you use.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

642. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 14:40:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C877BF0.DBCFB3C8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36637

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Just so you'll know, I DO have a kind and courteous manner. I have
> learned not to waste it on certain types of people.

Homo sapiens, for instance.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

643. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 14:45:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C877CF7.715377C6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36638

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > The best response I have seen to date is that the Russian premise is
> > ridiculous. :-)
>
> It's ridiculous because it is pointless. Who needs a license in memorized
> Russian?

On the contrary, Dick, it is definitely not pointless. If you do it, you will win the argument. Why are you not willing to spend what you say is a trivial amount of time performing what you say is a trivial task in order to win a big victory in the argument? The only reason I can think of is that you are not telling the truth when you state that memorizing 1000 Q&A is a trivial task.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

644. Re: CW vs. digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 14:47:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C877D65.86E6223A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36639

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >
> > >Psssssttt Dennis, don't tell him it is a spectrum analyzer. He'll never use
> > >it again, damn it to hell, and re-protest to the world that amateurs don't
> > >need spectrum analyzers.
> >
> > And he should have been around for the thread where Dick argued incessantly
> > that the field strength from a radiating antenna decreased as the inverse
> > distance squared in the far field in free space. :-)
>
> And you, sir, should stick to what is written instead of modifying it to meet
> your need to criticize. You *are* becoming more like Cecil. That's really too bad.

Dick, did you or did you not state that the far field strength falls off as the
distance squared?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

645. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 14:51:02 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c877ef4_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36640

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020307060339.06023.00000172@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >It was the only mode available that would get through under the
conditions
> >experienced.
>
> In most cases, it is a much better choice to change frequencies than to
change
> modes. Perhaps that is what we should be teaching new hams.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

An EXCELLENT point, Ed!!!

In fact, with the propagation prediction software available,
(I use PropMan2000 from Rockwell Collins ... $99) it is
possible to predict the best frequency quite accurately.

The software even goes to the internet to download the
latest space weather and other factors so that the prediction
is truly as accurate and up to the minute as possible.

Another thing which would be very useful for disaster
and emergency communications ... and also for routine
skeds to talk with friends (but would obviously not apply
to or appeal to DX chasers and contesters) is the potential
of using ALE "Automatic Link Establishment" software.

This is used, for example, on commercial and military
circuits where link reliability is or great interest. With
today's computer-controllable radios, I believe it would
be quite feasible for someone to write ALE software
for amateur use ...

(Yes, someone will grumble "That's not REAL HAM
RADIO!", but my point is that for emergency and
disaster communications, "making it work" is the
name of the game, NOT "following tradition.")

Carl - wa6vse

646. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 14:59:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C878056.4151F11A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36641

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > In most cases, it is a much better choice to change frequencies than to change
> > modes. Perhaps that is what we should be teaching new hams.
>
> I don't really agree with that statement. If propagation on 40 mtrs drops out, we
> should then
> plan on automatically changing bands to 75? That opens up a whole set of problems.

That's the way Intel had their emergency communications organized, Dick. Changing frequencies is a lot easier than changing modes, especially if all the operators are not practiced and prepared for their brand of CW traffic. For instance, Intel didn't have a straight key and, at the time, I couldn't handle the paddles.

> If you've ever changed bands under those circumstances, you'll understand. I have.

Intel iEARS practices emergency communications once a week, Dick. They have a calling schedule which dictates changing bands until communications is established. Then if communications fades, they go back to the original band rotation until communications are again established.

> What usually happens is the two stations lose each other, and wind up back on the
> same frequency trying to make a dying circuit work, absent better previous
> planning.

Why would they be absent better previous planning? To make CW more attractive? Once again, it seems you are advocating a lack of planning and preparation in order to push your agenda.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

647. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 15:33:57 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c878917_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36642

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020307055241.06023.00000168@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >Let's face it ... SSB voice is by far the most popular mode on HF.
> >But, it's over 50 years old and I'd hate to see it over-run the digital
> >bands to the degree that it inhibits the growth of the new modes
> >that are the future of ham radio.
>
> "Voice" is not limited to SSB on HF, Carl. There is plenty of need for
amateur
> experimentation and innovation on the HF voice bands, too.
>
> http://www.arrl.org/survey.php3
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed,

I recognize, and agree wholeheartedly with, your statement that
voice is not limited to SSB and that there is plenty of need for
amateur experimentation and innovation on the HF voice bands,
too.

My only concern is that, since
1) SSB is "the norm" for voice,
2) people tend to "use what they have," and
3) given the apparent reuctance of "the masses"
to readily accept and adopt new things
that SSB would "spread out" to a degree that it
would impair the use of the HF bands by other modes.
(including CW, other narrowband digital modes, and
yet-to-be-developed modes) in ways that would be
harmful to the development of "the next generation"
of amateur radio technologies.

Carl - wa6vse

648. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 15:42:33 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c878b19_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36643

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020307061034.06023.00000174@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net
>
> >I will put 100 bucks on the fact that amateur radio will still be around
> >2020.
>
> And I will stake my entire career on it! :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

And I'll bet that Ed will be happily retired by 2020 :-)

Carl - wa6vse

649. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 16:41:53 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8f51l9cgeg1f7@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 36644

Hello, "CAM"!

I haven't got a callsign yet! Remember, I'm STUDYING
for the tests, which I will start taking in a few days.

Do you READ any of these messages, or just
respond blindly?

I think I know now!

Anyway, you can get on the land line and through the
wonder of "information", get my actual phone number,
if you like.

You are a piece of work, no doubt.

Val Germann
Columbia, Missouri

650. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 16:59:44 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8f636m90ukp4a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 36645

Hello, again, "CAM"!

I've been monitoring this newsgroup off and on
for more than a year. Now, I understand that good
amateur practice is to LISTEN first before you
transmit. So, I've been listening for quite a while
and only decided to "transmit" here after I committed
totally to getting a license.

I'm in the book, the phone book, and can be
easily found, using that marvel, "Information."
For a few cents you could call me and verify
everything.

As for my writing style, it's my own, and if it's similiar
to Mr. Carroll's well, c'est la vie. Like I say, I've been
"listening" for quite a while.

Finally, I think that almost ANYONE looking to get
a ham license these days is using the questions and
answers to ease the job. I am firmly opposed to
such practice but I would be a FOOL not to take
advantage of what is freely offered. That is, no
matter what I think about things the object is to PASS
THE TEST -- ANY student will tell you that.

If the object of the whole process was for the student
to LEARN SOMETHING, well, those Radio Shack
books would certainly look different, in my view! If
I gave out the questions and answers to MY tests, in
advance, well, . . . let's not go there!

Val Germann
Columbia, Missouri

651. Re: ARS Licensing in the USA Since WW2

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 17:10:41 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C879F11.D2C1E979@psu.edu>
Source record: 36646

Welcome back, Wayne!

- Mike - KB3EIA

Wayne wrote:
>
> A very interesting summary, and well written.
> Having been interested in Ham radio when I was in high school, I do recall
> reading about novices having phone privileges on 2 meters way back, but did
> not know just when that was taken away.
> Would I had found a mentor back then, but alone, I never got far enough
> along till in the mid 70's, when I did take and pass the novice test.
> And only recently did my interest come back.
> I passed the tech test last weekend, with an 84% average.
> Next for tech plus or general.
>
> Wayne K?6???

652. Re: ARRL Newsgroup?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 17:21:21 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a687cv02899@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 36701

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:a67q0031htj@enews1.newsguy.com...
> I don't see the ARRL controlling what is happening here and other
newsgroups
> where ARRL discussion (for and against) occurs. Why would they
> automatically have that right? As far as corporations and organizations,
> there is plenty of other newgroups discussing the corporations and
> organizations and I don't see the corporations "controlling" those
> newsgroups. Or is the reason why you want the ARRL to control an ARRL
> newsgroup tied to some form restriction of the freedom of speech? I just
> thought the newsgroup idea would be nice for people on both sides of the
> fence. (for and against)
>
> Ryan

That's why this newsgroup was created. Policies, such as morse code testing, closed repeaters, antenna restrictions, etc., as well as what the ARRL is up to are all debated here. I don't see a large enough volume of messages that would require the ARRL to have a separate newsgroup. Stuff would probably get cross-posted anyway.

653. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 17:24:26 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a687io028m4@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 36702

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020307061034.06023.00000174@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net
>
> >I will put 100 bucks on the fact that amateur radio will still be around
> >2020.
>
> And I will stake my entire career on it! :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

I don't question that amatuer radio will be around in 2020. I question what
it will be like.

654. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 17:28:03 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C87A323.488A26B@psu.edu>
Source record: 36647

I'm sure Dick meant the test was dumbed down, not the person taking it.

For my own read on the situation, the test is just different, not necessarily dumbed down. Althought the Morse code was the hardest part for me, it wasn't for some other people I know who aced the Morse code element, and failed the other elements.

That's where I have trouble with the idea that the Morse Code is what elevates the testing to some smarter status.

- mike -

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > The question is merely a diversion on your part, as usual.
>
> It's no diversion, Dick. I truly cannot understand how studying for and
> passing a ham exam can dumb anyone down. And when, exactly, does this
> dumbing-down occur? Do people who take and fail a ham exam avoid the
> dumbing-down process?
>
> > Your error is in insisting that when hams don't know Morse code they are just
> > as qualified as when they do. Wrong.
>
> They *are* just as qualified for everything except CW, Dick. Some far
> exceed the minimum qualifications that you passed.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

655. Reciprocal license for Mexico

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 17:31:09 UTC
From: Diveman <diveman61@NOSPAMattbi.com>
Message-ID: <xtNh8.17662$aP6.18839@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 36648
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hello everyone,

Just want to bring up an idea I have & perhaps some of you follks can help me out with it. I'm planning a trip to Cozumel, Mexico this May and would like to bring along my Icom 706 to do some operating while I'm down there. What is the best way for me to obtain a reciprocal licence for Mexico? I have read the info on the ARRL site and found that many have obtained their permit at the nearest state capital after arrival. For Cozumel, that would require a trip to the city of Chetumal on the Quintana Roo mainland. (long bus/boat ride or expensive plane trip) On the other hand, I also read on the ARRL site that licences for island operation can only be obtained in Mexico City. All in all this is seems quite impractical and confusing.

I've been to Cozumel several times and the scuba diving is world class, food is great, prices are very reasonable, wonderfull people, I love it there. To be able to operate my rig and work some DX from this great locale would be icing on the cake for a great trip!

Anyone have any experience in doing something like this in mexico? Is it possible to obtain the permit before leaving home? Would love to hear suggestions, advice, or anything that might help. Thanks very much,

M Perry
KQ6FQ

Remove NOSPAM from email address to reply directly or just reply to the group.

656. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 17:32:56 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C87A446.4992A237@psu.edu>
Source record: 36649

Me Extra Lite too! Me make radio work! Talk whole world! ;^)

- Mike -

Robert Casey wrote:

> But the FCC is the organization that decides what is necessary. They decided
> that
> 20wpm is no longer necessary. So an "extra-lite" (I'm one) still has the
> necessary
> skills and knowledge to pass the tests as given.

657. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 17:35:19 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C87A4D5.3B5F53F7@psu.edu>
Source record: 36650

Oh, Krell - you walked right into that one!

- Mike -

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <a63gf80dr@enews3.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> writes:

> >I really wish you'd start adding "IMO" on your posts instead of stating
> >these things as if they are fact.
>
> Krell:
>
> No problemo. IMO, you're a wanker.

658. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 17:51:45 UTC
From: N2EY@aol.com
Message-ID: <975b4ea9.0203070951.331183a5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 36703

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c86ab34_2@news7.fast.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:9f4bfe89.0203061314.1c349469@posting.google.com...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
> news:<3c825bb7_1@news7.fast.net>...
> > >
> > > And there is no danger posed to Morse-proficient hams (or
> > > the public in general) by non-Morse-proficient hams ... except
> > > perhaps the "danger" that Morse enthusiasts will have to pro-
> > > actively recruit new Morse enthusiasts instead of relying on the
> > > "Morse welfare state" of mandatory Morse proficiency testing ...
> > >
> > The danger is interference.
> >
> I keep hearing that, but I don't buy it ...

Of course not - it supports code testing ;-)

> there is NO reason that
> anyone needs to be able to COPY Morse to be able to tell
> that it's there and avoid transmitting on top of it ...

What constitutes "on top of"?

Example 1:

CW operator A hears Operator B's S4 PSK31 signal on 3578.000 kHz. The
books all say PSK31 only needs 50-100 Hz of bandwidth, etc., etc., and
A knows this. r A's rig is equipped with good xtal filters and high
dynamic range, so he tunes off about 500 Hz and can no longer hear any
trace of the PSK31 signal. 3577.500 is clear but A asks if the
frequency is clear in standard fashion and gets no response, so he
blasts away with a CQ.

What A doesn't know and cannot know is that B is using the typical
soundcard-and-SSB rig implementation of PSK31, and B's rig inhales
about 3 kHz of the band at once. A also doesn't know that his signal
is S9+ at Operator B's location, because B is using QRP and an attic
dipole.

A's signal takes over B's AGC (which B cannot defeat because B's rig
doesn't
have an AGC off switch) and makes a mess of B's copy. C, who is in QSO
with
B, thinks "those "#$%^&@ CW lid is intentionally QRMing!" - which is

NOT
the case at all. But B and C can neither tell A what is going on nor
even identify him.

How far away from each digital signal must a CW station stay to avoid
such
problems?

The scenario could be reversed. But I suspect your response would be
something
like "tough - the CW station should use a 'better' mode" or some such.
;-)

> any more
> than a Morse op needs to be able to copy PSK31 or RTTY
> in his head to be able to tell the signal is there and avoid it.

NO reason? I disagree!

Example 2:

D listens on a frequency and hears nothing. Is that sufficient to
avoid
interference? Maybe, maybe not. Suppose the frequency is in use by E
and F, but F is inaudible at D's location and vice versa. But D and E
can hear each other S9++. If D simply starts transmitting without
asking if the frequency is in use, he clobbers E and F's QSO. How does
E let D know the frequency is in use
if D does ask, if they cannot communicate?

> I think you're grasping at straws ..

Nope. One of the most fundamental reasons for radio regulations is the
avoidance
of interference. Hardly a "straw".

73 de Jim, N2EY

659. Re: Reciprocal license for Mexico

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 17:57:33 UTC
From: AC6V <ac6v@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <3C87AA11.19D4EF6D@amsat.org>
Source record: 36704
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

For what it is worth (as it changes frequently) and I can not vouch for it as
many have had different experiences
The URL I want to direct you to is down at the moment, but you can read the
cache.
First go to google.com
Type in quotes
"Mexico Reciprocal License"

GET
Amateur Radio Operating Permits in Mexico
Bookworm Amateur Radio Page Mexican Reciprocal Permits
Procedures for Radio Amateurs in the ...
bookworm.sdsu.edu/mexpermit.html - 9k - Cached - Similar pages

CLICK ON Cached.
Was updated on Last revised September 21, 2001.

Good Luck - best get car insurance at the border (many tell me)
--
73 From AC6V, Rod In Oceanside, CA
I doubt, therefore I might be!

AC6V Mega Ham Index at http://ac6v.com
AC6V Book For DXers at http://ac6v.com/DXSAMPLE.htm
==========
Diveman wrote:

> Hello everyone,
>
> Just want to bring up an idea I have & perhaps some of you follks can help
> me out with it. I'm planning a trip to Cozumel, Mexico this May and would
> like to bring along my Icom 706 to do some operating while I'm down there.
> What is the best way for me to obtain a reciprocal licence for Mexico? I
> have read the info on the ARRL site and found that many have obtained their
> permit at the nearest state capital after arrival. For Cozumel, that would
> require a trip to the city of Chetumal on the Quintana Roo mainland. (long
> bus/boat ride or expensive plane trip) On the other hand, I also read on the
> ARRL site that licences for island operation can only be obtained in Mexico
> City. All in all this is seems quite impractical and confusing.
>
> I've been to Cozumel several times and the scuba diving is world class, food
> is great, prices are very reasonable, wonderfull people, I love it there. To
> be able to operate my rig and work some DX from this great locale would be
> icing on the cake for a great trip!
>

> Anyone have any experience in doing something like this in mexico? Is it
> possible to obtain the permit before leaving home? Would love to hear
> suggestions, advice, or anything that might help. Thanks very much,
>
> M Perry
> KQ6FQ

660. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 18:13:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C87ADD9.9D7DBC52@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36705

Valentine Germann wrote:
> You are a piece of work, no doubt.

And are you going to deny having any connection to Dick Carroll?
If you are a real person, I strongly suspect you have been posting
Dick's words to your account. There are simply too many clues for
it to be otherwise.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

661. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 18:16:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C87AE85.477E8F17@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36706

Valentine Germann wrote:
> As for my writing style, it's my own, and if it's similiar
> to Mr. Carroll's well, c'est la vie. Like I say, I've been
> "listening" for quite a while.

Do you deny any connection to Dick Carroll? It's not just the style. There were many more clues besides style. The practice of posting one's words through someone else's account is not new.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

662. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 18:23:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C87B010.A69EDE10@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36707

mike coslo wrote:
> I'm sure Dick meant the test was dumbed down, not the person taking it.

Well, if the people entering the amateur radio service are not dumbed down, what does it matter? You see, Dick is trying to have his cake and eat it too. If the new hams are not dumbed down, then the ARS is not being dumbed down. If the ARS is being dumbed down, then the new hams are being dumbed down. Inescapable logical conclusion: If Dick is right, taking an amateur radio exam dumbs people down and to avoid being dumbed down, people should avoid taking amateur radio exams. Dick clearly believes that if everyone avoids taking an amateur radio exam, then the ARS will not be dumbed down. Does that hint something about sandboxes?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

663. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 18:32:14 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C87B22D.9979A069@psu.edu>
Source record: 36708

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3C86B468.753D2E2E@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
<little snip>
> >Interesting how different people interpret the same thing:
> >
> >"LOYAL...offers loyalty, encouragement and support to other amateurs,
> >local clubs, and the American Radio Relay League, through which Amateur
> >Radio in the United States is represented nationally and
> >internationally."
> >
> >Whereas you read it as loyalty to the ARRL, I read it as support to the
> >ARRL. A different thing entirely. And I do know enough of history to
> >understand the contex within which it was written, in 1928.
>
> The editors and phrasemakers at the ARRL are very good at what
> they do. If they had meant "support" they would have reworded
> article two. Article two still has "LOYAL" in full caps as its first
> word. If you wish to "read it" as "support" then you are charged
> with inability to fully comprehend written English words.
>
Interesting, if I seem to not fully comprehend written English words,
then I would have to say that you not only comprehend them, but are
capable of extrapolating immense, profound and deep meanings from them.
If you believe in the law of averages, then I have been shortchanged in
my English comprehension due to your extra abilities!

How does ARRL punish the Amateur who does not offer their loyalty? You
referred to it as:

>Article two of "The Amateur's Code" demands membership
>organization loyalty solely to the ARRL.

in an earlier post. I must confess that I don't see the words demand in
there, nor do I see any mention of membership either.

> Does the ARRL support any unlicensed-in-the-amateur-radio-
> service individual? No. Should it? Doesn't have to. Yet the
> ARRL has consistently opposed dropping all morse code testing
> for an amateur radio license. That affects all who might be
> interested but not yet licensed. The ARRL has thus tried to
> exercise minority control on just GETTING INTO amateur radio.
> The ARRL does NOT represent "amateur radio" anywhere
> except for already-licensed amateurs who are voting members.

I look at it the same as voting in our countries elections. If I want to vote, I have to be a citizen, of proper voting age, and all the other qualifications as agreed upon.

If you want to have an effect on what is happening, then get involved, and exercise your rights. Your argument here sounds like the people who whine about politicians, but don't vote. If you want to change the ARRL, Join and vote.

We are talking about a hobby here, and it is amazing that Amateurs even have a powerful organization like the ARRL to lobby for them. What other choices do you have for ARS representation. If you want to change it Lennie, join, get involved, and vote!

> Since the membership of the ARRL is less than a quarter of all
> licensed US radio amateurs, that rather implicitly and without
> doubt spells out clearly minority control. As a US citizen, born
> in the MidWest, and a veteran, I'm not too keen about a minority
> controlling whatever I do and then saying they "represent my
> interests." Am I supposed to vow LOYALTY to a minority just
> because they make a lot of claims?

Hold on a second, Lennie. maybe you can help me with my comprehension here. That article 2 which still has LOYAL in full caps used the word offers, and here you replaced offers with the word "vow"

Vow:
Etymology: Middle English owe, from Old French vow, from Latin votum, from neuter of votus, past participle of vovEre to vow; akin to Greek euchesthai to pray, vow, Sanskrit vAghat sacrificer
Date: 14th century : a solemn promise or assertion; specifically : one by which a person is bound to an act, service, or condition

Essentially the modern definition is the solemn promise or assertion, specifically one by which a person is bound.... well the rest is already up there.

Offer:

1 a : to present as an act of worship or devotion : SACRIFICE b : to utter (as a prayer) in
devotion
2 a : to present for acceptance or rejection : TENDER <was offered a job> b : to present in order to satisfy a requirement <candidates for degrees may offer French as one of their foreign languages>

3 a : PROPOSE, SUGGEST <offer a solution to a problem> b : to declare one's readiness or willingness <offered to help me>
4 a : to try or begin to exert : PUT UP <offered stubborn resistance> b : THREATEN <offered to strike him with his cane>
5 : to make available : AFFORD; especially : to place (merchandise) on sale
6 : to present in performance or exhibition
7 : to propose as payment : BID intransitive senses
8 : archaic : to make an attempt

9 : to present itself
10 : to make a proposal (as of marriage)

I'm assuming that you don't interpret offer as Number 1, Probably our nation, the ARRL isn't suggesting that they be worshiped or offered sacrifices.

2. Probably not, although ARRL does offer various things to us in this definition.

3. This one makes some sense

4. I doubt it.

5. No

6. No

7. No

8. Only possibly, but I doubt the ARRL would use archaic terms like that

9. Could be, but a bit awkward

10. No

So whereas the most likely use of the word "Offers" would be to declare ones readiness or willingness to give loyalty to these other amateurs, radio clubs, and the ARRL (which to me sounds like a very good idea) you use the word vow which I can only interpret as the person must make a solemn promise or assertion; specifically : one by which a person is bound to an act, service, or condition.

Perhaps you could explain in terms that challenged people like myself can understand. 8^)

- Mike -

664. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 18:35:01 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C87B2D4.5329F9D1@psu.edu>
Source record: 36709

I'm dizzy for sure. I hate to see what Lennie would do with the Boy
Scout oath!!

- Mike -

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>
> >Whereas you read it as loyalty to the ARRL, I read it as support to the
> >ARRL.
>
> He read it as loyalty solely to the ARRL, in spite of that fact that the order
> or presentation put one's fellow hams and one's local clubs first.
>
> I think I am beginning to see why he thinks everyone else "spins," too.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

665. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 18:38:04 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C87B38A.101E0BE5@psu.edu>
Source record: 36710

I think I kinda said that in the rest of my message. Cece! 8^)

- mike -

CAM wrote:
>
> mike coslo wrote:
> > I'm sure Dick meant the test was dumbed down, not the person taking it.
>
> Well, if the people entering the amateur radio service are not dumbed
> down, what does it matter? You see, Dick is trying to have his cake
> and eat it too. If the new hams are not dumbed down, then the ARS
> is not being dumbed down. If the ARS is being dumbed down, then the
> new hams are being dumbed down. Inescapable logical conclusion: If
> Dick is right, taking an amateur radio exam dumbs people down and to
> avoid being dumbed down, people should avoid taking amateur radio exams.
> Dick clearly believes that if everyone avoids taking an amateur radio
> exam, then the ARS will not be dumbed down. Does that hint something
> about sandboxes?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

666. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 18:45:52 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C87B560.E9EC846E@uci.edu>
Source record: 36711

I said what I said I said. :-) You cut most of it out, but what's left
is evidence enough that you're wrong.

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > > If it wasn't your idea to have thought police, who's was it? It
> > > > certainly wasn't mine. You did feel it was absurd, did you not?
> > >
> > > Of course, it was absurd. Otherwise, I never would have asked that
> > > tongue-in-cheek rhetorical question. I think it was Larry's idea for
> > > hams to have to feel a certain way but I might be wrong about that.
> >
> > No. I simply observed that hams have feelings, and think different ways
> > about things, and you came up with your brilliant idea in response.
>
> That's not how it happened. Here's what was actually said:
> **********
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > Nor do I, although if, as Dick says, new hams are memorizing a question pool of
> > > over a thousand questions, can we not feel that the unwritten "work ethic" rule
> > > has been satisfied?
> >
> > I guess it all depends on how the 'memorizer' feels about it.

> Maybe we need a gang of Feeling Police? If someone doesn't feel
> correctly about their license, they don't get one?
> **********
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

667. Re: Whorass Admits his wife is a fat sow with sagging breasts and a dog's ass for a face

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 19:06:25 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a68fr0$5ae$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 36713
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.lloyd-davies,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Ham Radio" <hr@hrforallnowradio.org> wrote in message
news:a67nbv$3s6$0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "AB8MQ" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message:
>
> > > > you obviously don't have a clue or a brain for that matter.
> > Says the functional illiterate who huffs gas fumes, OBVIOUSLY.
> >
> >
> Roger,
> HR

No call, no credibility..and go fuck yourself. You seem to need some
counseling yourself, since you're so obsessed with what I write.

--
73 de Roger/ AB8MQ

668. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 19:12:14 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8fdrirtsplcf9@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 36712

CAM wrote:

>Do you deny any connection to Dick Carroll?

I've seen his messages on this newsgroup. That's it.

Give me a call on the phone! Use "who is" on the net!

Val

669. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 19:52:18 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0203071152.5493d172@posting.google.com>
Source record: 36714

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c877ef4_2@news7.fast.net>...
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020307060339.06023.00000172@mb-dd.aol.com...
> > From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >
> > >It was the only mode available that would get through under the
> conditions
> > >experienced.
> >
> > In most cases, it is a much better choice to change frequencies than to
> change
> > modes. Perhaps that is what we should be teaching new hams.
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> An EXCELLENT point, Ed!!!

Agreed. If changing frequencies can improve circuit conditions, the
frequencies are available at the stations involved, that's a
good move.
>
> In fact, with the propagation prediction software available,
> (I use PropMan2000 from Rockwell Collins ... $99) it is
> possible to predict the best frequency quite accurately.

If the emergency stations have it available, of course. And the
predictions may not be accurate when most needed.
>
> The software even goes to the internet to download the
> latest space weather and other factors so that the prediction
> is truly as accurate and up to the minute as possible.

Great! But if internet is available, why would ham radio be needed?
>
> Another thing which would be very useful for disaster
> and emergency communications ... and also for routine
> skeds to talk with friends (but would obviously not apply
> to or appeal to DX chasers and contesters) is the potential
> of using ALE "Automatic Link Establishment" software.

Sure - IF the stations that need it, have it available.
>
> This is used, for example, on commercial and military

> circuits where link reliability is or great interest. With
> today's computer-controllable radios, I believe it would
> be quite feasible for someone to write ALE software
> for amateur use ...

That's a "who's going to tie the bell on the cat" sort of someone.
>
> (Yes, someone will grumble "That's not REAL HAM
> RADIO!", but my point is that for emergency and
> disaster communications, "making it work" is the
> name of the game, NOT "following tradition.")

Actually, the tradition is to make it work.

The problem is having all of this stuff available and working when needed, with people who know how to use it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

670. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 20:41:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C87D05C.6050604@ieee.org>
Source record: 36715

Jim Kelley wrote:

> I said what I said I said. :-) You cut most of it out, but what's left
> is evidence enough that you're wrong.

Sorry, Jim, that's the *entire* posting that I cut and pasted from
Google. I was replying to Ed as much as I was replying to you.

>>**
>>Jim Kelley wrote:
>>
>>>W1RFI wrote:
>>>
>>>>Nor do I, although if, as Dick says, new hams are memorizing a question pool of
>>>>over a thousand questions, can we not feel that the unwritten "work ethic" rule
>>>>has been satisfied?
>>>>
>>>I guess it all depends on how the 'memorizer' feels about it.
>
>>Maybe we need a gang of Feeling Police? If someone doesn't feel
>>correctly about their license, they don't get one?
>>**
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

671. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 20:43:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <3C87D104.6070106@ieee.org>
Source record: 36716

Valentine Germann wrote:

> CAM wrote:
>>Do you deny any connection to Dick Carroll?

> I've seen his messages on this newsgroup. That's it.

Are you denying that you have ever been in email contact
with Dick Carroll?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

672. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 20:51:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307155143.09325.00000010@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 36719

In article <20020307084107.08795.00000308@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>As to the reworded article two, "representing [US amateur radio]
>>internationally," let me remind you that the ARRL opposed the
>>rewording of S25.5 by the IARU to be brought up at WRC-03.
>
>ARRL has a policy decision that it will not oppose changes that would remove
>Morse code testing as an international treaty requirement.

Since very recently. The ARRL has been in existance since 1914.
That is 88 years of existance. The ARRL has been OPPOSED to
morse code test removal up to and including 1998 at which time
the IARU reached a consensus view on removal of that test; the
ARRL remained in opposition and announced so publicly. That is
a period of 84 years since founding.

The ARRL announced a policy shift LAST YEAR that "it will not
oppose removal of the code test." Last year was 87 years since
founding.

The recent policy statement is rather boilerplate as far as political
wording goes. The ARRL has simply given up on the code test
issue around ITU-R S25.5 along with implications that it will not
oppose FCC removal of the code test. Null statement. No opposition,
no stance, neutral. No fighting. Concession. Tacit admission of
defeat. Non-musical (no violins).

I'll have to give the ARRL back-room boys a round of applause on
recognizing the future. FINALLY.

>Is this another one of those "what was said, what was heard" sort of things?

Is this another ARRL-apologist's spins to misdirect the subject?

>ARRL has a policy decision that it will not oppose changes that would remove
>Morse code testing as an international treaty requirement.

The meaning of that policy statement has been explained to
you. That policy statement was made last year. It DID NOT
APPLY prior to that year.

>Is this another one of those "what was said, what was heard" sort of things?

Is this another ARRL-apologist's spins to misdirect the subject?

>The ARRL does not control what you do, Len, at least not anywhere other than
>in your imagination. The FCC sets the requirements for Amateur Radio
licenses.
>ARRL has done no more than make its views known to the FCC.

For at least seven decades the ARRL has presumed to be the
"only" representative of the US radio amateur to federal radio
regulatory agencies. That is NOT "imagination." It is recorded
fact.

Up to FCC 90-53 the ARRL had been OPPOSED to a code-test-free
license class. That is NOT "imagination." It is recorded fact.

Up to FCC 99-412 the ARRL had been OPPOSED to eliminating all
but one code test rate for an amateur radio license having below-30-
MHz privileges. That is NOT "imagination." It is recorded fact.

Up to the end of the year 2000 the ARRL had been OPPOSED to
the elimination of the ITU-R amateur code test. That is NOT
"imagination." It is recorded fact.

>You always rail at
>ARRL and amateur operators for somehow denying you that right, but you appear
>to be saying that ARRL's making its views known to the FCC somehow controls
>you.

False attributions, all of them.

I've only mentioned ONE radio amateur's ATTEMPT to deny my
constitutional rights to petition my government. That is NOT
"imagination." It is recorded fact. [see Comments on 98-143 for
25 January 1999, it is on public record]

Why do you insist on so many false attributions as correct?

Why do you deny that the ARRL has had a strong influence
on the government regarding amateur radio regulations?

Are you saying that First Amendment rights "do not apply" when
it comes to amateur radio regulations?

If so, why? Please indicate the US Constitution articles or
amendments which permit such exclusion. What are they?

>Is this another one of those "do as I say, not do as I do" sort of things?

Is this another ARRL-apoligist's spins to attempt misdirection
or ridicule?

>Perhaps this is one of those what you said, what you heard yourself say sort
>of things. :-)

Is this another ARRL-apoligist's spins to attempt misdirection
or ridicule?

673. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 20:51:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307155144.09325.00000011@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 36717

In article <20020307083419.08795.00000307@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>The editors and phrasemakers at the ARRL are very good at what
>>they do. If they had meant "support" they would have reworded
>>article two.
>
>Do you think they are good enough at what they do to have said "unconditionally
>loyal" or "obedient?" Do you think they were good enough at what they do that
>they intended to use the words encouragement and support to expand on what they
>meant by the term "loyal?"

I'll just repeat what was written. If "support" were intended, the phrase makers would
have reworded that article. The rewritten article two as of 1999 still contains the word
"LOYAL" in full caps as the first word.

It is fairly obvious and not really a good argument that what the ARRL rewrote from
the 1928 original and the original being an implicit statement of national organization loyalty ONLY to the ARRL.

We could quibble endlessly over the phrasing with Ed Hare "replying" solely by questions and myself patiently explaining the basics of phrasemaking as used by wordsmiths in all fields. That's counterproductive, produces nothing since the
meaning is quite obvious.

>Do you think they intended anything when they put
>such loyalty to other amateurs and local radio clubs first.

I've already said that the ARRL phrasemakers are good. I will add that they are
not foolish, either.

Let me give you an old example of loyalty phrasing that's been unofficial and around a very long time. The USMC has in internal loyalty phrase/oath/etc.:

"For Corps, God, and country"

There's nothing wrong with the phrase. The order of the wording can be questioned. The fictitious example, probably seen by many is from the

motion picture, "A Few Good Men," primarily a military courtroom drama. That phrase's word ordering is challenged by the defense attorney who drives home one of the central points of the emotional loading to emphasize espirit de corps carried almost beyond reasonable limits.

Those who haven't been in any military service will disregard it, those who are "USMC forever" will be furious and outraged that it is brought up at all. It is nonetheless an emotionally-loaded phrase with a specific order of words that implicitly puts the "Corps" ahead of "God" with "country" last.

As a phrase by itself it can be subject to quibbling on word useage. As an emotionally-loaded phrase for an organization whose primary mission is to destroy (kill) an enemy it fulfills its purpose very well. The mission of any military is exremely harsh...put succinctly it is "kill or be killed." Emotional
support is necessary to maintain espirit de corps in such an environment.

I've used an extreme analogue in phrasings. The order of precedent of words in article two of "The Amateur's Code" is common sense, logical even in a lightly emotionally-loaded phrase. That leaves the last loyalty object, that of
the ARRL.

There is NO qualifier of any kind as to the national-international organization "which represents amateur radio." It is SOLELY that of the ARRL. Succint. No shading or implication of any other national or international organization.

>Do you still think the intent of the point in the code of conduct is to be
>loyal "solely" to ARRL?

Absolutely. This has been explained to you.

>Is this another one of those "what was said, what was heard" sort of things?

No. "The Amateur's Code" article two is quite specific in stating where and to whom a (radio) amateur's loyalty should belong.

Failure to accept the obvious, the long-repeated phrase indicates either an extreme loyalty to the ARRL or a simple failure to read and comprehend English words, phrases, statements, or meanings.

674. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 20:51:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307155145.09325.00000012@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 36718

In article <3c877ef4_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020307060339.06023.00000172@mb-dd.aol.com...
>> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>
>> >It was the only mode available that would get through under the
>conditions
>> >experienced.
>>
>> In most cases, it is a much better choice to change frequencies than to
>change
>> modes. Perhaps that is what we should be teaching new hams.
>>
>> 73,
>> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>An EXCELLENT point, Ed!!!
>
>In fact, with the propagation prediction software available,
>(I use PropMan2000 from Rockwell Collins ... $99) it is
>possible to predict the best frequency quite accurately.
>
>The software even goes to the internet to download the
>latest space weather and other factors so that the prediction
>is truly as accurate and up to the minute as possible.
>
>Another thing which would be very useful for disaster
>and emergency communications ... and also for routine
>skeds to talk with friends (but would obviously not apply
>to or appeal to DX chasers and contesters) is the potential
>of using ALE "Automatic Link Establishment" software.

For some reports of actual experimentation in the HF amateur
bands regarding ALE, anyone can go to www.tactical-link.com
a site originated and maintained by Pat Gibbons, WA6UBE.

For general experimentation in HF band ham communications
there is www.hfpack.com Primarily upper bands on HF
with an emphasis on "pedestrian" equipment. :-)

>This is used, for example, on commercial and military
>circuits where link reliability is or great interest. With
>today's computer-controllable radios, I believe it would

>be quite feasible for someone to write ALE software
>for amateur use ...

It's already been started in amateur use.

For the government, Fed Std 1045A covers ALE standards
and Fed Std 1052 covers radio modems. Both are 1993
releases.

There is a large resource on the Internet for ALE techniques
for both civilian and government radio use. For those who
wish to actually find out about such things, I would suggest
a search using "automatic link establishment" rather than
the keyword "ale." For obvious reasons. :-)

>(Yes, someone will grumble "That's not REAL HAM
>RADIO!", but my point is that for emergency and
>disaster communications, "making it work" is the
>name of the game, NOT "following tradition.")

"Real ham radio" seems to be defined solely by the
personal criteria of the definer...or is that "definator?" :-)

NVIS (Near Vertical Incidence Skywave) propagation
techniques have been in use by militaries world over for
over a decade. Brian Burke has mentioned that several
times in here as an actual user of the technique.

Loud DXers seem to discount and denigrate NVIS due to
it being contrary to their own aims of longer distance
propagation in "radio sport." They define it as "NOT Real
Ham Radio" as if written with capitalization yet it is an
ideal technique that can be applied to HF comm for
emergencies up to about 200 miles.

675. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 21:21:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307162138.04915.00000019@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 36720

In article <3C87B22D.9979A069@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3C86B468.753D2E2E@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
><mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>> writes:
> <little snip>
>> >Interesting how different people interpret the same thing:
>> >
>> >"LOYAL...offers loyalty, encouragement and support to other amateurs,
>> >local clubs, and the American Radio Relay League, through which Amateur
>> >Radio in the United States is represented nationally and
>> >internationally."
>> >
>> >Whereas you read it as loyalty to the ARRL, I read it as support to the
>> >ARRL. A different thing entirely. And I do know enough of history to
>> >understand the contex within which it was written, in 1928.
>>
>> The editors and phrasemakers at the ARRL are very good at what
>> they do. If they had meant "support" they would have reworded
>> article two. Article two still has "LOYAL" in full caps as its first
>> word. If you wish to "read it" as "support" then you are charged
>> with inability to fully comprehend written English words.
>>
> Interesting, if I seem to not fully comprehend written English words,
>then I would have to say that you not only comprehend them, but are
>capable of extrapolating immense, profound and deep meanings from them.
>If you believe in the law of averages, then I have been shortchanged in
>my English comprehension due to your extra abilities!

Acknowledgement of your shortcomings is the first step to
improving yourself. Congratulations on taking the first step.

> How does ARRL punish the Amateur who does not offer their loyalty?

This is a new subject thread on "punishment," something not
previously brought up. Please use another thread subject title
for new subjects.

>in an earlier post. I must confess that I don't see the words demand in
>there, nor do I see any mention of membership either.

The absence of a qualifier word indicate exclusivity implicitly.

Please consult my reply to Ed Hare on this.

> I look at it the same as voting in our countries elections. If I want
>to vote, I have to be a citizen, of proper voting age, and all the other
>qualifications as agreed upon.

No quarrel with that. I voted on March 5, 2002.

> If you want to have an effect on what is happening, then get involved,
>and exercise your rights. Your argument here sounds like the people who
>whine about politicians, but don't vote. If you want to change the ARRL,
>Join and vote.

The ARRL is a SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP, not a government body.
It is a private membership organization.

Voting qualifications as a citizen DO NOT APPLY to private membership
organizations.

>We are talking about a hobby here, and it is amazing that Amateurs even
>have a powerful organization like the ARRL to lobby for them. What other
>choices do you have for ARS representation. If you want to change it
>Lennie, join, get involved, and vote!

Thank you for the suggestions, MIKEY.

I have been involved with my government as a citizen. You may see
evidence of that in the Comments database for FCC 98-143. Look
under 13 January 1999 Comments. It is public record. You may
even go to DC and read one of the original paper copies at the FCC
Reading Room. [say you are from the official ARRL if you feel the
need]

There are a number of ways to work with the government, MIKEY.
They don't require a Big Brother or Orwellian approaches to having
some private SIG do the detail work.

>Hold on a second, Lennie. maybe you can help me with my comprehension
>here.

Sorry, MIKEY, I am not authorized as an English teacher. No help.

> Perhaps you could explain in terms that challenged people like myself
>can understand. 8^)

MIKEY, I would suggest you write to the ARRL for help with your
amateur radio understandings.

Did you have anything further, then, MIKEY?

676. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 21:53:18 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <a68nge$27qn$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 36721

Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote:
>"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020307055241.06023.00000168@mb-dd.aol.com...
>> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>>
>> >Let's face it ... SSB voice is by far the most popular mode on HF.
>> >But, it's over 50 years old and I'd hate to see it over-run the digital
>> >bands to the degree that it inhibits the growth of the new modes
>> >that are the future of ham radio.
>>
>> "Voice" is not limited to SSB on HF, Carl. There is plenty of need for
>amateur
>> experimentation and innovation on the HF voice bands, too.
>>
>> http://www.arrl.org/survey.php3
>>
>> 73,
>> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>Ed,
>
>I recognize, and agree wholeheartedly with, your statement that
>voice is not limited to SSB and that there is plenty of need for
>amateur experimentation and innovation on the HF voice bands,
>too.

But doesn't that bring us around to the starting point? Why is
it that one is allowed to run a 3 kHz wide digital signal carrying
compessed, FECd voice bits in the "voice" bands, but not other
kinds of bits? The bits are indistinguishable when you put them
on the air, why are voice bits okay but other bits that look the
same not okay? Why can't wide-band digital modes compete for space
with the AM/SSB guys the way you want narrow-band digital modes to
compete for space with CW? And why is it that if the band fades to
the point where you can't finish your 3 kHz wide digital voice conversation,
you can't fall back to a 100 Hz wide text mode on the same frequency
to complete it?

What I think I wish is that there weren't "voice" bands and "CW/data"
bands, but rather that there were "6 kHz or less occupied bandwidth"
bands, and "1 kHz or less occupied bandwidth" bands. Since the FCC's
current mode regulations are sort of irrational when applied to
digital modes, and since the FCC apparently doesn't like micromanaging
what hams do with their signals and bands in any case, removing the mode
regulations in favour of simple occupied bandwidth constraints

plus "good engineering practice" might both make them happier and allow a wider variety of digital applications while keeping the traditional analog modes in their place.

Note that this doesn't prevent the voice guys from coming down the band, but they can only do so if they can figure out how to fit it in 1 kHz of bandwidth. As this would require a step improvement in the state of the art of "spectrum efficiency", a current favoured technical way to accumulate spectrum preservation brownie points, even the CW guys might not object to living with the (exceedingly unlikely; SSB is already pretty efficient for voice if your aim is communications rather than quality) possibility that this might happen.

Dennis Ferguson

677. Re: Reciprocal license for Mexico

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 22:24:57 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c87e9f9_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36722
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Diveman" <diveman61@NOSPAMattbi.com> wrote in message
news:xtNh8.17662$aP6.18839@rwcrnsc54...
> Hello everyone,
>
> Just want to bring up an idea I have & perhaps some of you follks can help
> me out with it. I'm planning a trip to Cozumel, Mexico this May and would
> like to bring along my Icom 706 to do some operating while I'm down there.
> What is the best way for me to obtain a reciprocal licence for Mexico? I
> have read the info on the ARRL site and found that many have obtained
their
> permit at the nearest state capital after arrival. For Cozumel, that would
> require a trip to the city of Chetumal on the Quintana Roo mainland. (long
> bus/boat ride or expensive plane trip) On the other hand, I also read on
the
> ARRL site that licences for island operation can only be obtained in
Mexico
> City. All in all this is seems quite impractical and confusing.
>
> I've been to Cozumel several times and the scuba diving is world class,
food
> is great, prices are very reasonable, wonderfull people, I love it there.
To
> be able to operate my rig and work some DX from this great locale would be
> icing on the cake for a great trip!
>
> Anyone have any experience in doing something like this in mexico? Is it
> possible to obtain the permit before leaving home? Would love to hear
> suggestions, advice, or anything that might help. Thanks very much,
>
> M Perry
> KQ6FQ
>
> Remove NOSPAM from email address to reply directly or just reply to the
> group.
>
>

678. Re: Reciprocal license for Mexico

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 22:37:55 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c87ed0c_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36726
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Diveman" <diveman61@NOSPAMattbi.com> wrote in message
news:xtNh8.17662$aP6.18839@rwcrnsc54...
> Hello everyone,
>
> Just want to bring up an idea I have & perhaps some of you follks can help
> me out with it. I'm planning a trip to Cozumel, Mexico this May and would
> like to bring along my Icom 706 to do some operating while I'm down there.
> What is the best way for me to obtain a reciprocal licence for Mexico? I
> have read the info on the ARRL site and found that many have obtained
their
> permit at the nearest state capital after arrival. For Cozumel, that would
> require a trip to the city of Chetumal on the Quintana Roo mainland. (long
> bus/boat ride or expensive plane trip) On the other hand, I also read on
the
> ARRL site that licences for island operation can only be obtained in
Mexico
> City. All in all this is seems quite impractical and confusing.

I hate to rain on your parade, but I just obtained another Mexican
reciprocal license a couple of weeks ago, while in Mexico City
as a member of the US delegation to an international radio regulatory
conference.

While our Mexican hosts were (from my experience typically)
hospitable, including a senior official from CoFeTel (the Mexican
"FCC") sending me with one of her staffers ... in her car ... from
the conference hotel to the appropriate office(s) (you have to go
to more than one), then to the bank to pay the fee, then backwards
to the office(s) with the receipts, etc. to finally pick up the license
(about a 4 hour operation with a route that is so confusing that I
would NOT recommend it without the sort of guide that I had),
the license STILL prohibits contest operation (not that I care about
that) AND operation from Mexican islands.

I specifically asked if they meant places like Cozumel, or just more
outlying, perhaps ecologically sensitive islands. The answer was
"sorry Senior, no islands, period." (and I was sitting in the office of
and dealing directly with the head of the department that issues
reciprocal licenses to foreigners ... with a certain amount of "skid-
greasing already having been done ahead of time ...)

> I've been to Cozumel several times and the scuba diving is world class,
food
> is great, prices are very reasonable, wonderfull people, I love it there.

To
> be able to operate my rig and work some DX from this great locale would be
> icing on the cake for a great trip!

Agreed that the diving, food, etc. in Cozumel is great ... but getting
a license to operate there may turn out to be virtually impossible.
(and I would NOT recommend "winging it" if you get my drift ...)

> Anyone have any experience in doing something like this in mexico? Is it
> possible to obtain the permit before leaving home? Would love to hear
> suggestions, advice, or anything that might help. Thanks very much,

If you live near a Mexican Consulate, you may be able to do so ...
also, since you have a 6 call, if you're within traveling distance of
TJ, it used to be possible to get Mexican reciprocal licenses there
with a minimum of hassle ... but that was in the '92 time frame and
I don't know how that situation may have changed ...

I don't understand why the "no islands" thing, but it seems to be
a pretty firm thing with them ...

73,
Carl - wa6vse

679. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 22:38:52 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307173852.08738.00000329@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36723

>rom: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>>ARRL has a policy decision that it will not oppose changes that would remove
>>Morse code testing as an international treaty requirement.
>
>Since very recently. The ARRL has been in existance since 1914.

Okay, but if you have to go back to 1914. . . :-)

>The ARRL has been OPPOSED to
>morse code test removal up to and including 1998 at which time
>the IARU reached a consensus view on removal of that test; the
>ARRL remained in opposition and announced so publicly.

I believe that you are talking about the IARU Region 3(?) consensus view on the removal of that test. ARRL is represented in that Region because of the US territories in the Pacific. At the time, I believe ARRL was the sole dissenting vote, in line with the stated policy at the time.

>The ARRL announced a policy shift LAST YEAR that "it will not
>oppose removal of the code test." Last year was 87 years since
>founding.

I think we can stipulate that you can add and subtract okay, Len.

>The recent policy statement is rather boilerplate as far as political
>wording goes. The ARRL has simply given up on the code test
>issue around ITU-R S25.5 along with implications that it will not
>oppose FCC removal of the code test.

The ARRL has not changed its policy wrt the FCC removal of the test. I imagine it will not consider that matter until there is something specific on the plate to consider.

>Null statement. No opposition,
>no stance, neutral. No fighting. Concession. Tacit admission of
>defeat. Non-musical (no violins).

That about sums it up as far as the international requirements go.

>I'll have to give the ARRL back-room boys a round of applause on
>recognizing the future. FINALLY.

The policy was not kept in a back room, Len. From what I heard, the discussions about that policy would have been appropriate for a back room. :-)

>>Is this another one of those "what was said, what was heard" sort of things?
>

>Is this another ARRL-apologist's spins to misdirect the subject?

No, I think we kept right on subject.

>>Is this another one of those "what was said, what was heard" sort of things?
>
>Is this another ARRL-apologist's spins to misdirect the subject?

Nope, we are still on the subject.

Goodness, you are easily confused when you want to be!

>For at least seven decades the ARRL has presumed to be the
>"only" representative of the US radio amateur to federal radio
>regulatory agencies. That is NOT "imagination." It is recorded
>fact.

Not in the ARRL matter I have read, Len. The League has encouraged all to make
their own filings. As I said, "in your mind."

>p to FCC 90-53 the ARRL had been OPPOSED to a code-test-free
>license class. That is NOT "imagination." It is recorded fact.

You are correct.

>Up to FCC 99-412 the ARRL had been OPPOSED to eliminating all
>but one code test rate for an amateur radio license having below-30-
>MHz privileges. That is NOT "imagination." It is recorded fact.

You are correct.

>Up to the end of the year 2000 the ARRL had been OPPOSED to
>the elimination of the ITU-R amateur code test. That is NOT
>"imagination." It is recorded fact.

You are correct, but how do those statements explain your belief that ARRL is
trying to control you?

>Why do you deny that the ARRL has had a strong influence
>on the government regarding amateur radio regulations?

I do not deny that Len. I would not put the amount of energy I put into the FCC
regulatory filings I particiate in if I felt that such work would not have
influence. Why would I *want* to say that?

>Are you saying that First Amendment rights "do not apply" when
>it comes to amateur radio regulations?

Yup, it is another one of those "what he said, what he heard" sort of things.

>>Is this another one of those "do as I say, not do as I do" sort of things?
>
>Is this another ARRL-apoligist's spins to attempt misdirection
>or ridicule?

I don't believe that misdirection is needed here, Len, and we are still on topic. If you feel ridiculed, it was not due to misdirection.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

680. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 22:39:50 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307173950.08738.00000332@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36725

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>>>The editors and phrasemakers at the ARRL are very good at what
>>>they do. If they had meant "support" they would have reworded
>>>article two.

>>Do you think they are good enough at what they do to have said
>"unconditionally
>>loyal" or "obedient?" Do you think they were good enough at what they do
>that
>>they intended to use the words encouragement and support to expand on what
>they
>>meant by the term "loyal?"
>
>I'll just repeat what was written. If "support" were intended, the phrase
>makers would
>have reworded that article. The rewritten article two as of 1999 still
>contains the word
>"LOYAL" in full caps as the first word.
>
>It is fairly obvious and not really a good argument that what the ARRL
>rewrote
>from
>the 1928 original and the original being an implicit statement of national
>organization loyalty ONLY to the ARRL.
>
>We could quibble endlessly over the phrasing with Ed Hare "replying" solely
>by
>questions and myself patiently explaining the basics of phrasemaking as used
>by wordsmiths in all fields. That's counterproductive, produces nothing
>since
>the
>meaning is quite obvious.
>
>>Do you think they intended anything when they put
>>such loyalty to other amateurs and local radio clubs first.
>
>I've already said that the ARRL phrasemakers are good. I will add that they
>are
>not foolish, either.
>
>Let me give you an old example of loyalty phrasing that's been unofficial and
>around a very long time. The USMC has in internal loyalty phrase/oath/etc.:
>
> "For Corps, God, and country"

>
>There's nothing wrong with the phrase. The order of the wording can be
>questioned. The fictitious example, probably seen by many is from the
>motion picture, "A Few Good Men," primarily a military courtroom drama.
>That phrase's word ordering is challenged by the defense attorney who
>drives home one of the central points of the emotional loading to emphasize
>espirit de corps carried almost beyond reasonable limits.
>
>Those who haven't been in any military service will disregard it, those who
>are "USMC forever" will be furious and outraged that it is brought up at all.
>It is nonetheless an emotionally-loaded phrase with a specific order of
>words that implicitly puts the "Corps" ahead of "God" with "country" last.
>
>As a phrase by itself it can be subject to quibbling on word useage. As an
>emotionally-loaded phrase for an organization whose primary mission is to
>destroy (kill) an enemy it fulfills its purpose very well. The mission of
>any
>military is exremely harsh...put succinctly it is "kill or be killed."
>Emotional
>support is necessary to maintain espirit de corps in such an environment.
>
>I've used an extreme analogue in phrasings. The order of precedent of words
>in article two of "The Amateur's Code" is common sense, logical even in a
>lightly emotionally-loaded phrase. That leaves the last loyalty object, that
>of
>the ARRL.
>
>There is NO qualifier of any kind as to the national-international
>organization
>"which represents amateur radio." It is SOLELY that of the ARRL. Succint.
>No shading or implication of any other national or international
>organization.
>
>>Do you still think the intent of the point in the code of conduct is to be
>>loyal "solely" to ARRL?
>
>Absolutely. This has been explained to you.
>
>>Is this another one of those "what was said, what was heard" sort of things?
>
>No. "The Amateur's Code" article two is quite specific in stating where and
>to whom a (radio) amateur's loyalty should belong.
>
>Failure to accept the obvious, the long-repeated phrase indicates either an
>extreme loyalty to the ARRL or a simple failure to read and comprehend
>English words, phrases, statements, or meanings.
>
>
>
>

>
>
>
>

681. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 22:40:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307174040.08738.00000335@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36724

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>>>The editors and phrasemakers at the ARRL are very good at what
>>>they do. If they had meant "support" they would have reworded
>>>article two.
>>
>>Do you think they are good enough at what they do to have said
>"unconditionally
>>loyal" or "obedient?" Do you think they were good enough at what they do
>that
>>they intended to use the words encouragement and support to expand on what
>they
>>meant by the term "loyal?"
>
>I'll just repeat what was written.

A good enough non-answer to make my point.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

682. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 22:45:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307174506.08738.00000337@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36727

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>It is fairly obvious and not really a good argument that what the ARRL
>rewrote
>from
>the 1928 original and the original being an implicit statement of national
>organization loyalty ONLY to the ARRL.

If that is your way of ceding that ARRL did not say that one should be loyal solely to the ARRL, I think we are in agreement.

>There is NO qualifier of any kind as to the national-international
>organization
>"which represents amateur radio." It is SOLELY that of the ARRL. Succint.
>No shading or implication of any other national or international
>organization.

No, I guess we are not in agreement. If your ARRL-antagonist spin is that ARRL does not promote loyalty to other organizations through the amateur code of conduct, you are correct.

There, wasn't that easy. Do you feel better now?

>>Do you still think the intent of the point in the code of conduct is to be
>>loyal "solely" to ARRL?

>Absolutely. This has been explained to you.

Of course, the fact that the League promotes other organizations from time to time won't enter into the discussion, I am sure. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

683. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 22:46:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307174648.08738.00000338@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36728

From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu

>I'm dizzy for sure. I hate to see what Lennie would do with the Boy
>Scout oath!!

Well, he admitted from the getgo that he was trolling, so we can just all give the old fellow some fun.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

684. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 22:48:47 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307174847.08738.00000339@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36729

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>>Hold on a second, Lennie. maybe you can help me with my comprehension
>>here.
>
>Sorry, MIKEY, I am not authorized as an English teacher. No help.

Now, now, Len, a few posts back, you were trying to help me wiht my English comprehension. Or so you said... hmmm...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

685. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 22:50:35 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c87f00d_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36732

"N2EY" <N2EY@aol.com> wrote in message
news:975b4ea9.0203070951.331183a5@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c86ab34_2@news7.fast.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:9f4bfe89.0203061314.1c349469@posting.google.com...
> > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
> > news:<3c825bb7_1@news7.fast.net>...
> > > >
> > > > And there is no danger posed to Morse-proficient hams (or
> > > > the public in general) by non-Morse-proficient hams ... except
> > > > perhaps the "danger" that Morse enthusiasts will have to pro-
> > > > actively recruit new Morse enthusiasts instead of relying on the
> > > > "Morse welfare state" of mandatory Morse proficiency testing ...
> > >
> > > The danger is interference.
> >
> > I keep hearing that, but I don't buy it ...
>
> Of course not - it supports code testing ;-)

Not really ... but 1 point for trying :-)

> > there is NO reason that
> > anyone needs to be able to COPY Morse to be able to tell
> > that it's there and avoid transmitting on top of it ...
>
> What constitutes "on top of"?
>
> Example 1:
>
> CW operator A hears Operator B's S4 PSK31 signal on 3578.000 kHz. The
> books all say PSK31 only needs 50-100 Hz of bandwidth, etc., etc., and
> A knows this. r A's rig is equipped with good xtal filters and high
> dynamic range, so he tunes off about 500 Hz and can no longer hear any
> trace of the PSK31 signal. 3577.500 is clear but A asks if the
> frequency is clear in standard fashion and gets no response, so he
> blasts away with a CQ.
>
> What A doesn't know and cannot know is that B is using the typical
> soundcard-and-SSB rig implementation of PSK31, and B's rig inhales
> about 3 kHz of the band at once. A also doesn't know that his signal
> is S9+ at Operator B's location, because B is using QRP and an attic
> dipole.
>

> A's signal takes over B's AGC (which B cannot defeat because B's rig
> doesn't
> have an AGC off switch) and makes a mess of B's copy. C, who is in QSO
> with
> B, thinks "those "#$%^&@ CW lid is intentionally QRMing!" - which is
> NOT
> the case at all. But B and C can neither tell A what is going on nor
> even identify him.
>
> How far away from each digital signal must a CW station stay to avoid
> such problems?

Such problems happen all the time with all modes ... receiver
blocking, AGC "pumping," etc. are facts of life ... this is NOT
something that is unique to CW or which justifies a Morse test.

> The scenario could be reversed. But I suspect your response would be
> something
> like "tough - the CW station should use a 'better' mode" or some such.
> ;-)

Not at all ... my reaction would be "stuff happens." Turn the
knob a bit and find a frequency that works.

You seem to think that a Morse test will guarantee some sort
of idylic, interference free world ... that's simply not the case.

What about the situation where other mixes of modes cause
the same phenomenon and the operators can't copy each
other's transmissions? Same thing ...

We can't partition our bands rigidly into little compartments
for each and every mode ... that would be EXTREMELY
wasteful.

> > any more
> > than a Morse op needs to be able to copy PSK31 or RTTY
> > in his head to be able to tell the signal is there and avoid it.
>
> NO reason? I disagree!
>
> Example 2:
>
> D listens on a frequency and hears nothing. Is that sufficient to
> avoid
> interference? Maybe, maybe not. Suppose the frequency is in use by E
> and F, but F is inaudible at D's location and vice versa. But D and E
> can hear each other S9++. If D simply starts transmitting without
> asking if the frequency is in use, he clobbers E and F's QSO. How does
> E let D know the frequency is in use
> if D does ask, if they cannot communicate?
>

> > I think you're grasping at straws ..
>
> Nope. One of the most fundamental reasons for radio regulations is the
> avoidance of interference. Hardly a "straw".

Same as above ... "stuff happens" ...

You're making it sound like a little unintentional interference
is the end of the world as we know it or something ... the
fact of the matter is that there is no way that some modest
amount of unintentional interference is totally avoidable ...
whether between modes or same mode on same mode ...
propagation and other factors virtually guarantee it ... lighten
up a bit and be more flexible ... things will work out without
stuffing everyone into narrow, confining little "cubby holes."

Carl - wa6vse

686. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 22:51:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307175135.08738.00000340@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36730

From: N2EY@aol.com (N2EY)

>What A doesn't know and cannot know is that B is using the typical
>soundcard-and-SSB rig implementation of PSK31, and B's rig inhales
>about 3 kHz of the band at once. A also doesn't know that his signal
>is S9+ at Operator B's location, because B is using QRP and an attic
>dipole.

Same thing can happen with key clicks and SSB IMD. The solution to both
problems is better address techncially, not through code testing.

>How far away from each digital signal must a CW station stay to avoid
>such
>problems?

Just far enough not to have problems, I would say.

And in any event, knowing or not knowing the code would not have prevented the
interference.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

687. If I won the lottery (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 22:55:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307175537.08738.00000341@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36731

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>> >I will put 100 bucks on the fact that amateur radio will still be around
>> >2020.

>> And I will stake my entire career on it! :-)

>And I'll bet that Ed will be happily retired by 2020 :-)

More'n'likely, Carl. Some of what I do is a lot of fun, but there are plenty of times it is work. :-)

Of course, if I win the lottery, that date could be moved up some.

I used to say that if I won the big one, I was going to go to work and quit. I have changed my mind. If I win the big one, I am going to go to work and they are going to fire me!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

688. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 22:56:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307175630.08738.00000342@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36733

From: "Krell" krell1215@yahoo.com

>I don't question that amatuer radio will be around in 2020. I question what
>it will be like.

So do I. I somehow think that we will all have something to do with shaping
it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

689. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 22:58:51 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c87f203_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36735

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0203071152.5493d172@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c877ef4_2@news7.fast.net>...
> > "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020307060339.06023.00000172@mb-dd.aol.com...
> > > From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> > >
> > > >It was the only mode available that would get through under the
> > conditions
> > > >experienced.
> > >
> > > In most cases, it is a much better choice to change frequencies than
to
> > change
> > > modes. Perhaps that is what we should be teaching new hams.
> > >
> > > 73,
> > > Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
> > An EXCELLENT point, Ed!!!
>
> Agreed. If changing frequencies can improve circuit conditions, the
> frequencies are available at the stations involved, that's a
> good move.

"If the frequencies are available at the stations involved" ... this
sounds like a matter of proper preparation and planning to me.

> > In fact, with the propagation prediction software available,
> > (I use PropMan2000 from Rockwell Collins ... $99) it is
> > possible to predict the best frequency quite accurately.
>
> If the emergency stations have it available, of course. And the
> predictions may not be accurate when most needed.

It's a useful tool, not a "cure-all" ... and only one station need
have access to such software to do the predictions for an
entire net ... if it's not available, fine ... that's where operator
knowledge and experience come in ...

> > The software even goes to the internet to download the
> > latest space weather and other factors so that the prediction
> > is truly as accurate and up to the minute as possible.
>

> Great! But if internet is available, why would ham radio be needed?

Stations outside of the affected area could run the predictions
for, say the next 24 hours, then relay them to the parties that
need them ... even without the "to the minute updates,"
the software does a very good job ...

> > Another thing which would be very useful for disaster
> > and emergency communications ... and also for routine
> > skeds to talk with friends (but would obviously not apply
> > to or appeal to DX chasers and contesters) is the potential
> > of using ALE "Automatic Link Establishment" software.
>
> Sure - IF the stations that need it, have it available.

I said it could be a useful tool in one's toolbox ... not that
it was a necessity ... I tend to focus on planning and
preparation ... not on relying on spur of the moment use
of "minimalist" techniques ...

> > This is used, for example, on commercial and military
> > circuits where link reliability is or great interest. With
> > today's computer-controllable radios, I believe it would
> > be quite feasible for someone to write ALE software
> > for amateur use ...
>
> That's a "who's going to tie the bell on the cat" sort of someone.

???? I'm curious what you mean, but don't have any idea
what it is ...

> > (Yes, someone will grumble "That's not REAL HAM
> > RADIO!", but my point is that for emergency and
> > disaster communications, "making it work" is the
> > name of the game, NOT "following tradition.")
>
> Actually, the tradition is to make it work.
>
> The problem is having all of this stuff available and working when needed,
with
> people who know how to use it.

There we are back to proper planning and preparation ... instead
of relying on throwing something together willy-nilly after it's hit
the fan ...

Carl - wa6vse

690. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 23:01:47 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307180147.08738.00000344@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36734

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>3) given the apparent reuctance of "the masses"
> to readily accept and adopt new things
>that SSB would "spread out" to a degree that it
>would impair the use of the HF bands by other modes.
>(including CW, other narrowband digital modes, and
>yet-to-be-developed modes) in ways that would be
>harmful to the development of "the next generation"
>of amateur radio technologies.

Give the masses a bit more credit, Carl. First, the survey response doesn't really support your item #3. The masses have adopted more digital technology on HF in the teeth of existing CW use, so the historical trends are toward progress. The limitations on HF digital are not social; at this point, they are regulatory.

At least one manufacturer is working on adding digital voice to their equipment. That factor alone will promote its use. Where it has advantages, hams will adopt it and use it.

I don't know if it will have the advantages of weak-signal modes like SSB or CW, though. Right now, I don't know if the encoding methods are robust enough to function in the teeth of noise and QRM. I have little doubt that the development of robust encoding could be done, but right now, what is really lacking is any turnkey programmable system.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

691. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 23:07:36 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307180736.08738.00000345@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36736

From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson)

>But doesn't that bring us around to the starting point? Why is
>it that one is allowed to run a 3 kHz wide digital signal carrying
>compessed, FECd voice bits in the "voice" bands, but not other
>kinds of bits? The bits are indistinguishable when you put them
>on the air, why are voice bits okay but other bits that look the
>same not okay? Why can't wide-band digital modes compete for space
>with the AM/SSB guys the way you want narrow-band digital modes to
>compete for space with CW? And why is it that if the band fades to
>the point where you can't finish your 3 kHz wide digital voice conversation,
>you can't fall back to a 100 Hz wide text mode on the same frequency
>to complete it?

I agree completely; if there need to be any limits on amateur transmissions vs
frequency, bandwidth should be the limit, not content or data rate. If hams
can pump enough signal to noise at it, they can get some pretty high data rates
in a moderate bandwidth. The rules that permit the use of "unspecified digital
codes" could really let us do some neat R&D, if the rules didn't hem that in.
The FCC has clarified that posting information about the encoding method on a
public web site is enough "public knowledge" to permit a particular unspecified
digital code.

>What I think I wish is that there weren't "voice" bands and "CW/data"
>bands, but rather that there were "6 kHz or less occupied bandwidth"
>bands, and "1 kHz or less occupied bandwidth" bands. Since the FCC's
>current mode regulations are sort of irrational when applied to
>digital modes, and since the FCC apparently doesn't like micromanaging
>what hams do with their signals and bands in any case, removing the mode
>regulations in favour of simple occupied bandwidth constraints
>plus "good engineering practice" might both make them happier and allow
>a wider variety of digital applications while keeping the traditional
>analog modes in their place.

And I would wager that a petition for rulemaking would have a reasonable chance
of success. :-)

>Note that this doesn't prevent the voice guys from coming down the
>band, but they can only do so if they can figure out how to fit
>it in 1 kHz of bandwidth. As this would require a step improvement
>in the state of the art of "spectrum efficiency", a current
>favoured technical way to accumulate spectrum preservation brownie
>points, even the CW guys might not object to living with the
>(exceedingly unlikely; SSB is already pretty efficient for voice if
>your aim is communications rather than quality) possibility that this
>might happen.

At the signal/noise ratios that hams like to use ("you are 30 dB over S9 tonight), such bandwidth reductions should be very possible! :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
>Dennis Ferguson
>
>
>
>
>
>

692. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 23:09:51 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307180951.08738.00000347@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36737

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>There are seven Germann's in the QRZ data base, none from Missouri.
>Are you trying to tell me that Valentine Germann is the real name
>of a Missouri ham?

I may have missed it; did he say he was licensed? Did he say he held a US license? He could be a ham operating under one of the international agreements. He could be N0CALL, too. :-)

He could be Len under an assumed name!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

693. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 23:15:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307181541.08738.00000349@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36738

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>The only reason I can think of is that you are
>not telling the truth when you state that memorizing 1000 Q&A is a trivial
>task.

Remember, the premise is memorizing without understanding. That is the reason
for the Russian connection in the test to permit Dick to easily prove that he
is correct.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

694. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 23:21:47 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307182147.08738.00000351@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36739

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> In most cases, it is a much better choice to change frequencies than to
>change
>> modes. Perhaps that is what we should be teaching new hams.

> I don't really agree with that statement. If propagation on 40 mtrs drops
>out, we
>should then
>plan on automatically changing bands to 75? That opens up a whole set of
>problems.

If propagation on 40 meters starts to fail, it is possible to temporarily switch to a narrower mode such as CW or to a digital mode with better encoding and complete the message. This presumes, of course, that one has only one or two messages to complete. But if the band is failing, it is generally only a short time before the band goes out altogether. In that case, changing to a frequency with better propagation is the better choice.

I just find it odd that in all this "emergency" scenario, the only solution to a failing band being offered by people is the one that supports their views on code testing.

>If you've ever changed bands under those circumstances, you'll understand. I
>have.

We used to do it all the time on the county hunters nets, Dick, with 8-foot mobile antennas. Changing bands is a better choice most of the time than changing modes.

>What usually happens is the two stations lose each other, and wind up back on
>the
>same frequency trying to make a dying circuit work, absent better previous
>planning.

You are correct, previous planning is important to emergency communications. That planning let us change bands on the CH nets with impunity.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

695. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 23:40:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307184030.17082.00000265@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 36740

>Subject: Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/07/02 16:21 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020307162138.04915.00000019@mb-bk.aol.com>

>Acknowledgement of your shortcomings is the first step to
>improving yourself. Congratulations on taking the first step.

A step you should take yourself.

>Please consult my reply to Ed Hare on this.

Of which mindless rattling do you refer?

>Your argument here sounds like the people who
>>whine about politicians, but don't vote. If you want to change the ARRL,
>>Join and vote.
>
>The ARRL is a SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP, not a government body.
>It is a private membership organization.
>
>Voting qualifications as a citizen DO NOT APPLY to private membership
>organizations.

You hit it right on the head. Lennie KNOWS what he needs to do to effect
the changes he'd like to see occur, but he cannot do that because it would
require getting a license...THEN he'd be "one of us".

>They don't require a Big Brother or Orwellian approaches to having
>some private SIG do the detail work.

Sure they do. If they didn't there'd be no need for teh rantings and
beratings we suffer at your hands over it.

>>Hold on a second, Lennie. maybe you can help me with my comprehension
>>here.
>
>Sorry, MIKEY, I am not authorized as an English teacher. No help.

Don't worry, Mike. English is not the ONLY thing he's incompetent or
unskilled at...He's not much on instructing technical matters, either.

696. Re: Reciprocal license for Mexico

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-07 23:48:17 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gsmeht8.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 36741
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 07 Mar 2002 17:31:09 GMT, Diveman wrote:

>I also read on the
>ARRL site that licences for island operation can only be obtained in Mexico
>City. All in all this is seems quite impractical and confusing.

Mexico is not the US. They have no illusions about making it easy
for "ordinary folks" to get permits or licenses of any type.

>Anyone have any experience in doing something like this in mexico? Is it
>possible to obtain the permit before leaving home? Would love to hear
>suggestions, advice, or anything that might help. Thanks very much,

Depends on who you know and who THEY know, and the size of the salad
that you buy the local radio inspector (I heard that phrase used by
one on a visit to the US).

Serioulsy, check with ARRL HQ which maintains a file of "how to
get things done" in foreign countries. IIRC we do not have a
separate reciprocity agreement with Mexico, but they may be included
in the Inter-American treaty (CITEL). If so, you would have to get
an International Amateur Radio Permit, which is like an International
Driver License, to avoid a separate proceedingin Mexico.

The US issuing agent for the IARP is the ARRL, so check with them.

Vaya con Dios.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

697. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 00:00:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307190004.17082.00000266@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 36742

>Subject: Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/07/02 15:51 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020307155143.09325.00000010@mb-mo.aol.com

>>ARRL has a policy decision that it will not oppose changes that would remove
>>Morse code testing as an international treaty requirement.
>
>Since very recently. The ARRL has been in existance since 1914.
>That is 88 years of existance. The ARRL has been OPPOSED to
>morse code test removal up to and including 1998 at which time
>the IARU reached a consensus view on removal of that test; the
>ARRL remained in opposition and announced so publicly. That is
>a period of 84 years since founding.
>
>The ARRL announced a policy shift LAST YEAR that "it will not
>oppose removal of the code test." Last year was 87 years since
>founding.

The ARRLis a membership organization.

It has been since it's founding.

It's "policies" have reflected the majority opinion of the membership.

There's no conspiracy or black helicopters.

>Concession. Tacit admission of defeat.

No defeat, Lennie. It's a change of policy based upon the expressed views
of the membership. What part of "democratic process" are you deficient in
understanding?

>I'll have to give the ARRL back-room boys a round of applause on
>recognizing the future. FINALLY.

Your colostomy bag is leaking again, Your Malodoressness. No "back room
boys", no secret agenda, no international intrigue. The membership's desires
changed. The ARRL followed suit. What part of the democratic process are you
deficient in understanding?

>Is this another ARRL-apologist's spins to misdirect the subject?

What's misdirected?

>>ARRL has a policy decision that it will not oppose changes that would remove
>>Morse code testing as an international treaty requirement.
>

>The meaning of that policy statement has been explained to
>you. That policy statement was made last year. It DID NOT
>APPLY prior to that year.

And prior to that it was the general opinion of the membership AT THAT
TIME that code testing was prefered.

Now it is not.

What part of that is it so hard to understand? A membership organization
is doing what the membership wants.

>For at least seven decades the ARRL has presumed to be the
>"only" representative of the US radio amateur to federal radio
>regulatory agencies. That is NOT "imagination." It is recorded
>fact.

There was no "presumption" to it. With the exception of the occasional
"wannabe", the ARRL has been the only Amateur Radio organization in the United
States. No conspiracy. Simple market forces. The other organizations had
neither the broad appeal or infrastructure to provide what ARRL is already
doing.

CQ magazine is the only other entity that comes close to doing anything
the League does in terms of "membership" (subscriber) services.

Lennie...YOU have all this unused, wasted time...Why don't YOU create a
new organization?!?!

Since YOU obviously have ALL the answers, I am sure that the unwashed
masses will swarm to your feet, anxious to throw off the yoke of oppression of
the evil Empire of the ARRL.

698. Re: Whorass Admits his wife is a fat sow with sagging breasts and a dog's ass for a face

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 00:05:55 UTC
From: "Unit649 irc.foreverchat.net" <unit649@unit649.net>
Message-ID: <DfTh8.742$LN3.440177771@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 36743
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.lloyd-davies,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Your problem is beyond Ham Radio, plain and simple.

--
Unit649
irc.foreverchat.net
Network Founder
http://www.foreverchat.net
irc://irc.foreverchat.net

"AB8MQ" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:a68fr0$5ae$0@dosa.alt.net...
> "Ham Radio" <hr@hrforallnowradio.org> wrote in message
> news:a67nbv$3s6$0@dosa.alt.net...
> >
> > "AB8MQ" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message:
> >
> > > > > you obviously don't have a clue or a brain for that matter.
> > > > Says the functional illiterate who huffs gas fumes, OBVIOUSLY.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > Roger,
> > > HR
> >
> >
> No call, no credibility..and go fuck yourself. You seem to need some
> counseling yourself, since you're so obsessed with what I write.
>
> --
> 73 de Roger/ AB8MQ
>
>

699. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 00:07:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8800BA.D21CCB51@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36745

W1RFI wrote:
> Same thing can happen with key clicks and SSB IMD. The solution to both
> problems is better address techncially, not through code testing.

I heard a strange signal the other night. It sounded like a pot of
boiling eggs and was splashing all over the low end of the band. Got
any idea what that was? I don't remember what band it was on.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

700. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 00:08:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307190811.17082.00000267@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 36744

>Subject: Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/07/02 15:51 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020307155144.09325.00000011@mb-mo.aol.com>

>We could quibble endlessly over the phrasing with Ed Hare "replying" solely
>by
>questions and myself patiently explaining the basics of phrasemaking as used
>by wordsmiths in all fields. That's counterproductive, produces nothing
>since
>the
>meaning is quite obvious.

This also includes the wordsmithing of Leonard H. Anderscum, who is very proficient at such twisting of the word...the cut and paste...the "snip"...

Nice try, Lennie....no matter HOW "patiently" you try to explain it, it's still a spin from you.

>The mission of any
>military is exremely harsh...put succinctly it is "kill or be killed."

Spoken like the true "In The Rear With The Gear" geek that I have always presumed you to be.

Also spoken by someone who has absolutely NO experience in any kind of tactical military operations. You've been watching too much of that new "Combat Missions" game show, Lennie.

>>Do you still think the intent of the point in the code of conduct is to be
>>loyal "solely" to ARRL?
>
>Absolutely. This has been explained to you

And of course Lennie's explanation is absolutely correct. Now that HE has spoken, we can all quit.

Bad Lennie....bad Lennie.....

701. Re: If I won the lottery (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 00:15:22 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gsmg75b.pminews@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 36746

On 07 Mar 2002 22:55:37 GMT, W1RFI wrote:

>I used to say that if I won the big one, I was going to go to work
>and quit. I have changed my mind. If I win the big one, I am going to
>go to work and they are going to fire me!

I'd go to work and BUY them !!

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

702. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 00:16:59 UTC
From: Steve Adell - KF2TI <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a68vub$22u$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36747

In article <20020307173852.08738.00000329@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
says...
> >rom: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
> >>ARRL has a policy decision that it will not oppose changes that would remove
> >>Morse code testing as an international treaty requirement.
> >
> >Since very recently. The ARRL has been in existance since 1914.
>
> Okay, but if you have to go back to 1914. . . :-)

He does. People with no present and no future, always repost the past
AND chastise others for doing them same.

>
> >The ARRL has been OPPOSED to
> >morse code test removal up to and including 1998 at which time
> >the IARU reached a consensus view on removal of that test; the
> >ARRL remained in opposition and announced so publicly.
>
> I believe that you are talking about the IARU Region 3(?) consensus view on the
> removal of that test. ARRL is represented in that Region because of the US
> territories in the Pacific. At the time, I believe ARRL was the sole
> dissenting vote, in line with the stated policy at the time.
>
> >The ARRL announced a policy shift LAST YEAR that "it will not
> >oppose removal of the code test." Last year was 87 years since
> >founding.
>
> I think we can stipulate that you can add and subtract okay, Len.

Gee, I wonder who lent him their fingers and toes to count on ;-)

>
> >Null statement. No opposition,
> >no stance, neutral. No fighting. Concession. Tacit admission of
> >defeat. Non-musical (no violins).
>

Pretty much sums up Ol Lennie's p[roof that I have posted under anything
other than my own name..unlike he, who ALWAYS ends each post with his
name and never uses an alias yuck yuck yuck

> >For at least seven decades the ARRL has presumed to be the
> >"only" representative of the US radio amateur to federal radio
> >regulatory agencies. That is NOT "imagination." It is recorded

> >fact.
>
> Not in the ARRL matter I have read, Len. The League has encouraged all to make
> their own filings. As I said, "in your mind."

I thought 87 years would be at least 9 decades.

>
> You are correct, but how do those statements explain your belief that ARRL is
> trying to control you?

Ed, when Len was working at relaying 1.3 million rtty messages over 2
years, the ARRL planted a microprocessor in a part of his body that they
felt would not be used and therefore never noticed....his brain.

That's why he wears aluminum foil overalls and hats.

>
> I don't believe that misdirection is needed here, Len, and we are still on
> topic. If you feel ridiculed, it was not due to misdirection.

That's because ridicule is Len's middle name
Leonard Aridiculed Anderson

Still waiting Len. Come on the old man..just one piece of your supposed
proof.. please..pretty please with tailfin registry's on top. FRAUD!!!!

703. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 00:48:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C877E44.A3D66EA3@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36748

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Valentine Germann wrote:
> > > > . . . have been right all along. You really ARE worthless!
> > > > But I had to make completely sure, in real time, for myself.
> > > > Thanks for removing any doubts I might have had! :-)
> > >
> > > Who cares? You don't have to balls to post your real name.
> >
> > You having a very senior moment, Cecil? What's that above the text of
> > his post?
>
> There are seven Germann's in the QRZ data base, none from Missouri.
> Are you trying to tell me that Valentine Germann is the real name
> of a Missouri ham? Do you still have that Missouri ocean front
> property for sale?

You ARE having a very senior moment. He said he was finally getting around
to
getting his ham radio license, at age 52. (Pretty much typical these days.
In our day early teens was more typical). But that was why he was looking at
the question pools.

Besides, I'm not in Missouri, I'm in a Salt Lake City suburb. Spent the
winter in Phoenix. Got some beachfront property for sale there. Interested?

704. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 00:48:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C877EBD.6709D852@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36749

CAM wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >
> > >Valentine Germann wrote:
> >
> > >> . . . have been right all along. You really ARE worthless!
> > >> But I had to make completely sure, in real time, for myself.
> > >> Thanks for removing any doubts I might have had! :-)
> >
> > >Who cares? You don't have to balls to post your real name.
> >
> > How do you know that Valentine Germann is not a real name?
>
> Odds. Valentine Germann would be a total stranger to me. This
> guy is no stranger.

Do you *really* think that you're a stranger to the many people who read
this NG
but never post? He finally decided to post.

705. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 00:48:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C877F24.22250CCB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36651

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Aha Dick, it is you. Come on, don't deny it
> >
> > Deny it? I'm ROFL*M*AO this time. You really stepped on it this time,
> > Old Troll
>
> If you're not him, he must be your twin brother. You two think alike
> and talk alike. I note that you didn't deny it.

You really think I'm the only one who thinks like I do, especially where you're concerned?

706. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 00:48:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C878016.3633ABCB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36652

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Just so you'll know, I DO have a kind and courteous manner. I have
> > learned not to waste it on certain types of people.
>
> Homo sapiens, for instance.

Only a small subset of them.

707. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 00:48:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C877FE1.F5955ACF@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36750

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > How do you know that Valentine Germann is not a real name?
> >
> > He thinks it's me, ghostwriting. Wonder it the black helo has landed in
> > his yard yet. It's been circling for awhile.
>
> Please swear on your word of honor that it isn't you, Dick. "Val" is
> much too familiar with me to be a stranger. He thinks exactly like
> you and even constructs sentences exactly like you using the same
> words that you use.

Cecil: *It isn't me*. Got it? Do you really think I would think up a name
such
as Valentine Germann to use as a nom de plume? Not a chance.
You're read much more far and wide than you realized.

708. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 00:48:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C87F6F3.D5B30A7C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36653

CAM wrote:

> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > You are a piece of work, no doubt.
>
> And are you going to deny having any connection to Dick Carroll?
> If you are a real person, I strongly suspect you have been posting
> Dick's words to your account. There are simply too many clues for
> it to be otherwise.

Clues? You're a complete and dismal failure as a "detective", Sir Cecil. I never knew the man existed until his first post here yesterday. I hereby state categorically that I have no connection whatever with Valentine Germann other than that we are both, apparently, residents of the same state. That good enough for ya?

He SAID he's been reading your drippings here for the past year. I guarantee that's enough for him to get your drift. For anyone else too, for that matter.

709. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 00:48:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C87F72D.F103B588@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36654

CAM wrote: The practice

> of posting one's words through someone else's account is not
> new.

It may not be new to you, but it sure would be for me.

710. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 00:48:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C87FC81.515400E5@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36655

N2EY wrote:

> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c877ef4_2@news7.fast.net>...
> > "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020307060339.06023.00000172@mb-dd.aol.com...
> > > From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> > >
> > > >It was the only mode available that would get through under the
> > conditions
> > > >experienced.
> > >
> > > In most cases, it is a much better choice to change frequencies than to
> > change
> > > modes. Perhaps that is what we should be teaching new hams.
> > >
> > > 73,
> > > Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
> > An EXCELLENT point, Ed!!!
>
> Agreed. If changing frequencies can improve circuit conditions, the
> frequencies are available at the stations involved, that's a
> good move.
> >
> > In fact, with the propagation prediction software available,
> > (I use PropMan2000 from Rockwell Collins ... $99) it is
> > possible to predict the best frequency quite accurately.
>
> If the emergency stations have it available, of course. And the
> predictions may not be accurate when most needed.
> >
> > The software even goes to the internet to download the
> > latest space weather and other factors so that the prediction
> > is truly as accurate and up to the minute as possible.
>
> Great! But if internet is available, why would ham radio be needed?
> >
> > Another thing which would be very useful for disaster
> > and emergency communications ... and also for routine
> > skeds to talk with friends (but would obviously not apply
> > to or appeal to DX chasers and contesters) is the potential
> > of using ALE "Automatic Link Establishment" software.
>

> Sure - IF the stations that need it, have it available.
> >
> > This is used, for example, on commercial and military
> > circuits where link reliability is or great interest. With
> > today's computer-controllable radios, I believe it would
> > be quite feasible for someone to write ALE software
> > for amateur use ...
>
> That's a "who's going to tie the bell on the cat" sort of someone.
> >
> > (Yes, someone will grumble "That's not REAL HAM
> > RADIO!", but my point is that for emergency and
> > disaster communications, "making it work" is the
> > name of the game, NOT "following tradition.")
>
> Actually, the tradition is to make it work.
>

Rarely if ever will you see so many "longtime hams", engineers all, who speak as though they had no experience and hardly a clue to that in which they claim to be expert. Amazing.

Yes, the tradition is to make it work, Jim, and by far the best way to make it work NOW, when it is needed, while the traffic sits waiting to be passed and while it is still timely,
not after some amount of detailed configuration and other time consuming tinkering, propagation forecasts failing to hold up, etc. etc. ad nauseum.
The need
is to know what works, when, where and * get it working*. NOW, not sometime tomorrow.
If one has available all the material and information needed to use the most optimal mode -and all of it works right, when you need it to work-
by all means USE IT! But anyone with experience in these situations KNOWS that mother nature has her own way of seeing to it that the best laid plans will come up woefully short.
Any ham who doesn't understand that at the bottom line it is he or she who will make the difference in whether or not vital message traffic is passed successfully places himself at high risk for failure. That is true not only for hams, but for most any endeavor.

>
> The problem is having all of this stuff available and working when needed, with
> people who know how to use it.

Wasted words on the techies, Jim, we've been over that road so much the pavement has grooves in
it.
If it isn't ALL based on high tech, they want nothing to do with it, nor for anyone else to have anything to do with it either, their disclaimers notwithstanding. They'd rather see the whole communications system fail.

Dick

711. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 00:48:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C87FD12.7C7FF454@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36656

CAM wrote:

> Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> > CAM wrote:
> >>Do you deny any connection to Dick Carroll?
>
> > I've seen his messages on this newsgroup. That's it.
>
> Are you denying that you have ever been in email contact
> with Dick Carroll?

I'll "deny" it for him---He has never been in ANY contact with me, of
any kind,
email or any other. Keep checking your rear view mirror for those black
Hueys, Cec.

712. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 00:48:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C87FF34.7FD6F00@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36657

Dennis Ferguson wrote:

> Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote:
> >"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020307055241.06023.00000168@mb-dd.aol.com...
> >> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
> >>
> >> >Let's face it ... SSB voice is by far the most popular mode on HF.
> >> >But, it's over 50 years old and I'd hate to see it over-run the digital
> >> >bands to the degree that it inhibits the growth of the new modes
> >> >that are the future of ham radio.
> >>
> >> "Voice" is not limited to SSB on HF, Carl. There is plenty of need for
> >amateur
> >> experimentation and innovation on the HF voice bands, too.
> >>
> >> http://www.arrl.org/survey.php3
> >>
> >> 73,
> >> Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
> >Ed,
> >
> >I recognize, and agree wholeheartedly with, your statement that
> >voice is not limited to SSB and that there is plenty of need for
> >amateur experimentation and innovation on the HF voice bands,
> >too.
>
> But doesn't that bring us around to the starting point? Why is
> it that one is allowed to run a 3 kHz wide digital signal carrying
> compessed, FECd voice bits in the "voice" bands, but not other
> kinds of bits? The bits are indistinguishable when you put them
> on the air, why are voice bits okay but other bits that look the
> same not okay? Why can't wide-band digital modes compete for space
> with the AM/SSB guys the way you want narrow-band digital modes to
> compete for space with CW? And why is it that if the band fades to
> the point where you can't finish your 3 kHz wide digital voice conversation,
> you can't fall back to a 100 Hz wide text mode on the same frequency
> to complete it?
>
> What I think I wish is that there weren't "voice" bands and "CW/data"
> bands, but rather that there were "6 kHz or less occupied bandwidth"
> bands, and "1 kHz or less occupied bandwidth" bands. Since the FCC's
> current mode regulations are sort of irrational when applied to

> digital modes, and since the FCC apparently doesn't like micromanaging
> what hams do with their signals and bands in any case, removing the mode
> regulations in favour of simple occupied bandwidth constraints
> plus "good engineering practice" might both make them happier and allow
> a wider variety of digital applications while keeping the traditional
> analog modes in their place.
>
> Note that this doesn't prevent the voice guys from coming down the
> band, but they can only do so if they can figure out how to fit
> it in 1 kHz of bandwidth. As this would require a step improvement
> in the state of the art of "spectrum efficiency", a current
> favoured technical way to accumulate spectrum preservation brownie
> points, even the CW guys might not object to living with the
> (exceedingly unlikely; SSB is already pretty efficient for voice if
> your aim is communications rather than quality) possibility that this
> might happen.

Dennis, I believe your views here and what you posted earlier re. the WTC Part 15
activity on IEEE 802(.something) is actually pretty close to what the ARS will
look like once the FCC finally (if it ever does) reorganizes us to a truly modern
service. And the bottom line is there is, or at least should not be, any conflict or
problem in integrating modes, old and new, into such a reorganization.

I may be an "Olde farte" and not a design engineer, but if you think I have a backward
viewpoint of the world of communications its because you've been believing the nonsense
that Cecil and Carl have been spouting for so long. And that's exactly what they wanted
you to believe solely because I believe in hams being able to use the most basic mode
of radiocommunications. Which, of course, is manual radiotelegraphy.

Dick

713. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 00:48:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8801BC.59C3049F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36658

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > The best response I have seen to date is that the Russian premise is
> > > ridiculous. :-)
> >
> > It's ridiculous because it is pointless. Who needs a license in memorized
> > Russian?
>
> On the contrary, Dick, it is definitely not pointless. If you do it, you will
> win the argument.

I'm not trying to win any argument, in fact you and Ed are doing all the
arguing. I merely
state what I know to be factual, and as you can see it is once again backed up by

authoritative sources.

> Why are you not willing to spend what you say is a trivial
> amount of time performing what you say is a trivial task in order to win a
> big victory in the argument?

Why am I unwilling to submit to yet another of your endless trolls? Do you
really need to ask?

714. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 00:48:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C88077C.214BA6DC@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36659

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > In most cases, it is a much better choice to change frequencies than to change
> > > modes. Perhaps that is what we should be teaching new hams.
> >
> > I don't really agree with that statement. If propagation on 40 mtrs drops out, we
> > should then
> > plan on automatically changing bands to 75? That opens up a whole set of problems.
>
> That's the way Intel had their emergency communications organized, Dick. Changing
> frequencies is a lot easier than changing modes, especially if all the operators
> are not practiced and prepared for their brand of CW traffic. For instance, Intel
> didn't have a straight key and, at the time, I couldn't handle the paddles.
>
> > If you've ever changed bands under those circumstances, you'll understand. I have.
>
> Intel iEARS practices emergency communications once a week, Dick. They have a
> calling schedule which dictates changing bands until communications is established.
> Then if communications fades, they go back to the original band rotation until
> communications are again established.
>
> > What usually happens is the two stations lose each other, and wind up back on the
> > same frequency trying to make a dying circuit work, absent better previous
> > planning.
>
> Why would they be absent better previous planning? To make CW more attractive?
> Once again, it seems you are advocating a lack of planning and preparation in
> order to push your agenda.

You give CW, and Intel, far too much credit.

ONE MORE TIME.....

CW should be available as a last resort, useful
when whatever better mode you may be lucky enough to have available fails. Got it?

All you guys who are so hard-core in your belief that "planning" will solve all ills
and provide all you need are in store for a brush with Mother Nature. Stuff happens
on its own schedule, at a time and place of its own choosing. To blithely assume that
all hams can, should, and would "prepare" themselves and their stations to handle
any communications emergency that might occur anywhere is asking the futile. Sure,
larger organizations and EMA associated groups often spend considerable time and
funding to set up serious emergency systems, which are rarely used, and this facet

of ham radio often becomes a sub-hobby itself, but it is frankly a rarity when considered
as a small part of the whole which is ham radio.
In a widespread disaster, the very first need is for information to be passed from the scene of destruction to relief and rescue agencies far enough away that they aren't directly affected by the incident, and situated so that they would serve as the help that such incidents demand. Without explicit information as to what happened, exactly where it happened, the numbers of persons needing what sort of assistance, in what exact form, and exactly where to send that relief, over what surviving routes- that is the sort of activity that ham radio operators should be expected to quickly fill an instantly occurring need. Prior planning for such an occurrence can be expected to be minimal since no one can predict with any accuracy where or when they will happen.

Most states have, or had, statewide emergency nets which meet on SSB or CW, and few if any have organized nets that use other modes. So when disaster strikes, what would be

the most likely mode that most hams would be expected to fire up their rigs on, for coverage
beyond the local area? SSB, of course, and when that fails, CW.
Planning for the use of more efficient modes is indeed a desirable thing. But to realistically
expect to find many hams in any given area actually using them on the air on the spur of the
moment at a time of disaster is somewhat unrealistic. One uses what one finds available at the
time of need. If that happens to be SSB and when that fails due to conditions, CW, it makes sense to be prepared to "meet the need".
Dick

715. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 00:48:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C880A28.E501E902@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36660

CAM wrote:

> mike coslo wrote:
> > I'm sure Dick meant the test was dumbed down, not the person taking it.
>
> Well, if the people entering the amateur radio service are not dumbed
> down, what does it matter?

So your point is that since you were an engineer, and not "dumbed down" by
a technical test that you would have been able to pass regardless of its
complexity
then no other ham who acquired a license other than entry level would do so
while
lacking proper technical knowledge. You insist you're not an exception when
you are
the very model of an exception. Save the 20wpm code test which is not a part
of
the written but is a separate example of lowered qualifications on its own.

> You see, Dick is trying to have his cake
> and eat it too. If the new hams are not dumbed down, then the ARS
> is not being dumbed down. If the ARS is being dumbed down, then the
> new hams are being dumbed down. Inescapable logical conclusion: If
> Dick is right, taking an amateur radio exam dumbs people down and to
> avoid being dumbed down, people should avoid taking amateur radio exams.
> Dick clearly believes that if everyone avoids taking an amateur radio
> exam, then the ARS will not be dumbed down.

Wrong. Since the time when I first came to the point of helping others to
get
their ham radio license I have always believed that anyone who wants to get
licensed should be able to have the opportunity to do so. Not an eased
qualification opportunity, but a reasonable opportunity. That's why I started

a VE team and ran it for the first eight years of VE testing. Your
conclusion is false, and indeed it only matches your flawed sense of
the way things are, and does not match with reality at all.

> Does that hint something
> about sandboxes?

Has your cat been visiting yours? You seem so engrossed in it lately.

716. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 00:58:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307195846.06778.00000014@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 36664

In article <20020307173950.08738.00000332@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>>>The editors and phrasemakers at the ARRL are very good at what
>>>>they do. If they had meant "support" they would have reworded
>>>>article two.
>
>>>Do you think they are good enough at what they do to have said
>>"unconditionally
>>>loyal" or "obedient?" Do you think they were good enough at what they do
>>that
>>>they intended to use the words encouragement and support to expand on what
>>they
>>>meant by the term "loyal?"
>>
>>I'll just repeat what was written. If "support" were intended, the phrase
>>makers would
>>have reworded that article. The rewritten article two as of 1999 still
>>contains the word
>>"LOYAL" in full caps as the first word.
>>
>>It is fairly obvious and not really a good argument that what the ARRL
>>rewrote
>>from
>>the 1928 original and the original being an implicit statement of national
>>organization loyalty ONLY to the ARRL.
>>
>>We could quibble endlessly over the phrasing with Ed Hare "replying" solely
>>by
>>questions and myself patiently explaining the basics of phrasemaking as used
>>by wordsmiths in all fields. That's counterproductive, produces nothing
>>since
>>the
>>meaning is quite obvious.
>>
>>>Do you think they intended anything when they put
>>>such loyalty to other amateurs and local radio clubs first.
>>
>>I've already said that the ARRL phrasemakers are good. I will add that they
>>are
>>not foolish, either.
>>

>>Let me give you an old example of loyalty phrasing that's been unofficial
>and
>>around a very long time. The USMC has in internal loyalty phrase/oath/etc.:
>>
>> "For Corps, God, and country"
>>
>>There's nothing wrong with the phrase. The order of the wording can be
>>questioned. The fictitious example, probably seen by many is from the
>>motion picture, "A Few Good Men," primarily a military courtroom drama.
>>That phrase's word ordering is challenged by the defense attorney who
>>drives home one of the central points of the emotional loading to emphasize
>>espirit de corps carried almost beyond reasonable limits.
>>
>>Those who haven't been in any military service will disregard it, those who
>>are "USMC forever" will be furious and outraged that it is brought up at
>all.
>>It is nonetheless an emotionally-loaded phrase with a specific order of
>>words that implicitly puts the "Corps" ahead of "God" with "country" last.
>>
>>As a phrase by itself it can be subject to quibbling on word useage. As an
>>emotionally-loaded phrase for an organization whose primary mission is to
>>destroy (kill) an enemy it fulfills its purpose very well. The mission of
>>any
>>military is exremely harsh...put succinctly it is "kill or be killed."
>>Emotional
>>support is necessary to maintain espirit de corps in such an environment.
>>
>>I've used an extreme analogue in phrasings. The order of precedent of words
>>in article two of "The Amateur's Code" is common sense, logical even in a
>>lightly emotionally-loaded phrase. That leaves the last loyalty object,
>that
>>of
>>the ARRL.
>>
>>There is NO qualifier of any kind as to the national-international
>>organization
>>"which represents amateur radio." It is SOLELY that of the ARRL. Succint.
>>No shading or implication of any other national or international
>>organization.
>>
>>>Do you still think the intent of the point in the code of conduct is to be
>>>loyal "solely" to ARRL?
>>
>>Absolutely. This has been explained to you.
>>
>>>Is this another one of those "what was said, what was heard" sort of
>things?
>>
>>No. "The Amateur's Code" article two is quite specific in stating where and
>

>>to whom a (radio) amateur's loyalty should belong.
>>
>>Failure to accept the obvious, the long-repeated phrase indicates either an
>>extreme loyalty to the ARRL or a simple failure to read and comprehend
>>English words, phrases, statements, or meanings.

You have chosen to "reply" by an entire quote without adding
any comment whatsoever.

I will have to take that as either capitulation or frustration at not
being able to add any spin to a reply.

Matters not. Quibbling over word ordering in phrases is
counterproductive.

717. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 00:58:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307195848.06778.00000016@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 36661

In article <20020307174847.08738.00000339@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>>Sorry, MIKEY, I am not authorized as an English teacher. No help.
>
>Now, now, Len, a few posts back, you were trying to help me wiht my English
>comprehension. Or so you said... hmmm...

Let me add TYPING ABILITY.

I've heard that "Mavis Bacon Teaches Typing" is a good computer learning program and offer that as a suggestion.

718. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 00:58:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307195848.06778.00000015@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 36665

In article <20020307173852.08738.00000329@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
writes:

>>rom: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>>ARRL has a policy decision that it will not oppose changes that would remove
>>>Morse code testing as an international treaty requirement.
>>
>>Since very recently. The ARRL has been in existance since 1914.
>
>Okay, but if you have to go back to 1914. . . :-)

Follow the context of a reply. ALL THE WORDS.

Selective quoting is a very poor technique in debate although it is
extensively used in Internet squabling. You are engaging in mere
squabling.

Your own one-sentence "questions" as replies may be "worked over"
with the same technique to show you the foolishness. You will not
like the result. Neither will your employer.

>>The ARRL has been OPPOSED to
>>morse code test removal up to and including 1998 at which time
>>the IARU reached a consensus view on removal of that test; the
>>ARRL remained in opposition and announced so publicly.
>
>I believe that you are talking about the IARU Region 3(?) consensus view on
the
>removal of that test. ARRL is represented in that Region because of the US
>territories in the Pacific. At the time, I believe ARRL was the sole
>dissenting vote, in line with the stated policy at the time.

"You believe?" It was posted on the ARRL website. You have used that
in previous messages. Try last year.

>>The ARRL announced a policy shift LAST YEAR that "it will not
>>oppose removal of the code test." Last year was 87 years since
>>founding.
>
>I think we can stipulate that you can add and subtract okay, Len.

How gracious of you, your majesty.

>>The recent policy statement is rather boilerplate as far as political
>>wording goes. The ARRL has simply given up on the code test
>>issue around ITU-R S25.5 along with implications that it will not

>>oppose FCC removal of the code test.
>
>The ARRL has not changed its policy wrt the FCC removal of the test. I
>imagine it will not consider that matter until there is something specific on
the
>plate to consider.

The preliminary view of the FCC for WRC-03 on S25.1 through S25.6 has
been posted at the end of February. If you will recall, I am the one
who gave the document number and its location at the FCC...no one else
gave any specifics although Carl Stevenson came very close.

Just "how specific on the plate" must something be?!?

>>I'll have to give the ARRL back-room boys a round of applause on
>>recognizing the future. FINALLY.
>
>The policy was not kept in a back room, Len. From what I heard, the
>discussions about that policy would have been appropriate for a back room.
>:-)

We all know that back-room deliberations are kept secret there.

Have you anything NEW to report?

>>>Is this another one of those "what was said, what was heard" sort of
>things?
>>
>>Is this another ARRL-apologist's spins to misdirect the subject?
>
>No, I think we kept right on subject.

Then we can all take it that you are spinning as an ARRL-apologist.

Understood.

>>>Is this another one of those "what was said, what was heard" sort of
>things?
>>
>>Is this another ARRL-apologist's spins to misdirect the subject?
>
>Nope, we are still on the subject.
>
>Goodness, you are easily confused when you want to be!

Not at all. Misdirection into squabbling is easily perceived.

>You are correct, but how do those statements explain your belief that ARRL is
>trying to control you?

Incorrect. I stated that the ARRL is exercising CONTROL through labeling
itself as THE representative of US amateur radio to the FCC and from an
88-year tenure under such a claim. That is CONTROL over ALL amateurs.

ARRL membership is still less than a quarter of all licensed US radio amateurs.

>>Why do you deny that the ARRL has had a strong influence
>>on the government regarding amateur radio regulations?
>
>I do not deny that Len. I would not put the amount of energy I put into the
>FCC regulatory filings I particiate in if I felt that such work would not have
>influence. Why would I *want* to say that?

Who is Ed Hare's employer?

>>Are you saying that First Amendment rights "do not apply" when
>>it comes to amateur radio regulations?
>
>Yup, it is another one of those "what he said, what he heard" sort of things.

You did not answer the question.

You wish to use the single-sentence question as a "reply" on most
of your postings. That is a perfect example of the "what he said, what
he heard" sayings.

Why is that method exclusive and unidirectional for yourself, yet
"not allowed" for others?

>I don't believe that misdirection is needed here, Len, and we are still on
>topic. If you feel ridiculed, it was not due to misdirection.

Please do not engage in any more mind-fornication techniques. Those
are tiresome and transparent.

Your employer may not be pleased. The ARRL still hasn't membership
of even a quarter of licensed US radio amateurs. You are not making
things better.

719. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 00:58:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307195849.06778.00000017@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 36662

In article <20020307174648.08738.00000338@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
>>I'm dizzy for sure. I hate to see what Lennie would do with the Boy
>>Scout oath!!
>
>Well, he admitted from the getgo that he was trolling, so we can just all
>give the old fellow some fun.

False attribution.

Some (K2ASP) have referred to multi-tiered (older class) licensing as a "federal merit badge." [see early Comments on 98-143]

Presumably that referred to a boy scout merit badge.

What does Scouting have to do with US amateur radio licensing policy? Please be specific.

Why aren't the Girl Scouts included in this "oath" discussion? Is it because US amateur radio has become a white male dominated avocation?

Why are all your "replies" just questions?

Is that the "fun" you engage in?

720. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 00:58:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307195850.06778.00000018@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 36663

In article <20020307180951.08738.00000347@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>There are seven Germann's in the QRZ data base, none from Missouri.
>>Are you trying to tell me that Valentine Germann is the real name
>>of a Missouri ham?
>
>I may have missed it; did he say he was licensed? Did he say he held a US
>license? He could be a ham operating under one of the international
>agreements. He could be N0CALL, too. :-)
>
>He could be Len under an assumed name!

I have NO "assumed name" within the body of ANY chat room message.

Why are you "having fun" with this sort of nonsense?

Is this what grown-up ARRL employees do to tout the glories of ARRL membership and "representation?"

One of the Directors of the ARRL is named "Fried Heyn" isn't he?

Are you really sure you want to go this way on names?

721. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 01:14:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C88106E.205E8FF3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36666

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You really think I'm the only one who thinks like I do, especially where
> you're concerned?

It would be extremely unlikely to find another person who thinks like you
do, Dick. It reminds me of an old Texas Aggie joke: The punchline was:
"Go back, go back, there's two of them!"
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

722. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 01:16:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8810D1.F7C12D4F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36667

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Clues? You're a complete and dismal failure as a "detective", Sir
> Cecil.

As a detective, I made a good engineer.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

723. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 01:17:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C881139.3889385C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36669

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote: The practice
> > of posting one's words through someone else's account is not
> > new.
>
> It may not be new to you, but it sure would be for me.

I posted from N5AQM's account while I was visiting him in AZ.
I assume that's quite commonplace.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

724. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 01:18:50 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C88117F.3174A6DE@adelphia.net>
Source record: 36668

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Thank you for the suggestions, MIKEY.

> There are a number of ways to work with the government, MIKEY.

> >Hold on a second, Lennie. maybe you can help me with my comprehension
> >here.
>
> Sorry, MIKEY, I am not authorized as an English teacher. No help.

Nor are you authorized as a member of the ARS. I notice that has not stopped you from posting your thoughts on that.
>
> MIKEY, I would suggest you write to the ARRL for help with your
> amateur radio understandings.
>
> Did you have anything further, then, MIKEY?

Yes, I do. Why do you choose to use words, like vow, when the word actually used was offer. I was kind of hoping you would have answered that in the last post, but you must have forgotten.

- Mikey -

725. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 01:21:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C881227.E5CC28AD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36671

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > On the contrary, Dick, it is definitely not pointless. If you do it, you will
> > win the argument.
>
> I'm not trying to win any argument, in fact you and Ed are doing all the
> arguing. I merely
> state what I know to be factual, and as you can see it is once again backed up by
> authoritative sources.

Authoritative sources????? Shirley, you jest. You haven't offered one iota
of proof that anyone rote-memorizes 1000 Q&A on their way to passing an exam.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

726. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 01:22:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C881246.2456A66E@adelphia.net>
Source record: 36670

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

> Don't worry, Mike. English is not the ONLY thing he's incompetent or
> unskilled at...He's not much on instructing technical matters, either.

He seems to ignore the most important part of my post, where I was wondering about the word "vow", and how it doesn't seem to be the same as "offer". I thought it was an important distinction.

- Mikey -

727. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 01:24:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8812D3.2733D2B3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36672

Dick Carroll wrote:
> All you guys who are so hard-core in your belief that "planning" will solve all ills
> and provide all you need are in store for a brush with Mother Nature.

You really should try a little advanced planning once in awhile, Dick.
You might find it to be downright useful.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

728. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 01:59:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307205936.14946.00000023@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 36674

In article <3c87f00d_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:975b4ea9.0203070951.331183a5@posting.google.com...
>> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
>news:<3c86ab34_2@news7.fast.net>...
>> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> > news:9f4bfe89.0203061314.1c349469@posting.google.com...
>> > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
>> > news:<3c825bb7_1@news7.fast.net>...
>> > > >
>> > > > And there is no danger posed to Morse-proficient hams (or
>> > > > the public in general) by non-Morse-proficient hams ... except
>> > > > perhaps the "danger" that Morse enthusiasts will have to pro-
>> > > > actively recruit new Morse enthusiasts instead of relying on the
>> > > > "Morse welfare state" of mandatory Morse proficiency testing ...
>> > >
>> > > The danger is interference.
>> >
>> > I keep hearing that, but I don't buy it ...
>>
>> Of course not - it supports code testing ;-)
>
>Not really ... but 1 point for trying :-)
>
>> > there is NO reason that
>> > anyone needs to be able to COPY Morse to be able to tell
>> > that it's there and avoid transmitting on top of it ...
>>
>> What constitutes "on top of"?
>>
>> Example 1:
>>
>> CW operator A hears Operator B's S4 PSK31 signal on 3578.000 kHz. The
>> books all say PSK31 only needs 50-100 Hz of bandwidth, etc., etc., and
>> A knows this. r A's rig is equipped with good xtal filters and high
>> dynamic range, so he tunes off about 500 Hz and can no longer hear any
>> trace of the PSK31 signal. 3577.500 is clear but A asks if the
>> frequency is clear in standard fashion and gets no response, so he
>> blasts away with a CQ.
>>
>> What A doesn't know and cannot know is that B is using the typical
>> soundcard-and-SSB rig implementation of PSK31, and B's rig inhales

>> about 3 kHz of the band at once. A also doesn't know that his signal
>> is S9+ at Operator B's location, because B is using QRP and an attic
>> dipole.
>>
>> A's signal takes over B's AGC (which B cannot defeat because B's rig
>> doesn't
>> have an AGC off switch) and makes a mess of B's copy. C, who is in QSO
>> with
>> B, thinks "those "#$%^&@ CW lid is intentionally QRMing!" - which is
>> NOT
>> the case at all. But B and C can neither tell A what is going on nor
>> even identify him.
>>
>> How far away from each digital signal must a CW station stay to avoid
>> such problems?
>
>Such problems happen all the time with all modes ... receiver
>blocking, AGC "pumping," etc. are facts of life ...

Maybe to you, but I've found that decent rigs have defeatable AGC,
narrow filters and high dynamic range. And they're not expensive.

>this is NOT
>something that is unique to CW or which justifies a Morse test.

Of course it's not unique to CW. But it points to reasons to keep
modes separated, which is the issue.

>> The scenario could be reversed. But I suspect your response would be
>> something
>> like "tough - the CW station should use a 'better' mode" or some such.
>> ;-)
>
>Not at all ... my reaction would be "stuff happens." Turn the
>knob a bit and find a frequency that works.
>
>You seem to think that a Morse test will guarantee some sort
>of idylic, interference free world ...

Nope - just an alternative to a digital tower of Babel.

>that's simply not the case.
>
>What about the situation where other mixes of modes cause
>the same phenomenon and the operators can't copy each
>other's transmissions? Same thing ...

Exactly.
>
>We can't partition our bands rigidly into little compartments
>for each and every mode ... that would be EXTREMELY
>wasteful.

We do it with phone vs. digital/CW.
>
>> > any more
>> > than a Morse op needs to be able to copy PSK31 or RTTY
>> > in his head to be able to tell the signal is there and avoid it.
>>
>> NO reason? I disagree!
>>
>> Example 2:
>>
>> D listens on a frequency and hears nothing. Is that sufficient to
>> avoid
>> interference? Maybe, maybe not. Suppose the frequency is in use by E
>> and F, but F is inaudible at D's location and vice versa. But D and E
>> can hear each other S9++. If D simply starts transmitting without
>> asking if the frequency is in use, he clobbers E and F's QSO. How does
>> E let D know the frequency is in use
>> if D does ask, if they cannot communicate?
>>
>> > I think you're grasping at straws ..
>>
>> Nope. One of the most fundamental reasons for radio regulations is the
>> avoidance of interference. Hardly a "straw".
>
>Same as above ... "stuff happens" ...
>
>You're making it sound like a little unintentional interference
>is the end of the world as we know it or something ... the
>fact of the matter is that there is no way that some modest
>amount of unintentional interference is totally avoidable ...
>whether between modes or same mode on same mode ...
>propagation and other factors virtually guarantee it ... lighten
>up a bit and be more flexible ... things will work out without
>stuffing everyone into narrow, confining little "cubby holes."

You asked for reasons and I gave 'em.

73 de Jim, N2EY

729. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 01:59:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307205937.14946.00000024@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 36673

In article <20020307175135.08738.00000340@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: N2EY@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>What A doesn't know and cannot know is that B is using the typical
>>soundcard-and-SSB rig implementation of PSK31, and B's rig inhales
>>about 3 kHz of the band at once. A also doesn't know that his signal
>>is S9+ at Operator B's location, because B is using QRP and an attic
>>dipole.
>
>Same thing can happen with key clicks and SSB IMD.

Not if the rigs are designed and operated properly.

>The solution to both
>problems is better address techncially, not through code testing.

Or a CW-only subband....

>>How far away from each digital signal must a CW station stay to avoid
>>such
>>problems?
>
>Just far enough not to have problems, I would say.

Sounds like the classic answer to the question "How long should table legs be?" (Long enough to reach the floor).

>And in any event, knowing or not knowing the code would not have prevented
>the interference.

But it could lead to a solution.

73 de Jim, N2EY

730. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 02:15:54 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c882088_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36676

"Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote in message
news:a68nge$27qn$1@heap.juniper.net...
> Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote:
> >"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020307055241.06023.00000168@mb-dd.aol.com...
> >> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
> >>
> >> >Let's face it ... SSB voice is by far the most popular mode on HF.
> >> >But, it's over 50 years old and I'd hate to see it over-run the
digital
> >> >bands to the degree that it inhibits the growth of the new modes
> >> >that are the future of ham radio.
> >>
> >> "Voice" is not limited to SSB on HF, Carl. There is plenty of need for
> >amateur
> >> experimentation and innovation on the HF voice bands, too.
> >>
> >> http://www.arrl.org/survey.php3
> >>
> >> 73,
> >> Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
> >Ed,
> >
> >I recognize, and agree wholeheartedly with, your statement that
> >voice is not limited to SSB and that there is plenty of need for
> >amateur experimentation and innovation on the HF voice bands,
> >too.
>
> But doesn't that bring us around to the starting point? Why is
> it that one is allowed to run a 3 kHz wide digital signal carrying
> compessed, FECd voice bits in the "voice" bands, but not other
> kinds of bits? The bits are indistinguishable when you put them
> on the air, why are voice bits okay but other bits that look the
> same not okay? Why can't wide-band digital modes compete for space
> with the AM/SSB guys the way you want narrow-band digital modes to
> compete for space with CW? And why is it that if the band fades to
> the point where you can't finish your 3 kHz wide digital voice
conversation,
> you can't fall back to a 100 Hz wide text mode on the same frequency
> to complete it?

Dennis,

You are absolutely correct as far as I am concerned. If I gave
any other impression, it was by not being clear ... "bits is bits"
is absolutely correct and the content doesn't make a darned
bit of difference.

And as far as your last question is concerned, I see no reason
not to be able to fall back to a more robust mode on the same
frequency ... though that robustness may not necessarily be
achieved by going to a narrowband mode, but could alternatively
use a more robust modulation and coding scheme in the same
bandwidth. (one option, in addition to always thinking "narrower
is (always) better")

> What I think I wish is that there weren't "voice" bands and "CW/data"
> bands, but rather that there were "6 kHz or less occupied bandwidth"
> bands, and "1 kHz or less occupied bandwidth" bands. Since the FCC's
> current mode regulations are sort of irrational when applied to
> digital modes, and since the FCC apparently doesn't like micromanaging
> what hams do with their signals and bands in any case, removing the mode
> regulations in favour of simple occupied bandwidth constraints
> plus "good engineering practice" might both make them happier and allow
> a wider variety of digital applications while keeping the traditional
> analog modes in their place.

I find myself unable to find a rational reason to disagree on
a technical basis ... or a philosophical one, either, for that
matter.

I've been speaking in terms that have been intended to result
in the least "inflamation" of the traditional view that voice and
data are (and must forever remain) separate ... but the engineer
in me knows that that's a contrivance that's outdated.

> Note that this doesn't prevent the voice guys from coming down the
> band, but they can only do so if they can figure out how to fit
> it in 1 kHz of bandwidth. As this would require a step improvement
> in the state of the art of "spectrum efficiency", a current
> favoured technical way to accumulate spectrum preservation brownie
> points, even the CW guys might not object to living with the
> (exceedingly unlikely; SSB is already pretty efficient for voice if
> your aim is communications rather than quality) possibility that this
> might happen.

I've always maintained that the metric of spectrum efficiency
is bits/Hz ... to do voice in a 1 kHz or less bandwidth would
require some pretty sophisticated modulation and coding
and even still would likely suffer in terms of robustness
(can't violate Shannon ... the old tradeoff between bw and
s/n ratio) Your comment that SSB is already pretty efficient
for voice is correct ... essentially a 1:1 mapping between
"source data" bandwidth and "channel bandwidth".

However, deep down in the engineer in me, I do believe
that ultimately, in the future, bits will be bits and integrated
voice and data service, where it, as you put it, it doesn't
matter what the bits represent, will prevail. That approach
will allow flexible, efficient allocation and use of bandwidth
which adapts to the demands of the moment ... one minute
a frequency may be carrying voice, the next computer data
such as e-mail or a file transfer, the next a picture, etc.

Whoa ... a modern view of the future ... you and I need to be
more careful how we speak around here ... our species has
a history of burning heretics at the stake :-)

73,
Carl - wa6vse

731. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 02:20:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307212019.04915.00000023@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 36675

In article <20020307174506.08738.00000337@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>It is fairly obvious and not really a good argument that what the ARRL
>>rewrote from
>>the 1928 original and the original being an implicit statement of national
>>organization loyalty ONLY to the ARRL.
>
>If that is your way of ceding that ARRL did not say that one should be loyal
>solely to the ARRL, I think we are in agreement.

We are not. I gave you the logical proof in plain text before.

Absent any qualifier word, the loyalty to a national/international representative is implicitly ONLY to the ARRL.

Your denial of the obvious and attempts at misdirection do not apply.

>No, I guess we are not in agreement. If your ARRL-antagonist spin is that
>ARRL does not promote loyalty to other organizations through the amateur code
of
>conduct, you are correct.
>
>There, wasn't that easy. Do you feel better now?

No, but I'm glad you feel better in thinking the matter is "settled.".

I'm sure your employer is happy as well.

>>>Do you still think the intent of the point in the code of conduct is to be
>>>loyal "solely" to ARRL?
>
>>Absolutely. This has been explained to you.
>
>Of course, the fact that the League promotes other organizations from time to
>time won't enter into the discussion, I am sure. :-)

The ARRL MENTIONS other organizations. Since when did it "promote" them?

Your sentence does NOT invalidate what I've explained to you about article two of "The Amateur's Code."

That article is rather specific as to the loyalty of an amateur to THE national/international "representative" of amateur radio. There is NO "promotion" of any other national or international organization in article two.

Are you going to continue this word-game charade to please your
employer?

732. Twistedhed The Punch Clown

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 02:23:38 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0203071823.7a2182fa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 36677

Subject: More Twistedhed's Blathering
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Author: twistedhed@webtv.net (Twistedhed)
Date: 2001-03-26 17:20:06 PST

in 3741-3A87F5A4-23@storefull-122.iap.bryant.webtv.net
twistedhed@webtv.net wrote:
>nice forgery Dougie but the headers don't lie.
>Undoubtedly you don't understand how the Usenet
>works so I will explain it to you, my anonymous
>acolyte
>what do you know of my life? The jockstrap you sent
>in the mail is a trophy of your docile worship of
>me and it hangs proudly above my mantle
>I will never cease pirate CB activity as long as it irks
>you or someone like you. However, as a consolation
>and to ease your suffering, I will stay within the
>confines of the freeband for now. The saucer men tell
>me I have a good signal in the pile
==========

733. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 02:24:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C880EC6.671CC82D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36678

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

>
> My only concern is that, since
> 1) SSB is "the norm" for voice,

So then we should plan to utilize that voice mode which is widespread in
common usage.
Agreed wholeheartedly.

>
> 2) people tend to "use what they have"

Right. And since CW is the predominant digital mode, it only makes sense to
have it
available in our box of tricks, also, particularly as a mode of last resort..

Glad to see we finally agree!

734. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 02:24:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8819B4.FCCE4374@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36679

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> In most cases, it is a much better choice to change frequencies than to
> >change
> >> modes. Perhaps that is what we should be teaching new hams.
>
> > I don't really agree with that statement. If propagation on 40 mtrs drops
> >out, we
> >should then
> >plan on automatically changing bands to 75? That opens up a whole set of
> >problems.
>
> If propagation on 40 meters starts to fail, it is possible to temporarily
> switch to a narrower mode such as CW or to a digital mode with better encoding
> and complete the message. This presumes, of course, that one has only one or
> two messages to complete. But if the band is failing, it is generally only a
> short time before the band goes out altogether. In that case, changing to a
> frequency with better propagation is the better choice.

As always, it depends on circumstances. If one is attempting to pass a message,
or a few,
and can't complete it due to changing conditions, it may well be better to finish
the task at
hand before changing frequencies IF conditions on the "other" frequency are likely
to be at
least as poor. It is well known that emergency or disaster communications commonly
are
accompanied by very poor conditions as high storm static levels. Better use what
you have
at hand to finish the job at hand before looking into dumping the circuit
completely in favor
of a band change that might make things worse.

>
>
> I just find it odd that in all this "emergency" scenario, the only solution to
> a failing band being offered by people is the one that supports their views on
> code testing.
>

Why? Seems you find yourself constricted in your thinking just so you can go
along
with the code bashers. Curious,to say the least.

And it certainly is NOT the "only" solution, rather a solution that *is instantly
at hand*
one that comes prepackaged in virtually every HF ham rig built, available for use
only if hams
know how to use it.

>
> >If you've ever changed bands under those circumstances, you'll understand. I
> >have.
>
> We used to do it all the time on the county hunters nets, Dick, with 8-foot
> mobile antennas. Changing bands is a better choice most of the time than
> changing modes.
>

When operating under normal conditions, free of storm static, with a prearranged
plan
and a group doing what they routinely do, I certainly agree. Assuming you will
find
such circumstances in any given disaster/emergency situation where long distance
traffic
needs to be passed is making an assumption that is likely to fail to deliver.

>
> >What usually happens is the two stations lose each other, and wind up back on
> >the
> >same frequency trying to make a dying circuit work, absent better previous
> >planning.
>
> You are correct, previous planning is important to emergency communications.
> That planning let us change bands on the CH nets with impunity.
>

There probably isn't a whole lot you can do to inform me in the area of
emergency comm.
planning. I spend a dozen or so years -at work- deeply involved in communications
planning
for relief of a major earthquake and its victims, and learned a lot that I see
being overlooked by all the posters here who talk of such fine plans. Widespread
disasters have a way of not going according to some human plan.

The mechanics of post-disaster communications should indeed be the subject
of intensive planning and preparation. And a part of that planning that is
routinely
overlooked seems to be the part that can't be properly planned for-the case where
there
are people thrust into action by circumstances who must use what they find
available
on the spur of the moment. The hams who are what I always call the "early
reporters"
are some of those people. People who live in the area affected and upon whom
the outside world must rely on to get the initial information to the outside, upon

whom rests the lives of victims who need help soonest. Anyone who believes that every ham will be prepared to the maximum for all possible events and circumstances
likes to ignore reality. Most hams make little or no preparation beyond their routine activities.
That means that most have SSB, CW and 2meter FM available, and capabilities beyond

those is outside the norm.
Why so many posting here would decry the use of CW in such
circumstances is really strange and indeed indicates some sort of Agenda.

Dick W0EX

735. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 02:24:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C881DCA.191D72F5@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36681

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > You really think I'm the only one who thinks like I do, especially where
> > you're concerned?
>
> It would be extremely unlikely to find another person who thinks like you
> do, Dick

Thanks to Valentine Germann, one of many who think like I do, for proving you
wrong
yet again.

736. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 02:24:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C881FF1.2A6D10F6@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36680

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > On the contrary, Dick, it is definitely not pointless. If you do it, you will
> > > win the argument.
> >
> > I'm not trying to win any argument, in fact you and Ed are doing all the
> > arguing. I merely
> > state what I know to be factual, and as you can see it is once again backed up by
> > authoritative sources.
>
> Authoritative sources????? Shirley, you jest. You haven't offered one iota
> of proof that anyone rote-memorizes 1000 Q&A on their way to passing an exam.

That's exactly right, I haven't offered any such proof. And just for the record, yet one more
time, I DID NOT make any such claim, thus I intend to offer no such proof.
. That is all a construct of you and Ed who desperately
want, for some obscure reason, for me to look like I said that when I said no such thing.
Seems like y'all would rather they just go ahead and make the memory word associations

to pass their tests without anyone making mention of it. None of them are dumb enough
to try to memorize all the questions and their answers, and they know they don't need to.
It does make one wonder why its so important to you that no one talk about it. New hams-
to-be sure do know all about it.

737. Re: Reciprocal license for Mexico

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 02:45:54 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c8827b2_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36682
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Mexico hasn't signed the CITEL agreement on IARP,
so an IARP is worth zip nada in Mexico.

CITEL is, however, TRYING to "encourage" member
countries to sign on to recognize the IARP ... however,
while I love Mexico, I suspect that the approximately
$82 fee for a 6 reciprocal permit (valid for a maximum
of 6 months, or until your tourist card expires) is a factor
in motivating them not to rush to sign on ...

Carl - wa6vse

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gsmeht8.pminews@news.earthlink.net...
> On Thu, 07 Mar 2002 17:31:09 GMT, Diveman wrote:
>
> >I also read on the
> >ARRL site that licences for island operation can only be obtained in
Mexico
> >City. All in all this is seems quite impractical and confusing.
>
> Mexico is not the US. They have no illusions about making it easy
> for "ordinary folks" to get permits or licenses of any type.
>
> >Anyone have any experience in doing something like this in mexico? Is it
> >possible to obtain the permit before leaving home? Would love to hear
> >suggestions, advice, or anything that might help. Thanks very much,
>
> Depends on who you know and who THEY know, and the size of the salad
> that you buy the local radio inspector (I heard that phrase used by
> one on a visit to the US).
>
> Serioulsy, check with ARRL HQ which maintains a file of "how to
> get things done" in foreign countries. IIRC we do not have a
> separate reciprocity agreement with Mexico, but they may be included
> in the Inter-American treaty (CITEL). If so, you would have to get
> an International Amateur Radio Permit, which is like an International
> Driver License, to avoid a separate proceedingin Mexico.
>
> The US issuing agent for the IARP is the ARRL, so check with them.
>
> Vaya con Dios.
>
> ---

> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

738. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 02:54:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C882784.3E743C59@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36683

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> ultimately, in the future, bits will be bits and integrated
> voice and data service, where it, as you put it, it doesn't
> matter what the bits represent, will prevail. That approach
> will allow flexible, efficient allocation and use of bandwidth
> which adapts to the demands of the moment ... one minute
> a frequency may be carrying voice, the next computer data
> such as e-mail or a file transfer, the next a picture, etc.
>
> Whoa ... a modern view of the future ...

"The future"??? Sounds exactly like the ancient Internet. It's been around
for
many years already.
Ham radio should be an RF version of the Internet??? That might be a way to
get rid
of a lot of hams. How do you plan to keep interest in ham radio up with that
"plan"?

739. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 02:58:30 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c882ab2_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36684

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> distorted the facts again in
message news:3C87FC81.515400E5@worldnet.att.net...
>
> their disclaimers notwithstanding. They'd rather see
> the whole communications system fail.
>
> Dick

Dick,

Your assertion that "I (we)'d rather see the whole communications
system fail is patently false.

What I said (and some others have agreed with) is:

"Good planning and preparation for emergencies are more
valuable than Morse skill." (because if you've planned and
prepared well you won't NEED to fall back on Morse as a
"mode of last resort".)

... which is YOUR favorite "justification" for Morse testing.

(Let's just call it the "Dick can't plan things well and isn't willing to
prepare properly rationale for attempting to justify Morse testing.")

Carl - wa6vse

740. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 03:09:01 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c882d2d_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36685

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020307205936.14946.00000023@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <3c87f00d_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
> >
> >Such problems happen all the time with all modes ... receiver
> >blocking, AGC "pumping," etc. are facts of life ...
>
> Maybe to you, but I've found that decent rigs have defeatable AGC,
> narrow filters and high dynamic range. And they're not expensive.

Yes, I know ... but blocking, etc. still happen ... if the operator
knows how to use available controls on his radio, they can
be minimized, I agree ... but they still happen.

> >this is NOT
> >something that is unique to CW or which justifies a Morse test.
>
> Of course it's not unique to CW.

You certainly seemed to be trying to make it seem like it was ...

> But it points to reasons to keep
> modes separated, which is the issue.

Ridiculous ...

> >> The scenario could be reversed. But I suspect your response would be
> >> something
> >> like "tough - the CW station should use a 'better' mode" or some such.
> >> ;-)
> >
> >Not at all ... my reaction would be "stuff happens." Turn the
> >knob a bit and find a frequency that works.
> >
> >You seem to think that a Morse test will guarantee some sort
> >of idylic, interference free world ...
>
> Nope - just an alternative to a digital tower of Babel.

Sounds like the words of someone who's afraid his favorite
mode will eventually be displaced by more modern things.

> >that's simply not the case.
> >
> >What about the situation where other mixes of modes cause
> >the same phenomenon and the operators can't copy each

> >other's transmissions? Same thing ...
>
> Exactly.
> >
> >We can't partition our bands rigidly into little compartments
> >for each and every mode ... that would be EXTREMELY
> >wasteful.
>
> We do it with phone vs. digital/CW.

Yes ... and as you will see from my response to Dennis'
well-reasoned comments, I have very mixed feelings
about that from a technical/spectrum management
perspective, but I've been trying to be sensitive to the
political/traditional sensitivities of many hams and not
generate large amounts of inflamatory turmoil ... then
YOU come along and advocate a 35% Morse ONLY
setaside in all of the HF bands !!!

> >You're making it sound like a little unintentional interference
> >is the end of the world as we know it or something ... the
> >fact of the matter is that there is no way that some modest
> >amount of unintentional interference is totally avoidable ...
> >whether between modes or same mode on same mode ...
> >propagation and other factors virtually guarantee it ... lighten
> >up a bit and be more flexible ... things will work out without
> >stuffing everyone into narrow, confining little "cubby holes."
>
> You asked for reasons and I gave 'em.

Maybe I should only ask for good, valid reasons in the
future :-)

Carl - wa6vse

741. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 03:15:17 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c882eb6_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36686

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020307180147.08738.00000344@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >3) given the apparent reuctance of "the masses"
> > to readily accept and adopt new things
> >that SSB would "spread out" to a degree that it
> >would impair the use of the HF bands by other modes.
> >(including CW, other narrowband digital modes, and
> >yet-to-be-developed modes) in ways that would be
> >harmful to the development of "the next generation"
> >of amateur radio technologies.
>
> Give the masses a bit more credit, Carl. First, the survey response
doesn't
> really support your item #3. The masses have adopted more digital
technology
> on HF in the teeth of existing CW use, so the historical trends are toward
> progress. The limitations on HF digital are not social; at this point,
they
> are regulatory.

Ed,

While PSK31 has met with pretty good success at adoption,
and I agree that there are regulatory barriers that need fixing,
I still think the masses could use a bit of a kick in the backside
in the direction of progress :-).

Carl - wa6vse

742. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 03:39:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307223955.25808.00000052@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 36687

>Subject: Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/07/02 19:58 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020307195849.06778.00000017@mb-bh.aol.com>

>What does Scouting have to do with US amateur radio licensing
>policy? Please be specific.

What do you care? Discussing "policy" at any given moment as opposed to SINCGARS, Army traffic handling of the 1950's, or the relative merits of the AMA seem to be interchangeable with you...

>Why are all your "replies" just questions?

Why don't you answer the questions put to you?

>Is that the "fun" you engage in?

Why not? Works for you. You managed five question marks in nine sentences.

743. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 03:47:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307224759.25808.00000053@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 36688

>Subject: Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 03/07/02 20:18 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C88117F.3174A6DE@adelphia.net>

>Yes, I do. Why do you choose to use words, like vow, when the word
>actually used was offer. I was kind of hoping you would have answered
>that in the last post, but you must have forgotten.
>

Forgive him, Mike. Forgetting things, at his age, is expected. Notice that his long term memory is fair, yet he can't remember what he typed yesterday.

Lennie likes to use lot's of words, but only he can define what they are supposed to mean at any given moment.

And when his words come back to bite him on his saggy lil butt, he claims "mis-attribution".

He's a riot!

73

Steve, K4YZ

744. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 04:11:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307231120.06778.00000022@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 36689

In article <3C88117F.3174A6DE@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> Thank you for the suggestions, MIKEY.
>
>> There are a number of ways to work with the government, MIKEY.
>
>> >Hold on a second, Lennie. maybe you can help me with my comprehension
>> >here.
>>
>> Sorry, MIKEY, I am not authorized as an English teacher. No help.
>
> Nor are you authorized as a member of the ARS. I notice that has not
>stopped you from posting your thoughts on that.

I have expressed the firm opinion that US amateur radio, indeed
all of amateur radio is an interesting, enjoyable avocation. Does
one need "authoritization" to do that?

Both Presidents Bush and Clinton have endorsed US amateur
radio. They are not "authorized" members of the ARS.

None of the FCC Commissioners or staffers need be "authorized"
by an amateur radio license to set or enforce regulations pertaining
to US amateur radio.

This chat room is not "authorized" to be closed only to "authorized"
ARS members. Maybe you should quickly pull out your "authority"
and close it so you will not be bothered by "unauthorized" citizens.

> Yes, I do. Why do you choose to use words, like vow, when the word
>actually used was offer. I was kind of hoping you would have answered
>that in the last post, but you must have forgotten.

Why did you choose to argue - incorrectly - some words in an old,
rewritten "Amateur's Code" which clearly state the ARRL's
claim to being the ONLY national/international organization "through
which amateur radio is represented?"

You attempt petty squablings over words because you feel someone
has sullied some personal pride you have. You've been put down
and refuse to acknowledge that, preferring to engage in word fights.
Some find such fights enjoyable just as some individuals are
sociopathic and are "superior" through "authorization." I would
suggest you direct your attention only to "authorized" ARS members.

This keeps discourse closed (and in-bred) wherein all can give each other high-fives over the good job each is doing. The public will never know what happens. No pain, no negative criticsm, everything static just like "it has always been that way." Doesn't that sound good for the "authorized" in the ARS?

With some really good "authorized" technical smarts the "authorized" might figure out how to keep RF interference from "unauthorized" electronic equipment all around their "authorized" residential radio stations. Without an "authorization" all those RFI victims must be doing illegalities on "unauthorized" interference reception!

That's just a reducto ad absurdum example of the kind of silly pride exhibited over words made by a very "authorized" organization for 74 years. If you wish to quibble over "authorization" for free speech in the USA, I suggest you take it up with the Supreme Court of the United States in regard to constitutionality. Good luck.

745. Re: If I won the lottery (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 04:17:40 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020307231740.16305.00000055@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 36690

In article <20020307175537.08738.00000341@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>I used to say that if I won the big one, I was going to go to work and quit.
>I
>have changed my mind. If I win the big one, I am going to go to work and they
>are going to fire me!
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

Why would you get fired if you went to work after winning the lottery?

I once won $800 in the lottery, and didn't quit or get fired. However, even after winning such a small amount, it was surprising how many people thought I "owed" them free drinks, meals, etc. I can just imagine what it must be like to win a few million -- but I'd still be willing to struggle with that problem!

73 de Larry, K3LT

746. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 04:21:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307232106.25808.00000057@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 36691

>Subject: Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/07/02 19:58 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020307195848.06778.00000015@mb-bh.aol.com>

>Follow the context of a reply. ALL THE WORDS.
>
>Selective quoting is a very poor technique in debate although it is
>extensively used in Internet squabling. You are engaging in mere
>squabling.

GEEZUS FAH-REEKIN' KEE-RYST!

Leonard H. Anderson berating someone (especially someone HONORABLE) about not quoting an entire post! Who wudda thunk it?

How much lower can this mudworm squat?

> If you will recall, I am the one
>who gave the document number and its location at the FCC...no one else
>gave any specifics...(SNIP)

Perhaps it's because SOME of us have more important things to do than chase the minute details of WRC's. Some of us CAN operate on the air, unlike yourself. Can you say "Anally retentive"..???

>Just "how specific on the plate" must something be?!?

Well, since you again berate Ed for allegedly not quoting your post, and then asking him a question out of context, I guess that would be hard to answer. But how about the FCC "not moving" until something SPECIFIC has occured with the TREATY that they are obliged to adhere to?

>Then we can all take it that you are spinning as an ARRL-apologist.
>
>Understood.

(A) He's not apologized for anything.

(B) There's nothing to apologize for.

You, on the otherhand, have reams to apologize for. Lying. Antagonizing. Slander. Misrepresentation. Lot's more, but those will do for now.

>>Goodness, you are easily confused when you want to be!
>
>Not at all. Misdirection into squabbling is easily perceived

He's done neither, so what is it you perceive, Lennie?

>>You are correct, but how do those statements explain your belief that ARRL
>is
>>trying to control you?
>
>Incorrect. I stated that the ARRL is exercising CONTROL through labeling
>itself as THE representative of US amateur radio to the FCC and from an
>88-year tenure under such a claim. That is CONTROL over ALL amateurs.

Then get a license, join the League and vote to change it.

>>>Why do you deny that the ARRL has had a strong influence
>>>on the government regarding amateur radio regulations?
>>
>>I do not deny that Len. I would not put the amount of energy I put into the
>>FCC regulatory filings I particiate in if I felt that such work would not
>have
>>influence. Why would I *want* to say that?
>
>Who is Ed Hare's employer?

What does it matter WHO his employer is, Lennie? his first sentence..."I
do not deny that, Len."

Are you now suggesting that because Ed's basic philosophical beliefs on
Amateur policy are the same as the League's, that his is just a "puppet"
response?

Seems to me one unlicensed Left Coast antagonist has been wenching about
people being able to speak their mind unencumbered...

However that ONLY seems to apply when the opinion expressed does NOT
counter your rants, Your Gonadlessness......

>You wish to use the single-sentence question as a "reply" on most
>of your postings.

I repeat the thinly veiled explitive at the beginning of this response...

POT/KETTLE/BLACK

>Why is that method exclusive and unidirectional for yourself, yet
>"not allowed" for others?

Hmmmm......You berate him for a question posed, then pose one
yourself.......

>Please do not engage in any more mind-fornication techniques. Those
>are tiresome and transparent.

POT/KETTLE/BLACK

Whatta Putz.

> You are not making things better.

Let's ask 1000 Amateurs who Lennie Anderson is and then ask who Ed Hare is...

747. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 04:25:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020307232538.25808.00000058@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 36692

>Subject: Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/07/02 19:58 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020307195846.06778.00000014@mb-bh.aol.com>

>You have chosen to "reply" by an entire quote without adding
>any comment whatsoever.

POT/KETTLE/BLACK

Lennie...you do it all the time.

>Matters not. Quibbling over word ordering in phrases is
>counterproductive.

Then why are you "quibbling" over what was probably an accidental "send"
before he was done?

Just had to take advantage of it to make your "message points"?

748. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 05:26:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C884996.E5C01B37@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36693

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> I still think the masses could use a bit of a kick in the backside
> in the direction of progress :-).

Ah, that's the good ol' Carl we know and love. Talk about "forcing"
hams to do something - Might as well hand out invitations to turn in
licenses.

749. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 06:06:43 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <a69kdj$11lb$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 36694

Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote:
>"Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote in message
>> Note that this doesn't prevent the voice guys from coming down the
>> band, but they can only do so if they can figure out how to fit
>> it in 1 kHz of bandwidth. As this would require a step improvement
>> in the state of the art of "spectrum efficiency", a current
>> favoured technical way to accumulate spectrum preservation brownie
>> points, even the CW guys might not object to living with the
>> (exceedingly unlikely; SSB is already pretty efficient for voice if
>> your aim is communications rather than quality) possibility that this
>> might happen.
>
>I've always maintained that the metric of spectrum efficiency
>is bits/Hz ... to do voice in a 1 kHz or less bandwidth would
>require some pretty sophisticated modulation and coding
>and even still would likely suffer in terms of robustness
>(can't violate Shannon ... the old tradeoff between bw and
>s/n ratio) Your comment that SSB is already pretty efficient
>for voice is correct ... essentially a 1:1 mapping between
>"source data" bandwidth and "channel bandwidth".

I don't think the last sentence quite captures it. To put it
in geeky terms the strength of SSB is that it is redundantly coded
(i.e. you can figure out what is being said without receiving it all
quite the way it was sent) in a way that provides a near-optimum match
to the maximum likelyhood decoder attached to your ears. The guys
that are good at it (this wouldn't be me) say this about CW as well,
actually, and I see no reason to disbelieve that either. Computers
can do neat stuff fairly easily if you change the problem outside
the application range humans can manage, say to lower or higher bit
rates than wetware modems are good for, or to make use of better
available S/N than people need, but you've got your work cut out for you
if you want to go head to head with people at the S/N edges for voice (this
I know for a fact), and I wouldn't be surprised if the same applied to
CW-rate data (though I don't know this for sure).

About the voice-squeezing thing this must reflect biases derived from
working at different levels of the technology, since while you and Ed
Hare both fixated on bit rate versus S/N ratio and Shannon's law, my
first instinct would be to go after the voice codec to reduce the
required bit rate in the first place. I don't know the theoretical
limit on how low the codec bit rate can go before it become impossible
to encode comprehensible speach, but I'll bet it's only clever
algorithms yet to be invented to get it lower than the crappy 1500 bps
codecs I've heard recently. If you could get it down to, say, 500 bps

then you might get it to fit even with a 2:1 expansion for convolutional coding and relatively low-tech modulation. Note that this also indicates why I don't think bps/Hz is always the right measure of system (as opposed to subsystem) efficiency. If the point of the system is to squeeze voice into 1 kHz of spectrum, minimizing the bps requirement can provide as much or more efficiency as maximizing bps/Hz.

>However, deep down in the engineer in me, I do believe
>that ultimately, in the future, bits will be bits and integrated
>voice and data service, where it, as you put it, it doesn't
>matter what the bits represent, will prevail. That approach
>will allow flexible, efficient allocation and use of bandwidth
>which adapts to the demands of the moment ... one minute
>a frequency may be carrying voice, the next computer data
>such as e-mail or a file transfer, the next a picture, etc.

Actually my experience with wired networks is that the "killer app" is almost always a big surprise, and is pretty much never what you imagined it would be when you started, which is why I've ended up in the anarchist "I don't care what you do as long as you do it" school of traffic (non-)managment. In fact sometimes what you find out is that there is no "killer app", and that you've built a solution with no problem, but I know of no way to predict this ahead of time either. You need to try it to see what happens, and you shouldn't be surprised if you are surprised by the result.

What I do think in this case, however, is that if there really is an HF digital "killer app" or two for the ARS lurking out there somewhere, there's a about a 50% chance that the mode regulations are standing firmly in its way, so I think it is probably worth while to fix that.

Dennis Ferguson

750. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 06:12:54 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a6an8j2p9e@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 36795

Wow.... well, something about the Texas air must be doing well for you.
Looks like ya age well! Hopefully you live another 30 years or more.

I will definitely contact ya when I do get a chance to make it that way, and
if you ever make it anywhere near Michigan, same applies also to you. I
will buy the cup of coffee. I guess that would apply for about 90% of the
other people I have enjoyed messaging with here in this group. Even those
that I disagreed with, but had the intelligence to debate the topics
correctly. I may disagree with some people, but it does not mean I do not
like them. After all, all we are here in the newsgroups is a Font or
Typeface.

Get around Michigan, give me a ring!

Ryan KC8PMX

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C8776F7.587640BE@IEEE.org...
> KC8PMX wrote:
> > Why Cecil..... In the pic on the Qrz.com site for your callsign, you
look
> > like a healthly looking individual! :) I would guess around the age of
the
> > young 50's.
>
> I was 59-60 when that picture was taken. I'm 64 now. 64 + 18 = 82. My Dad
> is 89 but he wasn't wild and crazy in his younger days. Drop me an email
> when you come to TX.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

751. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 06:17:10 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a6an8j3p9e@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 36791

Wow... now there's some balls! I would agree also, amateur radio may change face and form, but it will still be there many years from now.

Ryan

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message news:20020307061034.06023.00000174@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net
>
> >I will put 100 bucks on the fact that amateur radio will still be around
> >2020.
>
> And I will stake my entire career on it! :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

752. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 06:19:41 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a6an8l4p9e@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 36794

Depends on how old he is.... if he is in his thirties, he may be working many more years. I haven't a clue as to how old Ed is.

By the way Ed, I was speaking with John, WB8RCR a local friend of mine and he said he had a QSO with ya in the past. Thought that was kinda neat. Hopefully sometime in the future we may have a QSO in some form or another over the radio.

Ryan

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message news:3c878b19_2@news7.fast.net...
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020307061034.06023.00000174@mb-dd.aol.com...
> > From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net
> >
> > >I will put 100 bucks on the fact that amateur radio will still be around
> > >2020.
> >
> > And I will stake my entire career on it! :-)
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> And I'll bet that Ed will be happily retired by 2020 :-)
>
> Carl - wa6vse
>
>

753. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 06:33:59 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a6an8m5p9e@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 36796

I agree.... with many more Amateurs becoming more active in their community, continue with public education and doing other things for the betterment of ham radio, I don't think we have to worry. If we stay lethargic and be the kind of people that sit around and bitch about problems without performing action to illicit change, then we may have a problem and I may have to pay off that bet in an earlier message here. The lethargy is kind of like our club meeting tonight. When the question of who was going to take on a net control position for certain night, all we got is blank stares.... Nobody wants to get involved anymore. We need to develop a sense of involvement and community if we are gonna stay strong as a hobby service, amongst other strengths/qualities we need to maintain or improve.

Ryan

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020307175630.08738.00000342@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: "Krell" krell1215@yahoo.com
>
> >I don't question that amatuer radio will be around in 2020. I question
what
> >it will be like.
>
> So do I. I somehow think that we will all have something to do with
shaping
> it.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

754. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 06:50:33 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a6an8n6p9e@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 36792

Just another for the killfile Cecil... There are only a few here I have kill-filed. A few from here, and of course that garbage that flows from rec.radio.amateur.misc once in a while.

I still have people like Dick unblocked because he actually has a valid point at least once in a while.....

Ryan

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3C87ADD9.9D7DBC52@IEEE.org...
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > You are a piece of work, no doubt.
>
> And are you going to deny having any connection to Dick Carroll?
> If you are a real person, I strongly suspect you have been posting
> Dick's words to your account. There are simply too many clues for
> it to be otherwise.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

755. Re: ARRL Newsgroup?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 07:26:28 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a6an8p7p9e@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 36793

Okay.... that is probably true, but if ya don't ask..... :)

Ryan

> That's why this newsgroup was created. Policies, such as morse code
testing,
> closed repeaters, antenna restrictions, etc., as well as what the ARRL is
up
> to are all debated here. I don't see a large enough volume of messages
that
> would require the ARRL to have a separate newsgroup. Stuff would probably
> get cross-posted anyway.
>
>

756. Re: ARRL Newsgroup?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 12:04:41 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <tN1i8.27$j54.21335216@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 36695

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:a67q0031htj@enews1.newsguy.com...
> > > >
> > > > Ryan, I'd rather not see the name "ARRL" on any newsgroup not
> initiated
> > > and
> > > > moderated by the ARRL. There's already enough ARRL bashing out
there.
> > > And
> > > > I believe that there are some SIG reflectors on the members only
side
> of
> > > the
> > > > ARRL.org site. The ARRL also has a number of weekly reports and
> > > newsletters
> > > > that are available via e-mail.
> > > >
> > > Not any different than if they are mentioned in any other group or
> list???
> > > Do they authorize there too?
> > >
> > >
> > > Ryan
> >
> > I don't understand you question. Brian
> >
>
> I don't see the ARRL controlling what is happening here and other
newsgroups
> where ARRL discussion (for and against) occurs. Why would they
> automatically have that right? As far as corporations and organizations,
> there is plenty of other newgroups discussing the corporations and
> organizations and I don't see the corporations "controlling" those
> newsgroups. Or is the reason why you want the ARRL to control an ARRL
> newsgroup tied to some form restriction of the freedom of speech? I just
> thought the newsgroup idea would be nice for people on both sides of the
> fence. (for and against)
>
> Ryan

You appear to have answered your own question. So why not just do it here?

Brian

757. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 12:10:58 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <mT1i8.28$_44.21313685@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 36696

Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020306153938.17082.00000040@mb-mr.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> >From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
> >Date: 03/05/02 17:16 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <rtbh8.122$2E4.29715632@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
>
> >> I don't memorize every other countries 6m authorization either. As to
> >> the Pacific calling frequency, I'm not in the Pacific calling other
> >> Pacific stations. The V7 station I worked on 6m was at 50.080 CW. The
> >> numerous Pacific area stations I worked from Tanzania were around
> >> 50.110. Would you like me to supply a list of prefixes so you can
check
> >> to see if any of those stations operated outside their assigned band
> >> segments?
> >
> >I guess you're not the least bit familiar with either the 160m or 6m
> >authorizations. Too bad for you. I guess you'll get DXCC by dumb luck.
>
> Brian, I'd really like for you to explain how you managed to pull
that bit
> of wisdom out from your otherwise dusty and ill-fitting hat.
>
> CW on either of the frequencies he cited is legal, and nothing he
stated
> was improper. Perhaps a bit of DX-envy?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, you have no idea what you're talking about. Go back to your bottle.
Brian

758. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 12:17:58 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <WZ1i8.29$5g4.22024304@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 36697

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C8669B8.5BB8F267@earthlink.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > It might be a place for you to *listen,* but no, you're right, just
keep
> > bumbling along.
>
> I see that you've decided to take this beyond ridiculous.

Sorry you don't see any benefit in knowing the band plans for the one's you
need. Your loss.

> > You need a strategy.
>
> I have a really good one: They shows up. I works 'em.

That works for a while.

> > > > > What are you going to do to alleviate the problem?
> > > >
> > > > Nothing.
> > >
> > > That's what's wrong with the youth of today. Some can see a problem
but
> > > don't wish to get involved. I did my part. It is time for you to
step
> > > up and do yours.
> >
> > Nope.
>
> Then your show of concern for potential hams in other countries was only
> artificial at best.

Its just not worth discussing with you, that's all. Sorry.

> The one thing they are making more of is people. People generate demand
> and demand increases prices. I don't see land getting any cheaper.
> >
> > But of course, I'm a boomer too, and I've got to pay the price if I want
a
> > piece of it. When I leave it to my kids it won't be worth a wooden
nickel.
>
> I think you and your kids might be surprised.

I'd like to suprise my kids.

We'll see what happens to the stock market when the 1st few years of boomers retire and start pulling money out of their retirement plans. Then about 10 years later when they pass on and all their homes are put on the market.

73, Brian

759. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 12:37:16 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308073716.06044.00000377@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36698

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Odds. Valentine Germann would be a total stranger to me.

>Do you *really* think that you're a stranger to the many people who read
>this NG
>but never post?

He didn't say that he would be a stranger to Valentine, Dick; he said that Valentine would be a stranger to him.

Do you *really* think that people who read this newsgroup but never post are not strangers to us? In what way do you know them?

Is this another one of those "I see things that no one else sees" sort of things?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

760. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 12:41:29 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308074129.06044.00000378@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36699

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Thanks to Valentine Germann, one of many who think like I do, for proving
>you
>wrong
>yet again.

Perhaps Valentine would be willing to memorize those 1000 Russian words to prove how trivial it is.

Val, I am sure you are reading all of this avidly. Don't take Dick's advice and try to use word associations to pass the test. The easiest way is to do what the rest of us did. We passed our tests with a combination of learning, memorizing, lucky guessing and hoping that a few of the tougher questions didn't appear on our exams.

Dick is giving bad advice to newcomers.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

761. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 12:44:57 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c88b5a3_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36758

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C882784.3E743C59@worldnet.att.net...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > ultimately, in the future, bits will be bits and integrated
> > voice and data service, where it, as you put it, it doesn't
> > matter what the bits represent, will prevail. That approach
> > will allow flexible, efficient allocation and use of bandwidth
> > which adapts to the demands of the moment ... one minute
> > a frequency may be carrying voice, the next computer data
> > such as e-mail or a file transfer, the next a picture, etc.
> >
> > Whoa ... a modern view of the future ...
>
> "The future"???

Yes, ham radio could use a little "back to the future." (unfortunately)

>Sounds exactly like the ancient Internet. It's been around
> for many years already.

Did you ever notice how much more popular and prevalent
the internet is? Could there be a reason? Could it be that
it allows one to do so many things? (And that set could
encompass, and expand on "traditional" ham radio things ...
it's called "diversification" ... and it can be a key factor in
surviving in a competitive market ...)

> Ham radio should be an RF version of the Internet???

Not exactly (or totally) but, to some degree that would be
a valuable thing ... as I've pointed out, being able to bridge
around outages in the wired infrastructure would be invaluable
to the emergency management folks ...
we could provide a robust, portable, wireless means to do
that (granted we would not be able to provide the gigabits of
bandwidth that the internet backbone can provide, but we
COULD provide very useful amounts of bandwidth).

> That might be a way to get rid of a lot of hams.

Why do you say that? Are you so set in your ways that YOU
would go away if things changed a bit? I am NOT suggesting
that folks couldn't continue to do what they do now ... just
that MORE is possible, would broaden the audience to
whom amateur radio would have interest, and would provide

many benefits.

> How do you plan to keep interest in ham radio up with that
> "plan"?

Simple ... provide more variety in "services" and more
capabilities in a spectrally efficient manner with less
interference and contention ... make the "product" more
attractive to a larger range of people than it is now ...
have a little vision (and an open mind), man!

Carl - wa6vse

762. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 12:45:55 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c88b5e5_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36756

"Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote in message
news:a69kdj$11lb$1@heap.juniper.net...
> Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote:
> >"Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote in message
> >> Note that this doesn't prevent the voice guys from coming down the
> >> band, but they can only do so if they can figure out how to fit
> >> it in 1 kHz of bandwidth. As this would require a step improvement
> >> in the state of the art of "spectrum efficiency", a current
> >> favoured technical way to accumulate spectrum preservation brownie
> >> points, even the CW guys might not object to living with the
> >> (exceedingly unlikely; SSB is already pretty efficient for voice if
> >> your aim is communications rather than quality) possibility that this
> >> might happen.
> >
> >I've always maintained that the metric of spectrum efficiency
> >is bits/Hz ... to do voice in a 1 kHz or less bandwidth would
> >require some pretty sophisticated modulation and coding
> >and even still would likely suffer in terms of robustness
> >(can't violate Shannon ... the old tradeoff between bw and
> >s/n ratio) Your comment that SSB is already pretty efficient
> >for voice is correct ... essentially a 1:1 mapping between
> >"source data" bandwidth and "channel bandwidth".
>
> I don't think the last sentence quite captures it. To put it
> in geeky terms the strength of SSB is that it is redundantly coded
> (i.e. you can figure out what is being said without receiving it all
> quite the way it was sent) in a way that provides a near-optimum match
> to the maximum likelyhood decoder attached to your ears. The guys
> that are good at it (this wouldn't be me) say this about CW as well,
> actually, and I see no reason to disbelieve that either. Computers
> can do neat stuff fairly easily if you change the problem outside
> the application range humans can manage, say to lower or higher bit
> rates than wetware modems are good for, or to make use of better
> available S/N than people need, but you've got your work cut out for you
> if you want to go head to head with people at the S/N edges for voice
(this
> I know for a fact), and I wouldn't be surprised if the same applied to
> CW-rate data (though I don't know this for sure).
>
> About the voice-squeezing thing this must reflect biases derived from
> working at different levels of the technology, since while you and Ed
> Hare both fixated on bit rate versus S/N ratio and Shannon's law, my
> first instinct would be to go after the voice codec to reduce the
> required bit rate in the first place. I don't know the theoretical

> limit on how low the codec bit rate can go before it become impossible
> to encode comprehensible speach, but I'll bet it's only clever
> algorithms yet to be invented to get it lower than the crappy 1500 bps
> codecs I've heard recently. If you could get it down to, say, 500 bps
> then you might get it to fit even with a 2:1 expansion for convolutional
> coding and relatively low-tech modulation. Note that this also
> indicates why I don't think bps/Hz is always the right measure of system
> (as opposed to subsystem) efficiency. If the point of the system is
> to squeeze voice into 1 kHz of spectrum, minimizing the bps requirement
> can provide as much or more efficiency as maximizing bps/Hz.
>
> >However, deep down in the engineer in me, I do believe
> >that ultimately, in the future, bits will be bits and integrated
> >voice and data service, where it, as you put it, it doesn't
> >matter what the bits represent, will prevail. That approach
> >will allow flexible, efficient allocation and use of bandwidth
> >which adapts to the demands of the moment ... one minute
> >a frequency may be carrying voice, the next computer data
> >such as e-mail or a file transfer, the next a picture, etc.
>
> Actually my experience with wired networks is that the "killer
> app" is almost always a big surprise, and is pretty much never what
> you imagined it would be when you started, which is why I've ended up
> in the anarchist "I don't care what you do as long as you do it"
> school of traffic (non-)managment. In fact sometimes what you find
> out is that there is no "killer app", and that you've built a solution
> with no problem, but I know of no way to predict this ahead of time
> either. You need to try it to see what happens, and you shouldn't
> be surprised if you are surprised by the result.
>
> What I do think in this case, however, is that if there really is an
> HF digital "killer app" or two for the ARS lurking out there somewhere,
> there's a about a 50% chance that the mode regulations are standing firmly
> in its way, so I think it is probably worth while to fix that.
>
> Dennis Ferguson

763. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 12:45:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308074556.06044.00000379@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36751

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> As always, it depends on circumstances.

I have not seen you tell people anything other than "you can switch to CW if the band fails." I am glad you finally recognize that doing so is only one of the possible choices. See, you did learn something from talking with me. :-)

> Why? Seems you find yourself constricted in your thinking just so you can go
>along
>with the code bashers.

Why do you say that? Because I feel that changing frequencies to a band that is open is a better longer-term choice than trying to wring a few more minutes out of a dying band?

> And it certainly is NOT the "only" solution, rather a solution that *is
>instantly at hand* one that comes prepackaged in virtually every
>HF ham rig built, available for use only if hamsknow how to use it.

So does the band switch, and far more hams know how to use the band switch than would be proficient enough in Morse code to be able to get reliable copy under failing conditions.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

764. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 12:48:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308074835.06044.00000380@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36700

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Whoa ... a modern view of the future ...

> "The future"??? Sounds exactly like the ancient Internet.

Good point, Dick. Perhaps ham radio has a bit of catching up to do.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

765. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 12:51:47 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308075147.06044.00000381@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36752

From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson)

>but you've got your work cut out for you
>if you want to go head to head with people at the S/N edges for voice (this
>I know for a fact), and I wouldn't be surprised if the same applied to
>CW-rate data (though I don't know this for sure).

In real time, right now, a human can beat the best CW decoding algorithms. However, when one can throw lots of processor time at the the problem, the CW decoding schemes can decode signals that most humans cannot even detect.

I think that the processing necessary to decode human voice under such conditions will be a much bigger challenge. The anticipation factor and the ability of a human to put together a big picture from incomplete fragments is not yet understood well enough to be coded.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

766. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 12:52:54 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308075254.06044.00000382@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36753

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>While PSK31 has met with pretty good success at adoption,
>and I agree that there are regulatory barriers that need fixing,
>I still think the masses could use a bit of a kick in the backside
>in the direction of progress :-).

And I think that encouragement and information will work better than kicking
people.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

767. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 12:55:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308075507.06044.00000383@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36754

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
>
>> I still think the masses could use a bit of a kick in the backside
>> in the direction of progress :-).
>
> Ah, that's the good ol' Carl we know and love. Talk about "forcing"
>hams to do something - Might as well hand out invitations to turn in
>licenses.

Do you *really* think that Carl's posting a message on rec.radio.amateur.policy
is an invitation that will somehow force people to turn in their licenses?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

768. Re: If I won the lottery (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 12:56:36 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308075636.06044.00000384@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36755

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>I used to say that if I won the big one, I was going to go to work and quit.
>>I
>>have changed my mind. If I win the big one, I am going to go to work and
>they
>>are going to fire me!

>Why would you get fired if you went to work after winning the lottery?

Surely you understood my post, Larry.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

769. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 13:00:39 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308080039.06044.00000385@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36757

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> I merely
>state what I know to be factual, and as you can see it is once again backed
>up by
>
>authoritative sources.

Ultimately, it is an authorative source that arbitrates all of this, Dick --
the only authorative source in Amateur Radio.

Would you like to bring up what that source has to say about the question pools
and need for code exams, or are you selective in your "authorative sources?"

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

770. Automatic Link Establishment (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 13:09:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308080920.06044.00000386@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36759

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>Another thing which would be very useful for disaster
>and emergency communications ... and also for routine
>skeds to talk with friends (but would obviously not apply
>to or appeal to DX chasers and contesters) is the potential
>of using ALE "Automatic Link Establishment" software.

>(Yes, someone will grumble "That's not REAL HAM
>RADIO!"

Feb 1995 QST 68 ALE--The Coming of Automatic Link Establishment
(Technical Correspondence)
Keywords: AUTOMATIC LINK ESTABLISHMENT Menold, Ronald E., AD4TB

Dec 1993 QEX 7 The Growing Family of Federal Standards for HF Radio Automatic
Link Establishment (ALE), Part VI Bodson, Dennis, W4PWF

Oct 1993 QEX 13 The Growing Family of Federal Standards for HF Radio Automatic
Link Establishment (ALE), Part IV Sutherland, David
Oct 1993 QEX 13 The Growing Family of Federal Standards for HF Radio Automatic
Link Establishment (ALE), Part IV Bodson, Dennis, W4PWF

Sep 1993 QEX 14 The Growing Family of Federal Standards for HF Radio Automatic
Link Establishment (ALE), Part III Bodson, Dennis, W4PWF

Aug 1993 QEX 9 The Growing Family of Federal Standards for HF Radio Automatic
Link Establishment (ALE), Part II Bodson, Dennis, W4PWF

Jul 1993 QEX 2 Growing Family of Federal Standards for HF Radio Automatic Link
Establishment (ALE), Part I Bodson, Dennis, W4PWF

Jan 1990 QEX 3 A Federal Standard for HF Radio Automatic Link Establishment
Adair, Robert T.

Unfortunately, none of these articles are available for download. I will see
what I can do about that. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

771. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 13:14:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308081427.06044.00000388@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36761

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>ONE MORE TIME........
>
>CW should be available as a last resort, useful
>when whatever better mode you may be lucky enough to have available fails.
>Got it?

It should be, Dick, but it never has been universally available. The number of hams who learned it and never used it, who don't even own a key, or whose skills are so rusty that they can barely copy it under ideal conditions is greater than the number of hams whose CW skills are up to the task of pulling a weak signal out of a failing band.

The old testing scheme did not universally give you what you feel should be available as a last resort, and if I need to depend on something that is available to only a small percentage of hams, I am going to look for something better.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

772. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 13:16:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308081603.06044.00000389@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36760

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Just so you'll know, I DO have a kind and courteous manner. I have
>learned not to waste it on certain types of people.

From what I have seen of your conduct here, "certain types of people" sure
covers a lot of people.

A kind and courteous demeanor is self replenishing, Dick. You do not have to be
so frugal with it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

773. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 13:24:34 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6aeeh$4l0$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36762

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020308081427.06044.00000388@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >ONE MORE TIME........
> >
> >CW should be available as a last resort, useful
> >when whatever better mode you may be lucky enough to have available
fails.
> >Got it?
>
> It should be, Dick, but it never has been universally available. The
number of
> hams who learned it and never used it, who don't even own a key, or whose
> skills are so rusty that they can barely copy it under ideal conditions is
> greater than the number of hams whose CW skills are up to the task of
pulling a
> weak signal out of a failing band.

In fact, many people do NOT stay with morse because they just do
not enjoy in any way trying to "pull a weak morse signal out of a failing
band."
There are also those that just are not as naturally capable of
developing the skill to begin with.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

774. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 13:27:37 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6aee1$756$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36763

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020308074556.06044.00000379@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > As always, it depends on circumstances.
>
> I have not seen you tell people anything other than "you can switch to CW
if
> the band fails." I am glad you finally recognize that doing so is only
one of
> the possible choices. See, you did learn something from talking with me.
:-)
>
> > Why? Seems you find yourself constricted in your thinking just so you
can go
> >along
> >with the code bashers.
>
> Why do you say that? Because I feel that changing frequencies to a band
that is
> open is a better longer-term choice than trying to wring a few more
minutes out
> of a dying band?
>
> > And it certainly is NOT the "only" solution, rather a solution that *is
> >instantly at hand* one that comes prepackaged in virtually every
> >HF ham rig built, available for use only if hamsknow how to use it.
>
> So does the band switch, and far more hams know how to use the band switch
than
> would be proficient enough in Morse code to be able to get reliable copy
under
> failing conditions.

Additionally, while my rig came with a microphone, it did not
come with a morse key wired to the appropriate jack

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

775. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 13:58:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308085805.17139.00000229@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 36764

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>Date: 03/08/02 07:10 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <mT1i8.28$_44.21313685@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>

>Steve, you have no idea what you're talking about. Go back to your bottle

Brian you cowardly scum,

Glad to see you are back to your usual self-diddling self. Guess when
Lennie strokes out, we'll have you to carry on the traditions, huh?

Wouldn't have it any other way.

Enjoy the day, Putz Jr.

Steve

776. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 14:00:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308090028.17139.00000230@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 36765

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>Date: 03/08/02 07:17 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <WZ1i8.29$5g4.22024304@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>

>I'd like to suprise my kids.

The surprising part is that you figured out what to do to CREATE kids. Of course even a dog can make babies and not know what "intercourse" means.

777. Re: Whorass Admits his wife is a fat sow with sagging breasts and a dog's ass for a face

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 14:05:41 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a6aj6u$p0$5@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 36772
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.lloyd-davies,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Unit649 irc.foreverchat.net" <unit649@unit649.net> wrote in message
news:DfTh8.742$LN3.440177771@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com...
> Your problem is beyond Ham Radio, plain and simple.

Thanks for proving my point, dumbass.

--
73 de Roger /AB8MQ

> "AB8MQ" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:a68fr0$5ae$0@dosa.alt.net...
> > "Ham Radio" <hr@hrforallnowradio.org> wrote in message
> > news:a67nbv$3s6$0@dosa.alt.net...
> > >
> > > "AB8MQ" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message:
> > >
> > > > > you obviously don't have a clue or a brain for that matter.
> > > > Says the functional illiterate who huffs gas fumes, OBVIOUSLY.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > Roger,
> > > HR
> > >
> > >
> > No call, no credibility..and go fuck yourself. You seem to need some
> > counseling yourself, since you're so obsessed with what I write.
> >
> > --
> > 73 de Roger/ AB8MQ
> >
> >
>
>

778. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 14:18:30 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c88cbe0_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36769

"Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote in message
news:a69kdj$11lb$1@heap.juniper.net...
> Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote:
> >"Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote in message
> >> Note that this doesn't prevent the voice guys from coming down the
> >> band, but they can only do so if they can figure out how to fit
> >> it in 1 kHz of bandwidth. As this would require a step improvement
> >> in the state of the art of "spectrum efficiency", a current
> >> favoured technical way to accumulate spectrum preservation brownie
> >> points, even the CW guys might not object to living with the
> >> (exceedingly unlikely; SSB is already pretty efficient for voice if
> >> your aim is communications rather than quality) possibility that this
> >> might happen.
> >
> >I've always maintained that the metric of spectrum efficiency
> >is bits/Hz ... to do voice in a 1 kHz or less bandwidth would
> >require some pretty sophisticated modulation and coding
> >and even still would likely suffer in terms of robustness
> >(can't violate Shannon ... the old tradeoff between bw and
> >s/n ratio) Your comment that SSB is already pretty efficient
> >for voice is correct ... essentially a 1:1 mapping between
> >"source data" bandwidth and "channel bandwidth".
>
> I don't think the last sentence quite captures it. To put it
> in geeky terms the strength of SSB is that it is redundantly coded
> (i.e. you can figure out what is being said without receiving it all
> quite the way it was sent) in a way that provides a near-optimum match
> to the maximum likelyhood decoder attached to your ears.

I was only talking about spectral efficency (How many Hz of RF
bandwidth does it take to transmit ___ Hz of baseband information?)
Your point about "reading between the lines" is applicable in terms
of effectiveness, but I was only talkng about spectral efficiency.

> The guys
> that are good at it (this wouldn't be me) say this about CW as well,
> actually, and I see no reason to disbelieve that either.

I don't doubt that highly skilled CW ops can copy very weak signals,
but it has been demonstrated that digital techniques can outdo them.

With modulation and coding schemes that are purpose-designed
for machine decoding, you can do even better ...

> About the voice-squeezing thing this must reflect biases derived from
> working at different levels of the technology, since while you and Ed

> Hare both fixated on bit rate versus S/N ratio and Shannon's law, my
> first instinct would be to go after the voice codec to reduce the
> required bit rate in the first place. I don't know the theoretical
> limit on how low the codec bit rate can go before it become impossible
> to encode comprehensible speach, but I'll bet it's only clever
> algorithms yet to be invented to get it lower than the crappy 1500 bps
> codecs I've heard recently. If you could get it down to, say, 500 bps
> then you might get it to fit even with a 2:1 expansion for convolutional
> coding and relatively low-tech modulation.

That's the problem ... the company I work for has some of the leading
speech coding experts in the world ... getting good quality speech at
really low bit rates is a VERY tough nut to crack. And the more you
try the more processing it takes and the more vulnerable to channel
errors you generally become.

> Note that this also
> indicates why I don't think bps/Hz is always the right measure of system
> (as opposed to subsystem) efficiency. If the point of the system is
> to squeeze voice into 1 kHz of spectrum, minimizing the bps requirement
> can provide as much or more efficiency as maximizing bps/Hz.

I see your point ... I'm more a PHY guy than a speech coding guy,
though I've discussed some of the issues in speech coding with
the experts ... given adequate s/n, I can figure ways to push more
bits through a given amount of bandwidth ... the speech coding
guys have a different (and in many ways fundamentally more
difficult) set of problems in reducing the source data rate.

> >However, deep down in the engineer in me, I do believe
> >that ultimately, in the future, bits will be bits and integrated
> >voice and data service, where it, as you put it, it doesn't
> >matter what the bits represent, will prevail. That approach
> >will allow flexible, efficient allocation and use of bandwidth
> >which adapts to the demands of the moment ... one minute
> >a frequency may be carrying voice, the next computer data
> >such as e-mail or a file transfer, the next a picture, etc.
>
> Actually my experience with wired networks is that the "killer
> app" is almost always a big surprise, and is pretty much never what
> you imagined it would be when you started, which is why I've ended up
> in the anarchist "I don't care what you do as long as you do it"
> school of traffic (non-)managment. In fact sometimes what you find
> out is that there is no "killer app", and that you've built a solution
> with no problem, but I know of no way to predict this ahead of time
> either. You need to try it to see what happens, and you shouldn't
> be surprised if you are surprised by the result.
>
> What I do think in this case, however, is that if there really is an
> HF digital "killer app" or two for the ARS lurking out there somewhere,
> there's a about a 50% chance that the mode regulations are standing firmly

> in its way, so I think it is probably worth while to fix that.

Again we seem to agree ... the idea of "bits is bits" as far as
the medium goes allows one to build different application layers
for new things without having to re-invent the wheel from scratch
at the lower layers ... and, if done right, it allows all of those things,
things that may not have been envisioned yet to fit in with pre-
existing things and "ride along" harmoniously, with the caveat that
they must fit into the available capacity provided by the lower layers.

Carl - wa6vse

779. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 14:22:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C88C93C.3DB21DA9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 36766

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C8669B8.5BB8F267@earthlink.net...
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >
> > > It might be a place for you to *listen,* but no, you're right, just
> keep
> > > bumbling along.
> > >
> > > I see that you've decided to take this beyond ridiculous.
> >
> > Sorry you don't see any benefit in knowing the band plans for the one's you
> > need. Your loss.

What have I lost, Brian? What have I missed? How do you know that I
missed anything audible here? Finally, what is it to you personally?

> > > You need a strategy.
> > >
> > > I have a really good one: They shows up. I works 'em.
> >
> > That works for a while.

Yeah, the next part is, I work 'em before they show up.

> > > > > > What are you going to do to alleviate the problem?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Nothing.
> > > > > >
> > > > > That's what's wrong with the youth of today. Some can see a problem
> but
> > > > > don't wish to get involved. I did my part. It is time for you to
> step
> > > > > up and do yours.
> > > >
> > > > Nope.
> > >
> > > Then your show of concern for potential hams in other countries was only
> > > artificial at best.
> >
> > Its just not worth discussing with you, that's all. Sorry.

You seemed to think so earlier--you know, before you ran out of credible
statements.
>

> > The one thing they are making more of is people. People generate demand
> > and demand increases prices. I don't see land getting any cheaper.
> > >
> > > But of course, I'm a boomer too, and I've got to pay the price if I want
> a
> > > piece of it. When I leave it to my kids it won't be worth a wooden
> nickel.
> >
> > I think you and your kids might be surprised.
>
> I'd like to suprise my kids.
>
> We'll see what happens to the stock market when the 1st few years of boomers
> retire and start pulling money out of their retirement plans. Then about 10
> years later when they pass on and all their homes are put on the market.

More folks are investing all the time as they begin to see the wisdom in savings. As for the homes, who will be the beneficiaries of the sales of boomer homes? Think it might be their children? I'm not going to start worrying about what might take place after I die. That'd be like worrying about 6m ops in another country who stray from their authorized band segments.

Dave K8MN

780. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 14:27:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C88CA5D.72A5F881@earthlink.net>
Source record: 36767

Bill Sohl wrote:

>
> In fact, many people do NOT stay with morse because they just do
> not enjoy in any way trying to "pull a weak morse signal out of a failing
> band."

Sounds like a group who'd really benefit from learning about that
bandswitch thing.

Dave K8MN

781. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 14:29:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C88CAC0.528C91D3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 36768

Bill Sohl wrote:

> Additionally, while my rig came with a microphone, it did not
> come with a morse key wired to the appropriate jack

Yours came hardwired? Wowser--totally hardcore.

Dave K8MN

782. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 14:40:04 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c88d100_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36773

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020308075147.06044.00000381@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson)
>
> >but you've got your work cut out for you
> >if you want to go head to head with people at the S/N edges for voice
(this
> >I know for a fact), and I wouldn't be surprised if the same applied to
> >CW-rate data (though I don't know this for sure).
>
> In real time, right now, a human can beat the best CW decoding algorithms.

I'm not sure that I am totally convinced of this ... though I admit to not
being
interested enough to have made an exhaustive study either.

> However, when one can throw lots of processor time at the the problem, the
CW
> decoding schemes can decode signals that most humans cannot even detect.

Of this, there is not doubt ... the point above is that CPUs are
so blazingly fast now, that I'm not convinced that it's not possible
to best the human operator in (at least very near) real time (to the
point where the processing delay would be acceptable.)

Once we start talking about non-Morse encodings, however, the
balance tips rather rapidly in favor of machine decoding.

> I think that the processing necessary to decode human voice under such
> conditions will be a much bigger challenge. The anticipation factor and
the
> ability of a human to put together a big picture from incomplete fragments
is
> not yet understood well enough to be coded.

It sounds like you are maybe talking about some sort of speech to
text decoding ... while that's interesting in some applications, I don't
see it as being that interesting for general communications.

The big issue with speech coding (just to send audio digitally
and reproduce it as audio at the other end) is reducing the number
of bits that need to be transmitted over the channel to get a certain
audio quality ... at really low bit rates, that alone gets to be a tough
nut to crack. Additionally, since fewer bits represent more audio,
each becomes more "important" and more vulnerable to errors
(a bit error causes a bigger chunk of bad audio) ... thus, s/n ratio

and error mitigation techniques become important.

Carl - wa6vse

783. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 14:41:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C88B627.8A91EC54@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36770

Dennis Ferguson wrote:

> my experience with wired networks is that the "killer

> app" is almost always a big surprise, and is pretty much never what
> you imagined it would be when you started

That would seem to be the history of most significant developments. I doubt
that
many of the radio intelligentsia of Armstrong's day could have visualized that
the
main circuit that would give receivers a giant leap forward (the
superheterodyne)
would come not from receivers, but rather from a transmitter - the oscillator.

784. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 14:41:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C88B89D.8EC83832@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36771

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> Odds. Valentine Germann would be a total stranger to me.
>
> >Do you *really* think that you're a stranger to the many people who read
> >this NG
> >but never post?
>
> He didn't say that he would be a stranger to Valentine, Dick; he said that
> Valentine would be a stranger to him.
>

Hey, Cecil can't help it if he's strange. :-)

>
> Do you *really* think that people who read this newsgroup but never post are
> not strangers to us? In what way do you know them?

>

Hey, Ed, this is Usenet, a subset of the Internet. With the passage of time
one learns
it's features. One of them is that many people read here and become familiar
with those
who post frequently but who themselves never do, and so remain anonymous. Why
should Cecil
-or you- find it so strange that someone posts who is familiar with Cecil, the
numero uno poster
in numbers of posts to this NG? Should Cecil be surprised that Val is familiar
to him, as he
has stated that he has read the NG for a year? Does Cecil -or you- believe that
only those who
have properly introduced themselves to him should be familiar with him? Do You?
Are both
of you daft?

>
> Is this another one of those "I see things that no one else sees" sort of
> things?

For you, it looks like it may be, indeed.

785. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 14:58:33 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c88d581_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36776

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C884996.E5C01B37@worldnet.att.net...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
>
> > I still think the masses could use a bit of a kick in the backside
> > in the direction of progress :-).
>
> Ah, that's the good ol' Carl we know and love. Talk about "forcing"
> hams to do something - Might as well hand out invitations to turn in
> licenses.

Dick,

I'm sorry that you can't differentiate between a slang term
used to indicate "prodding" or "encouragement" from "forcing."

And I still don't understand why you (or anye else) would "turn in
their license" just because OTHERs make progress ... nobody's
forcing YOU to do it ... I'm just trying to get you to stop working
so darned hard at discouraging OTHERs from doing it ...
Like your many "(fill in the blank with some useful knowledge)
isn't relevant to ham radio" rants.

Carl - wa6vse

786. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 15:00:55 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c88d614$1_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36777

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020308075254.06044.00000382@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >While PSK31 has met with pretty good success at adoption,
> >and I agree that there are regulatory barriers that need fixing,
> >I still think the masses could use a bit of a kick in the backside
> >in the direction of progress :-).
>
> And I think that encouragement and information will work better than
kicking
> people.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed,

Knowing me, I assumed that you'd realize I was speaking
figuratively and referring to "encouragment," "prodding,"
and similar, less forceful terms ... you DID see the :-)
didn't you?

Carl - wa6vse

787. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 15:04:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203080704.5c3ad48f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 36774

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c882d2d_2@news7.fast.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020307205936.14946.00000023@mb-fy.aol.com...
> > In article <3c87f00d_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
> > >
> > >Such problems happen all the time with all modes ... receiver
> > >blocking, AGC "pumping," etc. are facts of life ...
> >
> > Maybe to you, but I've found that decent rigs have defeatable AGC,
> > narrow filters and high dynamic range. And they're not expensive.
>
> Yes, I know ... but blocking, etc. still happen ... if the operator
> knows how to use available controls on his radio, they can
> be minimized, I agree ... but they still happen.

With reasonable preparation (in the form of a rig that has features
such as defeatable AGC, good IF filtering and decent dynamic range)
plus good operating skills (!) they can be minimized/eliminated.
>
> > >this is NOT
> > >something that is unique to CW or which justifies a Morse test.
> >
> > Of course it's not unique to CW.
>
> You certainly seemed to be trying to make it seem like it was ...

Sorry if it wasn't clear.
>
> > But it points to reasons to keep
> > modes separated, which is the issue.
>
> Ridiculous ...

I'd say it's ridiculous to mix all sorts of digital modes together, saying
that the most popular one doesn't deserve any protection from the others,
but at the same time have protection from voice modes.
>
> > >> The scenario could be reversed. But I suspect your response would be
> > >> something
> > >> like "tough - the CW station should use a 'better' mode" or some such.
> > >> ;-)
> > >
> > >Not at all ... my reaction would be "stuff happens." Turn the

> > >knob a bit and find a frequency that works.
> > >
> > >You seem to think that a Morse test will guarantee some sort
> > >of idylic, interference free world ...
> >
> > Nope - just an alternative to a digital tower of Babel.
>
> Sounds like the words of someone who's afraid his favorite
> mode will eventually be displaced by more modern things.

I did not invent the "Babel" phrase.

Your comment sounds like a wish.

> > >that's simply not the case.
> > >
> > >What about the situation where other mixes of modes cause
> > >the same phenomenon and the operators can't copy each
> > >other's transmissions? Same thing ...
> >
> > Exactly.
> > >
> > >We can't partition our bands rigidly into little compartments
> > >for each and every mode ... that would be EXTREMELY
> > >wasteful.
> >
> > We do it with phone vs. digital/CW.
>
> Yes ... and as you will see from my response to Dennis'
> well-reasoned comments, I have very mixed feelings
> about that from a technical/spectrum management
> perspective, but I've been trying to be sensitive to the
> political/traditional sensitivities of many hams and not
> generate large amounts of inflamatory turmoil

I see. Guess words like "twits" and "kick in the behind" and "smoking
something funny" are sensitive...

>... then
> YOU come along and advocate a 35% Morse ONLY
> setaside in all of the HF bands !!!

What is wrong with advocating such a thing the way I did it? I simply
mentioned it as an idea in this public forum, to stimulate reasonable
discussion. Didn't call anybody an "idiot" or an "olde farte", just
tossed out the idea. I even freely admitted that maybe 35% is too
much.

> > >You're making it sound like a little unintentional interference
> > >is the end of the world as we know it or something ... the
> > >fact of the matter is that there is no way that some modest
> > >amount of unintentional interference is totally avoidable ...

> > >whether between modes or same mode on same mode ...
> > >propagation and other factors virtually guarantee it ... lighten
> > >up a bit and be more flexible ... things will work out without
> > >stuffing everyone into narrow, confining little "cubby holes."
> >
> > You asked for reasons and I gave 'em.
>
> Maybe I should only ask for good, valid reasons in the
> future :-)

Good, valid reasons are the only type I give.

73 de Jim, N2EY

788. Re: Automatic Link Establishment (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 15:07:05 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c88d795_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36778

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020308080920.06044.00000386@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >Another thing which would be very useful for disaster
> >and emergency communications ... and also for routine
> >skeds to talk with friends (but would obviously not apply
> >to or appeal to DX chasers and contesters) is the potential
> >of using ALE "Automatic Link Establishment" software.
>
> >(Yes, someone will grumble "That's not REAL HAM
> >RADIO!"
>
> Feb 1995 QST 68 ALE--The Coming of Automatic Link Establishment
> (Technical Correspondence)
> Keywords: AUTOMATIC LINK ESTABLISHMENT Menold, Ronald E., AD4TB
>
> Dec 1993 QEX 7 The Growing Family of Federal Standards for HF Radio
Automatic
> Link Establishment (ALE), Part VI Bodson, Dennis, W4PWF
>
> Oct 1993 QEX 13 The Growing Family of Federal Standards for HF Radio
Automatic
> Link Establishment (ALE), Part IV Sutherland, David
> Oct 1993 QEX 13 The Growing Family of Federal Standards for HF Radio
Automatic
> Link Establishment (ALE), Part IV Bodson, Dennis, W4PWF
>
> Sep 1993 QEX 14 The Growing Family of Federal Standards for HF Radio
Automatic
> Link Establishment (ALE), Part III Bodson, Dennis, W4PWF
>
> Aug 1993 QEX 9 The Growing Family of Federal Standards for HF Radio
Automatic
> Link Establishment (ALE), Part II Bodson, Dennis, W4PWF
>
> Jul 1993 QEX 2 Growing Family of Federal Standards for HF Radio Automatic
Link
> Establishment (ALE), Part I Bodson, Dennis, W4PWF
>
> Jan 1990 QEX 3 A Federal Standard for HF Radio Automatic Link
Establishment
> Adair, Robert T.
>

> Unfortunately, none of these articles are available for download. I will
see
> what I can do about that. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed ... 1st, please do see if you can get those articles on the website
(at least in the members section).

2nd, I didn't mean in any way to allude that ARRL had voiced
any opposition to ALE techniques ...

3rd ... I still bet that there are more than just a few who will
grumble (at least privately, if not publicly) that "that's not
REAL ham radio" (because a machine is assisting.

Carl - wa6vse

p.s. please let us know if/when/where those articles become
available on the website ...

789. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 15:09:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C88D437.A7CDA2B8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36775

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> However, deep down in the engineer in me, I do believe
> that ultimately, in the future, bits will be bits and integrated
> voice and data service, where it, as you put it, it doesn't
> matter what the bits represent, will prevail. That approach
> will allow flexible, efficient allocation and use of bandwidth
> which adapts to the demands of the moment ... one minute
> a frequency may be carrying voice, the next computer data
> such as e-mail or a file transfer, the next a picture, etc.

PACTOR II does something similar now. Although 100% digital data,
PACTOR II has the ability to automatically vary the baud rate and
PSK modulation in order to achieve maximum throughput and reliability.
The data can come from a keyboard or a computer file. One could send
a compressed voice file and listen to it on one's computer but not
in real time yet AFAIK.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

790. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 15:25:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C88D7D1.C7D40FBC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36779

Dick Carroll wrote:
> And it certainly is NOT the "only" solution, rather a solution that *is instantly
> at hand*
> one that comes prepackaged in virtually every HF ham rig built, available for use
> only if hams know how to use it.

And therein lies CW's weakness. Probably 2/3 of coded hams cannot carry on a decent CW QSO anymore. 1/3 don't like CW and 1/3 don't care enough about CW to keep their skill polished. Mix a bunch of hams whose code skills are rusty to nonexistent with an emergency and you have a second disaster in the making. No other mode relies so heavily on labor intensive operator skill.

It doesn't work to test a ham's Morse code in 1960 and then expect him to be able to operate CW under emergency conditions 40 years later. I know you dislike advance planning, but knowing all hams' CW skill level before the emergency is one bit of planning that I think is absolutely necessary. If you wait for the emergency to start operating CW, you may not find many (any?) other hams at your level. I, personally, don't think that I would be of much use in a CW emergency net. I'm still having paddle problems.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

791. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 15:32:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C88D992.86CD205B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36780

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > It would be extremely unlikely to find another person who thinks like you
> > do, Dick
>
> Thanks to Valentine Germann, one of many who think like I do, for proving you
> wrong yet again.

You "two" are the only people in the world who have ever called me
"worthless". And his was on his second posting, just a mite too familiar
for him to be a stranger. Just what we need on r.r.a.p - more vulgarity.
I'm not sure the state of Missouri is big enough for both of you, Dick,
and I'm still not convinced that those were not your words that "Val"
posted. Setting up a second identity is not rocket science.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

792. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 15:37:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C88DAA6.1FA04336@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36781

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > I'm not trying to win any argument, in fact you and Ed are doing all the
> > > I merely state what I know to be factual, and as you can see it is once
> > > again backed up by authoritative sources.
> >
> > Authoritative sources????? Shirley, you jest. You haven't offered one iota
> > of proof that anyone rote-memorizes 1000 Q&A on their way to passing an exam.
>
> That's exactly right, I haven't offered any such proof. And just for the record, yet
> one more time, I DID NOT make any such claim, thus I intend to offer no such proof.

You state what you "know" to be factual, backed up by authoritative sources
and in the next breath, deny that you ever stated those facts backed up by
authoritative sources?????? Feeling bipolar today, are we?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

793. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 15:40:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C88DB6C.BFB088C9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36782

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> Sounds like the words of someone who's afraid his favorite
> mode will eventually be displaced by more modern things.

Sounds like a buggy whip maker 100 years ago. Too bad the
government didn't require a buggy whip on every horseless
carriage.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

794. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 15:42:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C88DBD2.F16FD743@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36783

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> While PSK31 has met with pretty good success at adoption,
> and I agree that there are regulatory barriers that need fixing,
> I still think the masses could use a bit of a kick in the backside
> in the direction of progress :-).

Note that even PSK31 didn't soar in popularity until it was free.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

795. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 15:44:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C88DC6E.9983BF1E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36784

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > I still think the masses could use a bit of a kick in the backside
> > in the direction of progress :-).
>
> Ah, that's the good ol' Carl we know and love. Talk about "forcing"
> hams to do something - Might as well hand out invitations to turn in
> licenses.

You support a Morse code kick in the backside, Dick. And there's no
smiley face on your postings.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

796. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 15:48:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C88DD54.79B268F5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36785

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >> I still think the masses could use a bit of a kick in the backside
> >> in the direction of progress :-).
> > >
> > > Ah, that's the good ol' Carl we know and love. Talk about "forcing"
> > >hams to do something - Might as well hand out invitations to turn in
> > >licenses.
>
> Do you *really* think that Carl's posting a message on rec.radio.amateur.policy
> is an invitation that will somehow force people to turn in their licenses?

Only the ones like Dick, who don't comprehend what :-) means.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

797. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 15:52:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C88DE53.3A5E7C88@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36786

Bill Sohl wrote:
> In fact, many people do NOT stay with morse because they just do
> not enjoy in any way trying to "pull a weak morse signal out of a failing
> band."

I hate trying to copy any signals through a high noise level. That's
one reason I like PACTOR II so well. I tune PACTOR II visually.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

798. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 15:56:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C88DF10.3AC2B76D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36787

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> I don't doubt that highly skilled CW ops can copy very weak signals,
> but it has been demonstrated that digital techniques can outdo them.
>
> With modulation and coding schemes that are purpose-designed
> for machine decoding, you can do even better ...

In fact, someone who doesn't know Morse code can operate
PACTOR II just fine thus overcoming CW's worst fault.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

799. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 16:01:57 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c88e4b3_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36789

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C88DC6E.9983BF1E@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > > I still think the masses could use a bit of a kick in the backside
> > > in the direction of progress :-).
> >
> > Ah, that's the good ol' Carl we know and love. Talk about "forcing"
> > hams to do something - Might as well hand out invitations to turn in
> > licenses.
>
> You support a Morse code kick in the backside, Dick. And there's no
> smiley face on your postings.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

Cecil,

Glad someone noticed the smiley ... as I explained in other
replies, the "bit of a kick in the backside" to which I referred
was intended as non-forced "encouragement" ...

Dick's approach WRT CW is more like a cattle prod ...
(or should that be a "sheep prod" ??? :-)

Carl - wa6vse

800. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 16:10:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C88E272.20184FF2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36788

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Should Cecil be surprised that Val is familiar to him, ...

Pssssst, Dick, Val is still not familiar to me because
I only heard of his existence two days ago. You
undoubtedly have some of the weirdest concepts that
I have ever encountered in a person living outside
of the fences. How can you possibly believe that Val
is familiar to me unless Val is you?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

801. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 16:18:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C88E473.3182BDC9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36790

Dick Carroll wrote:
> So your point is that since you were an engineer, and not "dumbed down" by
> a technical test that you would have been able to pass regardless of its
> complexity
> then no other ham who acquired a license other than entry level would do so
> while lacking proper technical knowledge.

Nope, Dick, you keep missing the point. Please pay attention. It is my
belief that nobody is dumbed down by expending the energy to study for
and pass an amateur radio exam. I believe that a person who doesn't
already know the material is *smartened up* by expending the energy to
study for and pass an amateur radio exam. The only people who are
not smartened up by expending the energy to study for and pass an
amateur radio exam are the ones who already know the material. Anyone
who can rote memorize 1000 questions and answers is a genius and will
be an asset to the ARS.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

802. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 16:27:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C88E672.D8B389E9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36798

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> Dick's approach WRT CW is more like a cattle prod ...

More like BOHICA!

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

803. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 16:31:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C88E775.9692175C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36799

KC8PMX wrote:
> Depends on how old he is.... if he is in his thirties, he may be working
> many more years. I haven't a clue as to how old Ed is.

I met Ed at the Ft. Tuthill Hamfest. He's just a young sprout.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

804. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 16:47:12 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8hpnip0o06bec@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 36797

W1RFI wrote, to Mr. Carrol, in a very obscure post:

(Item in [brackets] is a clarifier, I hope.)

>He [Cecil] didn't say that he would be a stranger to Valentine,
>Dick; he said that Valentine would be a stranger to him.

Yes, that would be true. That is, since I put no messages on this newsgroup until quite recently, and have been solely a lurker for quite some time, no one here would know anything about me. The ratio of lurkers to posters is very high on Usenet, VERY high. It can be hundreds, or even thousands, to one, depending on the group. ListServes, even specialized ones, are rarely better than a ten to one "lurker-to-poster" ratio and a UseNet group would nearly always average a much, much lower ratio than that.

>Do you *really* think that people who read this newsgroup but
>never post are not strangers to us? In what way do you know
>them?

You folks are NOT "strangers" to ME. That is, I know a LOT about you all thanks to the hundreds and hundreds of messages that you guys have put up over the last year or so. It was easy for me to "drop in" once I had something to say.

>Is this another one of those "I see things that no one else sees"
>sort of things?

I am beginning to wonder just exactly what you DO see! For instance, you've not commented directly on my views on the current amateur radio tests, which I am studying for right now.

Is that "strange?" Yes, I think it is in that you seem inordinately intersted in CAM's strange ideas about me.

Val

805. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 17:05:59 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Xb6i8.22131$106.1811405@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36800

Well said, Dennis

"Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote in message
news:a69kdj$11lb$1@heap.juniper.net...
> Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote:
> >"Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote in message
> >> Note that this doesn't prevent the voice guys from coming down the
> >> band, but they can only do so if they can figure out how to fit
> >> it in 1 kHz of bandwidth. As this would require a step improvement
> >> in the state of the art of "spectrum efficiency", a current
> >> favoured technical way to accumulate spectrum preservation brownie
> >> points, even the CW guys might not object to living with the
> >> (exceedingly unlikely; SSB is already pretty efficient for voice if
> >> your aim is communications rather than quality) possibility that this
> >> might happen.
> >
> >I've always maintained that the metric of spectrum efficiency
> >is bits/Hz ... to do voice in a 1 kHz or less bandwidth would
> >require some pretty sophisticated modulation and coding
> >and even still would likely suffer in terms of robustness
> >(can't violate Shannon ... the old tradeoff between bw and
> >s/n ratio) Your comment that SSB is already pretty efficient
> >for voice is correct ... essentially a 1:1 mapping between
> >"source data" bandwidth and "channel bandwidth".
>
> I don't think the last sentence quite captures it. To put it
> in geeky terms the strength of SSB is that it is redundantly coded
> (i.e. you can figure out what is being said without receiving it all
> quite the way it was sent) in a way that provides a near-optimum match
> to the maximum likelyhood decoder attached to your ears. The guys
> that are good at it (this wouldn't be me) say this about CW as well,
> actually, and I see no reason to disbelieve that either. Computers
> can do neat stuff fairly easily if you change the problem outside
> the application range humans can manage, say to lower or higher bit
> rates than wetware modems are good for, or to make use of better
> available S/N than people need, but you've got your work cut out for you
> if you want to go head to head with people at the S/N edges for voice
(this
> I know for a fact), and I wouldn't be surprised if the same applied to
> CW-rate data (though I don't know this for sure).
>
> About the voice-squeezing thing this must reflect biases derived from
> working at different levels of the technology, since while you and Ed
> Hare both fixated on bit rate versus S/N ratio and Shannon's law, my

> first instinct would be to go after the voice codec to reduce the
> required bit rate in the first place. I don't know the theoretical
> limit on how low the codec bit rate can go before it become impossible
> to encode comprehensible speach, but I'll bet it's only clever
> algorithms yet to be invented to get it lower than the crappy 1500 bps
> codecs I've heard recently. If you could get it down to, say, 500 bps
> then you might get it to fit even with a 2:1 expansion for convolutional
> coding and relatively low-tech modulation. Note that this also
> indicates why I don't think bps/Hz is always the right measure of system
> (as opposed to subsystem) efficiency. If the point of the system is
> to squeeze voice into 1 kHz of spectrum, minimizing the bps requirement
> can provide as much or more efficiency as maximizing bps/Hz.
>
> >However, deep down in the engineer in me, I do believe
> >that ultimately, in the future, bits will be bits and integrated
> >voice and data service, where it, as you put it, it doesn't
> >matter what the bits represent, will prevail. That approach
> >will allow flexible, efficient allocation and use of bandwidth
> >which adapts to the demands of the moment ... one minute
> >a frequency may be carrying voice, the next computer data
> >such as e-mail or a file transfer, the next a picture, etc.
>
> Actually my experience with wired networks is that the "killer
> app" is almost always a big surprise, and is pretty much never what
> you imagined it would be when you started, which is why I've ended up
> in the anarchist "I don't care what you do as long as you do it"
> school of traffic (non-)managment. In fact sometimes what you find
> out is that there is no "killer app", and that you've built a solution
> with no problem, but I know of no way to predict this ahead of time
> either. You need to try it to see what happens, and you shouldn't
> be surprised if you are surprised by the result.
>
> What I do think in this case, however, is that if there really is an
> HF digital "killer app" or two for the ARS lurking out there somewhere,
> there's a about a 50% chance that the mode regulations are standing
firmly
> in its way, so I think it is probably worth while to fix that.
>
> Dennis Ferguson

806. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 17:10:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308121030.22805.00000026@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 36801

In article <3c87f203_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0203071152.5493d172@posting.google.com...
>> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
>news:<3c877ef4_2@news7.fast.net>...
>> > "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
>> > news:20020307060339.06023.00000172@mb-dd.aol.com...
>> > > From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>> > >
>> > > >It was the only mode available that would get through under the
>> > conditions
>> > > >experienced.
>> > >
>> > > In most cases, it is a much better choice to change frequencies than
>to
>> > change
>> > > modes. Perhaps that is what we should be teaching new hams.
>> > >
>> > > 73,
>> > > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>> >
>> > An EXCELLENT point, Ed!!!
>>
>> Agreed. If changing frequencies can improve circuit conditions, the
>> frequencies are available at the stations involved, that's a
>> good move.
>
>"If the frequencies are available at the stations involved" ... this
>sounds like a matter of proper preparation and planning to me.

Sure - but how much preparation is "proper"? Is two bands enough, or maybe
three or four, or what? How much power?

Many emergencies wipe out commercial power and take out the antennas as well.
Like the
ice storms of '97. And the alternate frequencies may be no better.
>
>> > In fact, with the propagation prediction software available,
>> > (I use PropMan2000 from Rockwell Collins ... $99) it is
>> > possible to predict the best frequency quite accurately.
>>
>> If the emergency stations have it available, of course. And the
>> predictions may not be accurate when most needed.

>
>It's a useful tool, not a "cure-all" ... and only one station need
>have access to such software to do the predictions for an
>entire net ...

Only useful if the net members can copy it and use it.

> if it's not available, fine ... that's where operator
>knowledge and experience come in ...

Agreed! That's one of the skills on my list.
>
>> > The software even goes to the internet to download the
>> > latest space weather and other factors so that the prediction
>> > is truly as accurate and up to the minute as possible.
>>
>> Great! But if internet is available, why would ham radio be needed?
>
>Stations outside of the affected area could run the predictions
>for, say the next 24 hours, then relay them to the parties that
>need them ... even without the "to the minute updates,"
>the software does a very good job ...

Again - only if the stations in the net can copy them and implement them.
>
>> > Another thing which would be very useful for disaster
>> > and emergency communications ... and also for routine
>> > skeds to talk with friends (but would obviously not apply
>> > to or appeal to DX chasers and contesters) is the potential
>> > of using ALE "Automatic Link Establishment" software.
>>
>> Sure - IF the stations that need it, have it available.
>
>I said it could be a useful tool in one's toolbox ... not that
>it was a necessity ... I tend to focus on planning and
>preparation ... not on relying on spur of the moment use
>of "minimalist" techniques ...

OK - how much planning and preparation is adequate? How many
different types of emergency should we prepare for? The last hurricane
to come through EPA and do any significant damage was Floyd in late
1999. How much hurricane preparation is adequate?
>
>> > This is used, for example, on commercial and military
>> > circuits where link reliability is or great interest. With
>> > today's computer-controllable radios, I believe it would
>> > be quite feasible for someone to write ALE software
>> > for amateur use ...
>>
>> That's a "who's going to tie the bell on the cat" sort of someone.
>
>???? I'm curious what you mean, but don't have any idea

>what it is ...

The old story was that that the mice were being harassed by a cat, and
they developed the idea of tying a bell on the cat's collar so they could
hear the cat coming. Everybody thought it was a great idea, but
nobody would volunteer to actually DO it.

ALE's a great idea for hams, but for it to work somebody has to develop it
and make it available in an inexpensive, easy to use form. Like what was
done with PSK31. Are you volunteering, Carl?
>
>> > (Yes, someone will grumble "That's not REAL HAM
>> > RADIO!", but my point is that for emergency and
>> > disaster communications, "making it work" is the
>> > name of the game, NOT "following tradition.")
>>
>> Actually, the tradition is to make it work.
>>
>> The problem is having all of this stuff available and working when needed,
>with
>> people who know how to use it.
>
>There we are back to proper planning and preparation ... instead
>of relying on throwing something together willy-nilly after it's hit
>the fan ...

I agree 100%. But even the best preparations go awry, like having one's
antennas fall down in an emergency. Or you use up the emergency fuel supply
and it's impossible or difficult to get more.

Seems odd to me that things like multiband capability, ALE, propagation
prediction,
and other tools are considered reasonable additions to the toolbox, but Morse
skill isn't. Of course Morse skill isn't guaranteed by testing.

73 de Jim, N2EY

807. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 18:09:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C88FE55.B19C332B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36802

Valentine Germann wrote:
> I am beginning to wonder just exactly what you DO see! For
> instance, you've not commented directly on my views on the
> current amateur radio tests, which I am studying for right now.

If you have been reading this newsgroup for "quite some time",
you already know what everyone thinks about your views which
are, strangely enough, identical to Dick's.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

808. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 18:14:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C88FF93.70F6BE85@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36803

N2EY wrote:
> Seems odd to me that things like multiband capability, ALE, propagation
> prediction, and other tools are considered reasonable additions to the
> toolbox, but Morse skill isn't.

Nobody had said that Morse skill isn't useful. Hams are free to add
any of the above items (and more) to their toolbox. There is no
requirement for multiband capability, ALE, propagation prediction
either. What is wrong with live and let live?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

809. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 19:10:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308141005.06778.00000044@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 36804

In article <3C88B627.8A91EC54@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>Dennis Ferguson wrote:
>
>> my experience with wired networks is that the "killer
>> app" is almost always a big surprise, and is pretty much never what
>> you imagined it would be when you started
>
>That would seem to be the history of most significant developments. I doubt
that
>many of the radio intelligentsia of Armstrong's day could have visualized that
the
>main circuit that would give receivers a giant leap forward (the
superheterodyne)
>would come not from receivers, but rather from a transmitter - the
>oscillator.

That's quite incorrect by all the radio history that exists. Oscillators
ALREADY
existed by 1918 and heterodyning ALREADY existed both in theory and
circuitry. Note that the coined word "superheterodyne" comes from heterodyne
with the prefix added to denote a new development as well as a bit of puffery
common in those early days of electronics and multitudinous patent fights.

The common radio receiver was basically a TRF architecture whether it was one
crystal diode, one tube, or multiple tubes in the RF section. Selectivity at
higher frequencies (in those days MF was "high") was already troublesome.
Captain Armstrong (he would not get a promotion to major until after WW1)
uniquely melded several known techniques for the same selectivity over the
entire tuning range of a receiver. That was innovative enough to secure a
patent in the USA, Great Britain, and other countries.

Vacuum tube transmitters were NOT common in 1918, so the terrible reach
to attempt identifying the selectivity solution could NOT have come from
"transmitter circuits." Oscillators were already known, identified, named,
and in use for various purposes as was mixing or heterodyning.

810. Re: Automatic Link Establishment (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 19:10:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308141005.06778.00000043@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 36805

In article <3c88d795_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020308080920.06044.00000386@mb-dd.aol.com...
>> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>>
>> >Another thing which would be very useful for disaster
>> >and emergency communications ... and also for routine
>> >skeds to talk with friends (but would obviously not apply
>> >to or appeal to DX chasers and contesters) is the potential
>> >of using ALE "Automatic Link Establishment" software.
>>
>> >(Yes, someone will grumble "That's not REAL HAM
>> >RADIO!"
>>
>> Feb 1995 QST 68 ALE--The Coming of Automatic Link Establishment
>> (Technical Correspondence)
>> Keywords: AUTOMATIC LINK ESTABLISHMENT Menold, Ronald E., AD4TB
>>
>> Dec 1993 QEX 7 The Growing Family of Federal Standards for HF Radio
>Automatic
>> Link Establishment (ALE), Part VI Bodson, Dennis, W4PWF
>>
>> Oct 1993 QEX 13 The Growing Family of Federal Standards for HF Radio
>Automatic
>> Link Establishment (ALE), Part IV Sutherland, David
>> Oct 1993 QEX 13 The Growing Family of Federal Standards for HF Radio
>Automatic
>> Link Establishment (ALE), Part IV Bodson, Dennis, W4PWF
>>
>> Sep 1993 QEX 14 The Growing Family of Federal Standards for HF Radio
>Automatic
>> Link Establishment (ALE), Part III Bodson, Dennis, W4PWF
>>
>> Aug 1993 QEX 9 The Growing Family of Federal Standards for HF Radio
>Automatic
>> Link Establishment (ALE), Part II Bodson, Dennis, W4PWF
>>
>> Jul 1993 QEX 2 Growing Family of Federal Standards for HF Radio Automatic
>Link
>> Establishment (ALE), Part I Bodson, Dennis, W4PWF
>>
>> Jan 1990 QEX 3 A Federal Standard for HF Radio Automatic Link

>Establishment
>> Adair, Robert T.
>>
>> Unfortunately, none of these articles are available for download. I will
>see
>> what I can do about that. :-)
>>
>> 73,
>> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>Ed ... 1st, please do see if you can get those articles on the website
>(at least in the members section).
>
>2nd, I didn't mean in any way to allude that ARRL had voiced
>any opposition to ALE techniques ...
>
>3rd ... I still bet that there are more than just a few who will
>grumble (at least privately, if not publicly) that "that's not
>REAL ham radio" (because a machine is assisting.
>
>Carl - wa6vse
>
>p.s. please let us know if/when/where those articles become
>available on the website ...

For anyone seriously interested in Automatic Link Establishment
they can look in and download whatever they want from Fed Std
1045A at www.its.bldrdoc.gov/fs-1045a/

That's a link from NTIA. Fed Std 1045A was released on 18 Oct 93,
although much of the work on getting agreement on all the parts of
a rather huge document had been going on for years.

Fed Std 1052 on RF Modems can be downloaded as desired from
www.its.bldrdoc.gov/fs-1052/

In between 1045 and 1052 are a number of other Federal Standards
pertaining to specific techniques in HF communications. There are
links to those, too.

A problem with getting the information directly is that it isn't pre-
digested wtih pretty pictures for the "expert" paddle-twitchers. One
has to actually STUDY (horrors!) the material without any possibility
of a "reward" by another hang-it-on-the-wall credential. :-)

811. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 19:10:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308141006.06778.00000045@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 36806

In article <3C882784.3E743C59@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
>> ultimately, in the future, bits will be bits and integrated
>> voice and data service, where it, as you put it, it doesn't
>> matter what the bits represent, will prevail. That approach
>> will allow flexible, efficient allocation and use of bandwidth
>> which adapts to the demands of the moment ... one minute
>> a frequency may be carrying voice, the next computer data
>> such as e-mail or a file transfer, the next a picture, etc.
>>
>> Whoa ... a modern view of the future ...
>
> "The future"??? Sounds exactly like the ancient Internet. It's been around
>for many years already.

Eleven years.

> Ham radio should be an RF version of the Internet???

No one made that allusion or attribution. This is another reach of Carroll's,
again incorrect as in his attempt to identify the "key ingredient" of the
Armstrong superheterodyne.

> That might be a way to get rid of a lot of hams.

...only those whose standards and practices were frozen to the old era
of the 1930s where the ARS is defined as the acryonym for "Ancient
Radiotelegraphy Service."

>How do you plan to keep interest in ham radio up with that "plan"?

In the year 2001 fully HALF of all HOUSEHOLDS had Internet access.
Eleven years before that it was zero. Internet connectivity-access has
not stopped growing worldwide in all those eleven years.

It should be rather obvious that the Internet and all it entails has become
so large and useful that Ancient Radiotelegraphy methods and
techniques can only appeal to a small minority of a minority of hobbyists.

No one can promote the future by emphasizing old standards and
practices. "Promotion" by uncivil, sociopathic conduct towards all that
seek improvement is no promotion at all, just uncivil sociopathic conduct.

812. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 19:57:47 UTC
From: N2EY@aol.com
Message-ID: <975b4ea9.0203081157.33187550@posting.google.com>
Source record: 36808

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c86b89c_1@news7.fast.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:9f4bfe89.0203061538.43ddaf1b@posting.google.com...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
> news:<3c865294_2@news7.fast.net>...
> >
> > > The reality of the situation is that, left to itself, SSB would probably
> > > over-run the HF bands to the virtual exclusion of other modes.
> >
> > Hmmmm - in previous posts you wrote that most of the world has no mode
> > restrictions and didn't seem to have any problems, but now you seem to
> > have changed your mind.
>
> I guess to be perfectly honest, I've got a lot less faith in the
> ability/willingness of US hams to behave as reasonably as
> our counterparts from other countries do in the sort of "here
> are the band edges, you guys behave yourselves" sort of
> environment that they are USED to operating in ...

OK, that's an up-front honest opinion.

But if what you say is true, why do you say that US hams using 'phone
cannot be counted on to behave reasonably but those using digital
modes
can be counted on to do so?

> It is TRUE that most of the world has no sub-band by mode
> restrictions and that it HASN'T caused any real problems.

What constitutes "most of the world" in this context? Most of the land
area,
most governments, where most hams live, where the
active-hams-per-square-mile density is highest, or what?

Dave Heil, K8MN, says the situation is not so rosy in Europe. He's the
most
qualified DXer here that I know of.

> > I agree that having no mode restrictions would probably result in lots
> > of SSB and AM voice all over the place.
>
> That's because of cultural differences, IMHO ... in other cultures,
> there is a much greater spirit of cooperation and desire for
> harmony ...

There's also less class mobility, less freedom and much more
conformity. Also
less affluence.

> in our culture, unfortunately, too many people are
> "just out for themselves" and want to "stake out their turf and
> defend it" rather than sharing equitably.

That's the "American way"! It's a competitive, turf-based culture.

> > > Keeping it restricted to the upper part does 2 things.
> > > 1) It forces some semblance of cooperative sharing and operating
> > > efficiently on the users of SSB.
> > > 2) It assures that the CW folks and the digital folks have a reasonable
> > > amount of spectrum to work in.
> >
> > Agreed on both points, to an extent. There are still battles between
> > AM and SSB folks.
>
> The "turf wars" phenomenon I referred to ... I think it's rather
> uniquely a US phenomenon. (Mixed blessing ... unfortunate
> that it's so predominant and we're to blame for it, fortunate
> that it's not like that throughout the world's ham population.)

How much of the world's active ham population with HF privs beyond QRP
lives outside the USA?
>
> I see it as sort of the ham radio equivalent of the classical
> "ugly American" tourist ....

One of the reasons our 'phone bands were limited in the first place
was to
give foreign 'phones some breathing room where they would not have to
compete with stateside KWs.
>
> > There are at least two other effects:
> >
> > 3) The crowding of the 'phone bands acts as an incentive for hams to
> > use
> > other modes, such as PACTOR, PSK31 or CW, that are more
> > spectrum-efficient and
> > are allowed where 'phone is not. In other words, "welfare for nonvoice
> > modes" ;-)
>
> Give me a break ... WHAT "crowding on the 'phone bands" ???

If there's no crowding, why the ARRL BoD "refarming" initiative? Why
all the
screaming and moaning over "incentive licensing" back in the '60s,
when the
US ham population was less than half what it is today?
>
> Even last weekend with the DX contest, I was able to find space

> to operate in the phone bands without any real problem ...

Which bands? Didja know that 17 and 12 meters are not in the contest?

> I was
> NOT "forced to retreat to where SSB was not allowed" ...

Try 75 meters on a winter night when the MUF is down below 10 MHz.

> "welfare for nonvoice modes" ??? ROTFLMAO!

That's EXACTLY what it is.

If there's no crowding on the 'phone bands now, as you claim, then
why not open up the entire width of all bands to all modes? Do you
think
that doing so would attract more SSB users?

The limitation of 'phone is in some ways like "HOV" or "diamond" lanes
on
freeways that only cars carrying several passengers can use. Having
those
lanes encourages carpooling, which reduces traffic jams, parking
problems,
pollution and fuel wastage.
>
> It's not that the phone bands are so crowded that they can't
> support more users ... the PROBLEM is that too many folks
> want "their own frequency" (to stake out, protect, and not
> share reasonably with others ...) THAT is why I think that US
> hams would spread SSB throughout the lower parts of the
> bands if allowed to do so ... THAT is why I don't support
> "phone band expansion."

I don't understand how hams can "share a frequency" using SSB except
for
having bigger roundtables (which is what the AM folks often do).

Let's say I get on 3940 LSB, call CQ and have a QSO with 2 other hams.
We
all have decent rigs, clean signals, etc. Everybody adjusts their
power so
that we're all solid copy but not "bending the meter". Everybody takes
a
turn saying their piece and the conversaton goes on for some time. Our
signals are solid copy over hundreds of thousands of square miles.

How are we supposed to "share" this frequency with others, except for
allowing them to join the roundtable?

> > 4) A precedent is set to allocate spectrum space by criteria other
> > than popularity of a mode.
> >
> > >(Sharing between the CW folks and

> > > the digital folks also needs to be cooperative ... without any "I own
> > > this part of the band exclusively" attitudes, in the interest of
> efficient
> > > use of our spectrum, both now, and as usage patterns inevitably change
> > > in the future.)
> >
> > Sure. And if that could be guaranteed, there's no problem. But one of
> > the
> > problems of having a growing number of digital modes and no code test
> > is the
> > inability of their users to inter-communicate. The PSK31 user cannot
> > understand the PACTOR user that is trying to say "the frequency is in
> > use" unless the PSK31
> > user is also equipped with PACTOR. And vice versa. Same for CW vs
> > other modes.
>
> DECENT implementations of any digital mode would allow users
> to detect the presence of users of other modes (including CW)
> and avoid them.

Who gets to decide what's "decent"?
>
> Period, end of story, no excuses.

So any digital mode that doesn't do so is to be banned? What about
PACTOR mailboxes and such?
>
> The idea that one must be able to copy Morse to be able to
> avoid it is about as inaccurate as to say that one must be
> able to speak Spanish in order to recognize that a Spanish-
> speaking person is speaking to someone else in a public
> place and to avoid interrupting him. One doesn't have to
> understand WHAT he's saying, just that he's speaking, in
> order to wait until he's finished and avoid rudly interrupting him.

Incorrect. Voice bandwidths are all the same and the "receivers" used
for
the mode are all pretty much equivalent. Radio is different.
>
> > > > You have already said 25 kHz CW only would be OK.
> > >
> > > That 25 kHz was ALWAYS a "token gesture of good faith,"
> > > don't try to expand it in an "ask for an inch, take a mile" sort
> > > of maneuver ...
> >
> > It's called negotiating, Carl. Gotta allow some negotiating room.
> >
> > It could be said that the "token" of 25 kHz is a "land grab" for
> > digital.
>
> ROTFLMAO!!!!!!!!!! All digital modes, including CW, are

> presently on an equal footing ...

That may change in the future.

> how could you POSSIBLY
> construe a "give-away" of 25 kHz of EXCLUSIVE CW
> spectrum as "a 'land grab' for digital"??? THAT's REALLY
> funny!!!

It's very simple:

Suppose there were a 25 kHz CW-only subband on each HF band, down at
the
low end. The digital folks could say that ALL CW should be down there,
not
in the "digital" part of the band.

After all, how much routine digital or CW operation goes on in the
'phone
bands? Practically none, in part because the 'phone ops would scream
bloody murder: "You digital guys have your own part of the band where
we
can't go, why are you coming up here??" The digital folks could say
the
same thing.

In fact, that might be the best argument AGAINST CW-only subbands.
Create them,
and there may be a movement to push ALL CW operation down there. VERY
BAD IDEA!

Interesting.

> > However, we may both be out in the cold on this one. I would not be
> > surprised
> > if our objections to 'phone band expansion are ignored by the FCC and
> > the
> > 'phone subbands are widened in the near future, as proposed by the
> > ARRL BoD.
> > This will push the foreign 'phones still lower in the band to get away
> > from stateside QRM, and afford even less space for CW and digital. If
> > the use of
> > 'phone HF by US hams increases dramatically in the future, the
> > pressure to
> > widen the 'phone bands still more may carry the day against objections
> > from
> > both digital and CW users.
>
> I'll lobby against phone band expansion with you ... OK???

Depends what you mean by "lobby". I've already let the BoD know there
is
no reason to widen the 'phone bands now. If there is a proposal, I'll

comment against it and urge others to do so.

If you mean joining NCI, forget it! ;-)

Here's another idea:

"Refarm" the bands by occupied bandwidth instead of "mode". Maybe 25%
"narrow"
(defined as less than, say, 250 Hz necessary bandwidth), 25% "medium"
(less than, say, 1000-1500 Hz necessary bandwidth) and 50% "wide"
(meaning wide enough
for SSB, AM and NFM). Toss out all the stuff about "symbol rate" and
"bps" from
the regs - occupied bandwidth is the coin of the realm, so to speak.
If somebody
can come up with a highspeed data mode that takes up 1000 Hz, let them
use it in
the "medium" subband. Same for digital voice, which might be sent
time-dilated.
Narrow modes can go anywhere, same as now.

Think about it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

813. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 19:59:47 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8i50lltgvcte7@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 36807

Hello, all!

CAM, attempting to be moderately intelligent, wrote:

>If you have been reading this newsgroup for "quite some time",
>you already know what everyone thinks about your views which
>are, strangely enough, identical to Dick's.
>
>cheers, CAM, W5DXP

Sorry, guy, that's lame even by YOUR standards. I'm writing
for the lurkers, who are once again being shown the true lay
of the land -- by what is NOT being responded to.

Also, this surey is an outback of UseNet, repartee-wise,
especially in the qualilty of the trolling, non-responsive
mis-directing posts. You and Mr. Hare sure are trying
to be clever and such but, really, you'll have to step it up
quite a bit, quality-wise, to even reach the UseNet average!

Val Germann
Columbia, Missouri

**

814. Re: Whorass Admits his wife is a fat sow with sagging breasts and a dog's ass for a face

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 20:09:07 UTC
From: Big John <Evvy@75meterNetgang.org>
Message-ID: <a6b5v0$357$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 36809
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"AB8MQ" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message:
> > > >
> > > > > > > you obviously don't have a clue or a brain for that matter.
> > > > > > Says the functional illiterate who huffs gas fumes, OBVIOUSLY.
> > > > > >
> > No call, no credibility..and go fuck yourself. You seem to need some
> > > counseling yourself, since you're so obsessed with what I write.
> > >
> > > --
> > > 73 de Roger/ AB8MQ

Curtains boy AB8MQ, big man behind a key board and
hides behind Big Marie's curtains. Nobody has ever heard
you on the air Welfare Extra boy! Post and frequency and
time so I can talk to you. I bet all you post for an answer
is more of your filth and obscene child pornography.

Al

815. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 21:11:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C89290B.AB33166E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36810

Valentine Germann wrote:
> CAM, attempting to be moderately intelligent, wrote:
> >If you have been reading this newsgroup for "quite some time",
> >you already know what everyone thinks about your views which
> >are, strangely enough, identical to Dick's.
>
> Sorry, guy, that's lame even by YOUR standards.

You sure are reacting just like Dick reacts. Instead of explaining what's wrong with my statement, you just call it lame. If you are not Dick, you sure have been taking lessons from him.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

816. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 21:21:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C88CE8A.FC08FAF7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36811

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Thanks to Valentine Germann, one of many who think like I do, for proving
> >you
> >wrong
> >yet again.
>
> Perhaps Valentine would be willing to memorize those 1000 Russian words to
> prove how trivial it is.
>
> Val, I am sure you are reading all of this avidly. Don't take Dick's advice and
> try to use word associations to pass the test. The easiest way is to do what
> the rest of us did. We passed our tests with a combination of learning,
> memorizing, lucky guessing and hoping that a few of the tougher questions
> didn't appear on our exams.
>
> Dick is giving bad advice to newcomers.

You're wasting your advice on one who is already an educator. Do you presume to be more of an education expert than he?

817. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 21:21:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C88CFF3.EFFEA25F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36812

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > As always, it depends on circumstances.
>
> I have not seen you tell people anything other than "you can switch to CW if
> the band fails."

That's because you chose to overlook that.

> I am glad you finally recognize that doing so is only one of
> the possible choices.

Finally? Where HAS your head been, Ed?

> See, you did learn something from talking with me. :-)
>
>

If I did, it sure wasn't that.

> > Why? Seems you find yourself constricted in your thinking just so you can go
> >along
> >with the code bashers.
>
> Why do you say that? Because I feel that changing frequencies to a band that is
> open is a better longer-term choice than trying to wring a few more minutes out
> of a dying band?

Because we're not talking about "longer-term choice". We're discussing passing
message
traffic when SSB fades and CW will still work.

>
> > And it certainly is NOT the "only" solution, rather a solution that *is
> >instantly at hand* one that comes prepackaged in virtually every
> >HF ham rig built, available for use only if hamsknow how to use it.
>
> So does the band switch, and far more hams know how to use the band switch than
> would be proficient enough in Morse code to be able to get reliable copy under
> failing conditions.

So you go right ahead and switch to 75 meter SSB with all the added storm static
and
see how it works out. As stated, it depends entirely on conditions. If 75 flops,
I'll be

ready to jump right back up to 40 CW. Sorry about all you New Agers. Looks like you may be out of luck.

818. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 21:21:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C88D2F2.43ACF370@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36813

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C882784.3E743C59@worldnet.att.net...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > > ultimately, in the future, bits will be bits and integrated
> > > voice and data service, where it, as you put it, it doesn't
> > > matter what the bits represent, will prevail. That approach
> > > will allow flexible, efficient allocation and use of bandwidth
> > > which adapts to the demands of the moment ... one minute
> > > a frequency may be carrying voice, the next computer data
> > > such as e-mail or a file transfer, the next a picture, etc.
> > >
> > > Whoa ... a modern view of the future ...
> >
> > "The future"???
>
> Yes, ham radio could use a little "back to the future." (unfortunately)
>
> >Sounds exactly like the ancient Internet. It's been around
> > for many years already.
>
> Did you ever notice how much more popular and prevalent
> the internet is? Could there be a reason? Could it be that
> it allows one to do so many things? (And that set could
> encompass, and expand on "traditional" ham radio things ...
> it's called "diversification" ... and it can be a key factor in
> surviving in a competitive market ...)
>
> > Ham radio should be an RF version of the Internet???
>
> Not exactly (or totally) but, to some degree that would be
> a valuable thing ... as I've pointed out, being able to bridge
> around outages in the wired infrastructure would be invaluable
> to the emergency management folks ...
> we could provide a robust, portable, wireless means to do
> that (granted we would not be able to provide the gigabits of
> bandwidth that the internet backbone can provide, but we
> COULD provide very useful amounts of bandwidth).
>
> > That might be a way to get rid of a lot of hams.
>
> Why do you say that? Are you so set in your ways that YOU

> would go away if things changed a bit? I am NOT suggesting
> that folks couldn't continue to do what they do now ... just
> that MORE is possible, would broaden the audience to
> whom amateur radio would have interest, and would provide
> many benefits.
>
> > How do you plan to keep interest in ham radio up with that
> > "plan"?
>
> Simple ... provide more variety in "services" and more
> capabilities in a spectrally efficient manner with less
> interference and contention ... make the "product" more
> attractive to a larger range of people than it is now ...
> have a little vision (and an open mind), man!
>
> Carl - wa6vse

Big fly in your ointment, Carl. There is now no truly effective way to monitor the Internet for the
purposes of preserving national security, ours or anyone else's. So do you really believe that regulators will ever loosen things up to the point where ham radio will be allowed to
go as far in the same direction? I seriously doubt it. It would only add to the enormous
problem already at hand.

Surely we all know, now, how important national security is. It's a matter of survival.
I hope no ham would advocate placing survival at high risk for the purposes of
"modernizing" ham radio. Would we?

819. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 21:21:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C88D36B.D2C00FE7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36814

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > I merely
> >state what I know to be factual, and as you can see it is once again backed
> >up by
> > >
> >authoritative sources.
>
> Ultimately, it is an authorative source that arbitrates all of this, Dick --
> the only authorative source in Amateur Radio.
>
> Would you like to bring up what that source has to say about the question pools
> and need for code exams, or are you selective in your "authorative sources?"

So you're saying that the FCC is always 100% correct just because it sets the
rules.
Typical of your version of trolling, not quite as awful as Cecil's, but not too far
behind.

820. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 21:21:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C88D4AF.BD4748F0@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36815

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >ONE MORE TIME........
> >
> >CW should be available as a last resort, useful
> >when whatever better mode you may be lucky enough to have available fails.
> >Got it?
>
> It should be, Dick, but it never has been universally available.

What about ham radio has ever been universal?

> The number of
> hams who learned it and never used it, who don't even own a key, or whose
> skills are so rusty that they can barely copy it under ideal conditions is
> greater than the number of hams whose CW skills are up to the task of pulling a
> weak signal out of a failing band.

That may be, but one the code test always did was to assure that most hams at least

learned the code and were capable of its use. That alone assured that some
significant portion of their number would retain the capability, as evidenced by
long years of its wide use on ham radio when no activity of any sort is mandated.

>
>
> The old testing scheme did not universally give you what you feel should be
> available as a last resort, and if I need to depend on something that is
> available to only a small percentage of hams, I am going to look for something
> better.

Then you must look beyond ham radio.

821. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 21:21:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C891CE7.6031DEE@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36816

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> Whoa ... a modern view of the future ...
>
> > "The future"??? Sounds exactly like the ancient Internet.
>
> Good point, Dick. Perhaps ham radio has a bit of catching up to do.

I dunno, Ed, for a completely voluntary avocational activity where
everything
one does (well, most of us at least) costs instead of paying off, I
think we're keeping up pretty well.

822. Re: Automatic Link Establishment (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 21:21:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C891EA0.7A63D56C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36817

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

>I still bet that there are more than just a few who will

> grumble (at least privately, if not publicly) that "that's not
> REAL ham radio" (because a machine is assisting.

???? Where ya been, Carl, rachetjawing up on SSB?? Check out what's going
on down below .100 on each of the most popular HF bands and you'll see LOTS
of machine assisted QSO's taking place.......some of them might even be mine!

823. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 21:21:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C891F95.8BDFC47E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36818

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > And it certainly is NOT the "only" solution, rather a solution that *is instantly
> > at hand*
> > one that comes prepackaged in virtually every HF ham rig built, available for use
> > only if hams know how to use it.
>
> And therein lies CW's weakness. Probably 2/3 of coded hams cannot carry on a
> decent CW QSO anymore. 1/3 don't like CW and 1/3 don't care enough about CW
> to keep their skill polished. Mix a bunch of hams whose code skills are rusty
> to nonexistent with an emergency and you have a second disaster in the making.

Now that sounds just like an "agin-er" doesn't it? As I stated before, clearly,
some of you guys would rather have NOTHING workable than to admit that
radiotelegraphy is indeed useful as a real, live communications mode.

As for your Ass-ertions, they are no more than uneducated guesses. If you want to see
for yourself
how many hams are able to use CW, just take a good listen to the HF bands when
a CW contest is on. You'll get the surprise of your life. No, I won't be there, I'm not
a
contester.

824. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 21:21:54 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8921D2.ED207EE3@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36819

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > It would be extremely unlikely to find another person who thinks like you
> > > do, Dick
> >
> > Thanks to Valentine Germann, one of many who think like I do, for proving you
> > wrong yet again.
>
> You "two" are the only people in the world who have ever called me
> "worthless".

Ok, so I challenge you to show where I ever called you worthless. If you can I'll
publicly apologize, for I don't believe I ever said that, and never even thought it.

His opinion was formed from reading your postings here, and not from taking
the sort of abuse you have tossed my way -for the singular reason that I still
believe it's worthwhile to require some code testing. What a reason! Do
you really find it so odd that I'd be offended by it all?

> And his was on his second posting, just a mite too familiar
> for him to be a stranger. Just what we need on r.r.a.p - more vulgarity.

Then toss your buddy W5TIT off rrap, and we'll go from there.

>
> I'm not sure the state of Missouri is big enough for both of you, Dick,

It doesn't need to be; as I said, I'm presently far from Missouri, about 1,400 miles

in fact. Haven't been there since November. I have no idea who Valentine Germann
is beyond what he has posted and we all read here. End of story. Read it and weep.

>
> and I'm still not convinced that those were not your words that "Val"
> posted. Setting up a second identity is not rocket science.

First one needs a reason to go to the trouble.....if you think I'd do it for you,
rest easy.
You are far down my list of priorities , and whatever dealings with you I find
needed will be handled right here on rrap.
YOU are the fellow who said he has signed up for a newsfeed service, not me.
Why did you do that, some ulterior motive?

825. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 21:21:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C892316.260C29F5@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36820

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > I'm not trying to win any argument, in fact you and Ed are doing all the
> > > > I merely state what I know to be factual, and as you can see it is once
> > > > again backed up by authoritative sources.
> > >
> > > Authoritative sources????? Shirley, you jest. You haven't offered one iota
> > > of proof that anyone rote-memorizes 1000 Q&A on their way to passing an exam.
> >
> > That's exactly right, I haven't offered any such proof. And just for the record, yet
> > one more time, I DID NOT make any such claim, thus I intend to offer no such proof.
>
> You state what you "know" to be factual, backed up by authoritative sources
> and in the next breath, deny that you ever stated those facts backed up by
> authoritative sources??????

Having more reading comprehension troubles Cec? I said I offered no proof and don't plan to .What Val German said, as a longtime professional educator, is not news nor is it the first time that same statement has been made here by professional educators.

> Feeling bipolar today, are we?

Two might be better than your half dozen.

826. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 21:24:35 UTC
From: Steve Adell - KF2TI <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a6ba78$4cf$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36821

In article <3C89290B.AB33166E@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > CAM, attempting to be moderately intelligent, wrote:
> > >If you have been reading this newsgroup for "quite some time",
> > >you already know what everyone thinks about your views which
> > >are, strangely enough, identical to Dick's.
> >
> > Sorry, guy, that's lame even by YOUR standards.
>
> You sure are reacting just like Dick reacts. Instead of explaining
> what's wrong with my statement, you just call it lame. If you are
> not Dick, you sure have been taking lessons from him.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

And unfortunately Cecil, you are taking lesson from Lennie J'accuse"
Anderson. Shame shame.

Hey Len, old man..still waiting for any piece of evidence or should we
take your complete silence as an Andersonian type of apology??

827. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 21:34:06 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c893425_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36824

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020308121030.22805.00000026@mb-cb.aol.com...
> In article <3c87f203_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>
> >"If the frequencies are available at the stations involved" ... this
> >sounds like a matter of proper preparation and planning to me.
>
> Sure - but how much preparation is "proper"? Is two bands enough, or maybe
> three or four, or what? How much power?

Whatever it takes ... I can run all bands from 160m to 70cm all
modes (even CW ... though I'm admittedly way out of practice
and would NOT even attempt to use it when better means are
readily available). I don't have (and don't envision needing)
an amplifier ... I can run from QRP to 100W ... I don't HAVE
to talk to the other side of the world ... just outside of (or into
an adjoining) disaster area ... or within the disaster area ...
it's not like I'm going to need to talk to Vanawatu to help in
an Eastern PA disaster ... and if the disaster is in Vanawatu,
there will be people better positioned to help them than me
here in Eastern PA ...

> Many emergencies wipe out commercial power

I don't need commercial power ... all of my gear can be run
from 12VDC ... I have large, deep-cycle batteries and the
means to charge them without commercial power (it's called
vehicles, and gas to run them) This is part of being properly
and adequately prepared.

> and take out the antennas as well.
> Like the ice storms of '97.

I can (and have) strung antennas in the dark in freezing
rain, sleet, and snow ... no big deal ... if they come down, put
new ones up. (Having a decent spool of suitable wire ... and
other suitable replacements and backup gear ... is also part
of being properly and adequately prepared)

> And the alternate frequencies may be no better.

Come on ... with 160m to 70cm to work with, I can find
a workable frequency for virtually anything without resorting
to having to fall back on CW as a "last resort." And there
are always relays in case of "skip zones."

> >> > In fact, with the propagation prediction software available,
> >> > (I use PropMan2000 from Rockwell Collins ... $99) it is
> >> > possible to predict the best frequency quite accurately.
> >>
> >> If the emergency stations have it available, of course. And the
> >> predictions may not be accurate when most needed.
> >
> >It's a useful tool, not a "cure-all" ... and only one station need
> >have access to such software to do the predictions for an
> >entire net ...
>
> Only useful if the net members can copy it and use it.
>
> > if it's not available, fine ... that's where operator
> >knowledge and experience come in ...
>
> Agreed! That's one of the skills on my list.

You equate operator skill and experience with CW proficiency.
I place far more value on things that I know to be more useful
and important.

[snipped another attempt to completely discount the possibility
that propagation predictions just might be useful]

> >> > Another thing which would be very useful for disaster
> >> > and emergency communications ... and also for routine
> >> > skeds to talk with friends (but would obviously not apply
> >> > to or appeal to DX chasers and contesters) is the potential
> >> > of using ALE "Automatic Link Establishment" software.
> >>
> >> Sure - IF the stations that need it, have it available.
> >
> >I said it could be a useful tool in one's toolbox ... not that
> >it was a necessity ... I tend to focus on planning and
> >preparation ... not on relying on spur of the moment use
> >of "minimalist" techniques ...
>
> OK - how much planning and preparation is adequate? How many
> different types of emergency should we prepare for? The last hurricane
> to come through EPA and do any significant damage was Floyd in late
> 1999. How much hurricane preparation is adequate?

However much it takes to have a reasonable assurance that
stations can be fielded to provide communications ... that means
backups of gear, power sources, antennas, and operators.

It's sort of like the old joke about the guy who asked "How do
I get to Carnegie Hall?" and the guy answered "Practice, practice,
practice." You have to plan, prepare, and practice if you're going
to be effective ... you can't just say "I know Morse." and think
that's going to get the job done ... as someone (was it Ed or
maybe Cecil?) pointed out ... the majority of the ops you'll contact

out there (outside of the disaster area) are probably not competent
to handle real traffic in Morse ...

> ALE's a great idea for hams, but for it to work somebody has to develop it
> and make it available in an inexpensive, easy to use form. Like what was
> done with PSK31. Are you volunteering, Carl?

While I can write code in a several different programming languages,
I'm more of a system architect/hardware designer sort of guy ... I'm
sure that there are more competent programmers who could do a
better job of this task than me ... but I'd be willing to collaborate with
someone on the systems aspects and the hardware/software interface
and integration ...

> >> > (Yes, someone will grumble "That's not REAL HAM
> >> > RADIO!", but my point is that for emergency and
> >> > disaster communications, "making it work" is the
> >> > name of the game, NOT "following tradition.")
> >>
> >> Actually, the tradition is to make it work.

Making it work is about being prepared to make it work WELL,
not waiting for all hell to break loose, then hoping that "Morse
will save the day."

> >>
> >> The problem is having all of this stuff available and working when
needed,
> >> with people who know how to use it.

Like Dick ... you seem to have a fundamental hangup about
doing the basic planning and preparation ...

> >There we are back to proper planning and preparation ... instead
> >of relying on throwing something together willy-nilly after it's hit
> >the fan ...
>
> I agree 100%. But even the best preparations go awry, like having one's
> antennas fall down in an emergency.

As I said, if the antennas come down, you put new ones up (you
did plan ahead and have extra wire, coax, etc. on hand, right?)

> Or you use up the emergency fuel supply
> and it's impossible or difficult to get more.

If you run out of power, you didn't plan adequately. Period.

I could keep my radios going for weeks without commercial
power ... 'course I'd be eating canned foods and making
coffee over a wood fire, but I'd still have enough eat and I'd
still be on the air.

> Seems odd to me that things like multiband capability,
> ALE, propagation prediction, and other tools are considered
> reasonable additions to the toolbox, but Morse
> skill isn't. Of course Morse skill isn't guaranteed by testing.

Bingo ... that's why I am unwilling to rely on Morse skill as
the "backbone" or "fall-back" position ... it's the weakest
link in the chain ... and not the most effective mode for the
type of communications required.

If you want to have fun with it, fine ... but don't bet the farm
on it when "it hits the fan" ... cover that bet with good planning
and preparedness and backup gear and supplies and you can
more easily and effectively use better modes.

Carl - wa6vse

828. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 21:40:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C892D4A.6BD7BE98@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36822

CAM wrote:

> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > CAM, attempting to be moderately intelligent, wrote:
> > >If you have been reading this newsgroup for "quite some time",
> > >you already know what everyone thinks about your views which
> > >are, strangely enough, identical to Dick's.
> >
> > Sorry, guy, that's lame even by YOUR standards.
>
> You sure are reacting just like Dick reacts. Instead of explaining
> what's wrong with my statement, you just call it lame. If you are
> not Dick, you sure have been taking lessons from him.

Not everyone has to have everything explained in detail for them. As
for you,
it's a matter of you wanting it all in the most detailed form merely
so that you
can pick it apart with changes of context, manipulations of meaning,
generalized
"logical" trolling, and if all that fails, you can always
"dictionaryize" it to death.
If Webster's won't do it, there's always the IEEE job.

829. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 21:40:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C892FAB.C7AF2484@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36823

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > > I still think the masses could use a bit of a kick in the backside
> > > in the direction of progress :-).
> >
> > Ah, that's the good ol' Carl we know and love. Talk about "forcing"
> > hams to do something - Might as well hand out invitations to turn in
> > licenses.
>
> You support a Morse code kick in the backside, Dick. And there's no
> smiley face on your postings.

I don't, and never did, blame anyone for not wanting to have to pass a
code test
to get a ham radio license. I didn't either. But sit, whining and howling
about it for decades, is
truly unconscionable when one could just do it.

Now that the maximum code test speed is 5wpm, truly no one is being even
seriously
inconvenienced by any code test. Why you insist on being obtuse only you
can say

Meanwhile it appears, from listening to the CW bands, that there is indeed
an significant element newcomers who have found enough interest in CW to
use it on the air, and
to gain skill. When they no longer have to learn it to even 5wpm it is most
unlikely
they would ever even give it a try.

830. Re: Automatic Link Establishment (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 22:01:54 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c893ae2_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36825

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020308141005.06778.00000043@mb-bh.aol.com...
>
> For anyone seriously interested in Automatic Link Establishment
> they can look in and download whatever they want from Fed Std
> 1045A at www.its.bldrdoc.gov/fs-1045a/
>
> That's a link from NTIA. Fed Std 1045A was released on 18 Oct 93,
> although much of the work on getting agreement on all the parts of
> a rather huge document had been going on for years.
>
> Fed Std 1052 on RF Modems can be downloaded as desired from
> www.its.bldrdoc.gov/fs-1052/
>
> In between 1045 and 1052 are a number of other Federal Standards
> pertaining to specific techniques in HF communications. There are
> links to those, too.
>

Len,

Thanks for posting the links ... perhaps someone else will
study the Fed Stds and learn something ... maybe even
write an amateur implementation for use with the more
popular computer-controllable radios (if you do, please
document the API for the interface to the radios well ...).

I'd still like to see the articles that Ed mentioned, though,
to see how the subject was treated in QST/QEX ...

Carl - wa6vse

831. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 22:24:54 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c894052_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36826

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C88D2F2.43ACF370@worldnet.att.net...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > Simple ... provide more variety in "services" and more
> > capabilities in a spectrally efficient manner with less
> > interference and contention ... make the "product" more
> > attractive to a larger range of people than it is now ...
> > have a little vision (and an open mind), man!
> >
> > Carl - wa6vse
>
> Big fly in your ointment, Carl. There is now no truly effective
> way to monitor the Internet for the purposes of preserving
> national security, ours or anyone else's. So do you
> really believe that regulators will ever loosen things up to the
> point where ham radio will be allowed to go as far in the same
> direction? I seriously doubt it. It would only add to the enormous
> problem already at hand.

Big lack of intelligent content in your response, Dick ... first,
I think you'd be surprised at how sophisticated some of
the 3-letter agencies might be at snooping on the internet ...
second, what makes you think that ham radio NOW is any
easier (or harder) to snoop on than the internet???

"Secret messages" can be hidden in seemingly innocent
plain language messages ...

Your entire paragraph above is nothing more than a touch
of "huff and puff" mixed with a LOT of pure, senseless
babbling ...

> Surely we all know, now, how important national security
> is. It's a matter of survival.

Yes, it's a serious matter ... one so serious that you should
not stoop so low as to attempt to capitalize on it to forward
your Morse-centric distortion of the world through senseless,
baseless insinuations that somehow modernizing ham radio
would "compromise national security."

My God, man ... get a life and wake up ... there's a real world
out here and it doesn't revolve around, or depend on, your
Morse-centric fantasy land of the 1940's and 50's ...

> I hope no ham would advocate placing survival at high
> risk for the purposes of "modernizing" ham radio. Would we?

Your assertion that such is in any way the case borders on
the obscene, given the events of Sept. 11th, the serious
nature of national security, and the fact that modernizing ham
radio could CONTRIBUTE to the national security, rather
than, as you baselessly allege "compromise" it.

Carl - wa6vse

832. Re: Reciprocal license for Mexico

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 23:01:50 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C8942DD.858A9D6C@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 36827
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Phil Kane wrote:

> On Thu, 07 Mar 2002 17:31:09 GMT, Diveman wrote:
>
> >I also read on the
> >ARRL site that licences for island operation can only be obtained in Mexico
> >City. All in all this is seems quite impractical and confusing.
>
> Mexico is not the US. They have no illusions about making it easy
> for "ordinary folks" to get permits or licenses of any type.

Didn't that NAFTA thing do anything? :-)

833. Re: Whorass Admits his wife is a fat sow with sagging breasts and a dog's ass for a face

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 23:22:57 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a6bl7i$76c$3@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 36833
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.lloyd-davies,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Big John" <Evvy@75meterNetgang.org> wrote in message
news:a6b5v0$357$0@pita.alt.net...
> "AB8MQ" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message:
> > > No call, no credibility..and go fuck yourself. You seem to need some
> > > > counseling yourself, since you're so obsessed with what I write.
> > > >
> > > > --
> > > > 73 de Roger/ AB8MQ
>
> Curtains

Yes, you can do curtains, Gopher face. Did you run up ro Richland and fuck
your mommy up the ass? Next time get some balls, Turdeater.

834. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 23:45:35 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c89535e_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36830

"N2EY" <N2EY@aol.com> wrote in message
news:975b4ea9.0203081157.33187550@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c86b89c_1@news7.fast.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:9f4bfe89.0203061538.43ddaf1b@posting.google.com...
> > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
> > news:<3c865294_2@news7.fast.net>...
> > >
> > > > The reality of the situation is that, left to itself, SSB would
probably
> > > > over-run the HF bands to the virtual exclusion of other modes.
> > >
> > > Hmmmm - in previous posts you wrote that most of the world has no mode
> > > restrictions and didn't seem to have any problems, but now you seem to
> > > have changed your mind.
> >
> > I guess to be perfectly honest, I've got a lot less faith in the
> > ability/willingness of US hams to behave as reasonably as
> > our counterparts from other countries do in the sort of "here
> > are the band edges, you guys behave yourselves" sort of
> > environment that they are USED to operating in ...
>
> OK, that's an up-front honest opinion.

I've been told that at times I can be brutally honest :-) I'm
pretty much a "tell it like I see it" sort of guy most of the
time, in case you haven't noticed ... of course, sometimes
it aggrevates folks, but at least they know where I stand.

> But if what you say is true, why do you say that US hams using 'phone
> cannot be counted on to behave reasonably but those using digital
> modes can be counted on to do so?

I guess because my experience has been that people who
are capable of understanding the benefits of digital modes
also understand that they're better off where they're mpt
"banging heads" with the voice ops ... (politically and out
of courtesy, more than in terms of competing for the use of
a frequency, since most digital modes are VERY patient
and persistent and will usually get through eventually even
when someone intentionally tries to casually jam them)

> What constitutes "most of the world" in this context? Most of the land
> area,

> most governments, where most hams live, where the
> active-hams-per-square-mile density is highest, or what?

Most of the governments or "regulatory domains" if you will ...

> Dave Heil, K8MN, says the situation is not so rosy in Europe. He's the
> most qualified DXer here that I know of.

I'm sorry ... I think Dave is a pompus jerk and I don't trust or
value his opinion on much of anything ... (there, I was brutally
honest again ... but in fairness, I'm sure Dave thinks I'm a jerk,
too ...)

> How much of the world's active ham population with HF privs beyond QRP
> lives outside the USA?

I don't know the exact numbers, but it's a sizable population ...

> > Give me a break ... WHAT "crowding on the 'phone bands" ???
>
> If there's no crowding, why the ARRL BoD "refarming" initiative?

I agree completely "Why the ARRL BoD 'refarming' initiative?"
I think it's a stupid, ill-advised idea aimed at pandering to the
SSB-only crowd.

> > Even last weekend with the DX contest, I was able to find space
> > to operate in the phone bands without any real problem ...
>
> Which bands? Didja know that 17 and 12 meters are not in the contest?

I wasn't counting the WARC bands ... just 80/40/40/15/10 ...

> So any digital mode that doesn't do so is to be banned? What about
> PACTOR mailboxes and such?

Read my letter on that subject in QST ... I forget which issue.

> > The idea that one must be able to copy Morse to be able to
> > avoid it is about as inaccurate as to say that one must be
> > able to speak Spanish in order to recognize that a Spanish-
> > speaking person is speaking to someone else in a public
> > place and to avoid interrupting him. One doesn't have to
> > understand WHAT he's saying, just that he's speaking, in
> > order to wait until he's finished and avoid rudly interrupting him.
>
> Incorrect. Voice bandwidths are all the same and the "receivers" used
> for the mode are all pretty much equivalent. Radio is different.

OK ... I'm the receiver ... I hear energy in my passband above
some reasonable threshold. I inhibit the transmitter. I didn't have
to decode the energy ... just recognize its presence. This is
done all the time.

> Here's another idea:
>
> "Refarm" the bands by occupied bandwidth instead of "mode". Maybe 25%
> "narrow"
> (defined as less than, say, 250 Hz necessary bandwidth), 25% "medium"
> (less than, say, 1000-1500 Hz necessary bandwidth) and 50% "wide"
> (meaning wide enough for SSB, AM and NFM).

Not a totally horrible idea if you HAVE to balkanize things ... but
on the other hand, it's still more rigid, stifling, and less efficient
than completely dynamic frequency allocation.

> Toss out all the stuff about "symbol rate" and "bps" from the regs

I'll buy that ... those things are VERY limiting and unnecessary.

> occupied bandwidth is the coin of the realm, so to speak.

Bits/sec/Hz and Eb/No are my preferred metrics of "goodness."

> Narrow modes can go anywhere, same as now.

Why this sudden reversion to preferential treatment for modes
just because they're narrow ... they could be narrow simply
because they're slow and inefficient (like OOK Morse :-)

Carl - wa6vse

835. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 23:55:41 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <1cci8.806$h04.114334816@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 36828

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020306153124.17082.00000038@mb-mr.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)
> >From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
> >Date: 03/05/02 07:28 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3c860b64_1@newsa.ev1.net>
>
> >Why must someone be a radio amateur to comment and have opinion on
amateur
> >radio, Dave? That doesn't make sense at all.
>
> Sure it does. It makes all the sense in the world. Lennie the Loser
has
> NO experience (beyond the theoretical) from which to address matters
pertaining
> to Amateur radio policy or practice.
>
> NONE.

Nor does Colin Powell's kid. But he's doing it.

836. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-08 23:59:41 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Nfci8.808$i04.114335894@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 36829

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020308090028.17139.00000230@mb-mr.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> >From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
> >Date: 03/08/02 07:17 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <WZ1i8.29$5g4.22024304@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
>
> >I'd like to suprise my kids.
>
> The surprising part is that you figured out what to do to CREATE
kids. Of
> course even a dog can make babies and not know what "intercourse" means.

Steve, you really need to stop drinking. At least stay off the newsgroups
when you're drunk.

837. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 00:14:18 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <utci8.817$gm4.115737673@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 36831

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C88C93C.3DB21DA9@earthlink.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C8669B8.5BB8F267@earthlink.net...
> > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > >
> > > > It might be a place for you to *listen,* but no, you're right, just
> > keep
> > > > bumbling along.
> > > >
> > > I see that you've decided to take this beyond ridiculous.
> > >
> > Sorry you don't see any benefit in knowing the band plans for the one's
you
> > need. Your loss.
>
> What have I lost, Brian? What have I missed? How do you know that I
> missed anything audible here? Finally, what is it to you personally?

You claimed to know something of DX, that's all. Maybe you just have a lot
of time on your hands and can afford to waste it listening in parts of the
band where they're not supposed to be. Smart DXers spend their time
listening to the parts of the band where the DX is supposed to be (i.e.,
authorized).

> > > > You need a strategy.
> > >
> > > I have a really good one: They shows up. I works 'em.
> > >
> > That works for a while.
>
> Yeah, the next part is, I work 'em before they show up.

Now that would be PFM.

> > > > > > > What are you going to do to alleviate the problem?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Nothing.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > That's what's wrong with the youth of today. Some can see a
problem
> > but
> > > > > > don't wish to get involved. I did my part. It is time for you to

> > step
> > > > > up and do yours.
> > > >
> > > > Nope.
> > >
> > > Then your show of concern for potential hams in other countries was
only
> > > artificial at best.
> >
> > Its just not worth discussing with you, that's all. Sorry.
>
> You seemed to think so earlier--you know, before you ran out of credible
> statements.

I made a mistake. Not much is worth discussing with you.

> > > The one thing they are making more of is people. People generate
demand
> > > and demand increases prices. I don't see land getting any cheaper.
> > > >
> > > > But of course, I'm a boomer too, and I've got to pay the price if I
want
> > a
> > > > piece of it. When I leave it to my kids it won't be worth a wooden
> > nickel.
> > >
> > > I think you and your kids might be surprised.
> >
> > I'd like to suprise my kids.
> >
> > We'll see what happens to the stock market when the 1st few years of
boomers
> > retire and start pulling money out of their retirement plans. Then
about 10
> > years later when they pass on and all their homes are put on the market.
>
> More folks are investing all the time as they begin to see the wisdom in
> savings. As for the homes, who will be the beneficiaries of the sales
> of boomer homes? Think it might be their children? I'm not going to
> start worrying about what might take place after I die. That'd be like
> worrying about 6m ops in another country who stray from their authorized
> band segments.

Working the French out of band after you die? Now that would be PFM. I
wonder if heaven has an FCC, or maybe it'll be the other place.

73, Brian

838. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 00:24:02 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <CCci8.825$Mu4.116289705@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 36832

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020308085805.17139.00000229@mb-mr.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> >From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
> >Date: 03/08/02 07:10 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <mT1i8.28$_44.21313685@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
>
> >Steve, you have no idea what you're talking about. Go back to your
bottle
>
> Brian you cowardly scum,
>
> Glad to see you are back to your usual self-diddling self. Guess
when
> Lennie strokes out, we'll have you to carry on the traditions, huh?
>
> Wouldn't have it any other way.
>
> Enjoy the day, Putz Jr.
>
> Steve

Steve, "cowardly scum," "self-diddling self," putz?" Just what is your problem? Try being civil and less of a buffoon, and I'll let you drink yourself to death without further comment.

Brian

839. Re: Whorass Admits his wife is a fat sow with sagging breasts and a dog's ass for a face

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 01:12:39 UTC
From: Doug <Doug14313@DougISbossOF14313.com>
Message-ID: <a6bngg$c43$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 36834
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"AB8MQ" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:a6bl7i$76c$3@pita.alt.net...
> "Big John" <Evvy@75meterNetgang.org> wrote in message
> news:a6b5v0$357$0@pita.alt.net...
> > "AB8MQ" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message:
> > > > No call, no credibility..and go fuck yourself. You seem to need
some
> > > > > counseling yourself, since you're so obsessed with what I write.
> > > > >
> > > > > --
> > > > > 73 de Roger/ AB8MQ
> >
> > Curtains
>
> Yes, you can do curtains, Gopher face. Did you run up ro Richland and fuck
> your mommy up the ass? Next time get some balls, Turdeater.
>
>
Like the poster said, YOU ARE A CHICKEN SHIT Roger.
Why won't you talk to someone on ham radio? Huh, Mr
Welfare Extra Curtains Boy? Cowardly Roger Wiseman!
hahahahhahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahaha
Curtains Boy!
```

840. Re: B2 RADIO ! We're spanking gorgeous !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 01:28:09 UTC
From: Stagger Lee <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
Message-ID: <3C896529.F5EB91B@houston-hunks.com>
Source record: 36835
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.packet,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

B2RADIO wrote:
>
> B2:RADIO! is a live broadcast internet radio station hosted by the good
> people at Live365.com and promises to have a good poke around the vile
> underbelly of Internet society.

Does this post mean that you're going to be featuring Roger Wiseman's
Greyhound Men's Room Band?

P L E A S E S A Y I T I S N ' T S O ! ! ! !

841. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 01:35:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C8966CF.6CAF54F8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 36836

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C88DC6E.9983BF1E@IEEE.org...
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > >
> > > > I still think the masses could use a bit of a kick in the backside
> > > > in the direction of progress :-).
> > >
> > > Ah, that's the good ol' Carl we know and love. Talk about "forcing"
> > > hams to do something - Might as well hand out invitations to turn in
> > > licenses.
> >
> > You support a Morse code kick in the backside, Dick. And there's no
> > smiley face on your postings.
> > --
> > cheers, CAM, W5DXP
>
> Cecil,
>
> Glad someone noticed the smiley ... as I explained in other
> replies, the "bit of a kick in the backside" to which I referred
> was intended as non-forced "encouragement" ...

You raced to correct your earlier statement and in the correction used
both the words "encouragment" and "prodding" as in:

"Dick's approach WRT CW is more like a cattle prod ...
(or should that be a "sheep prod" ??? :-)"

As to what "the masses" need, Carl: It is my view that you are one of
the masses.

Dave K8MN

842. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 01:42:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C896890.2F683D79@earthlink.net>
Source record: 36837

CAM wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> > Seems odd to me that things like multiband capability, ALE, propagation
> > prediction, and other tools are considered reasonable additions to the
> > toolbox, but Morse skill isn't.
>
> Nobody had said that Morse skill isn't useful. Hams are free to add
> any of the above items (and more) to their toolbox. There is no
> requirement for multiband capability, ALE, propagation prediction
> either. What is wrong with live and let live?

I think I'm beginning to understand your way of thinking. We should lead in marketing the migration away from archaic, legacy modes and toward a free market of modes which will mark the paradigm shift into the high speed wireless world of the future. In doing this, we should feel free to retain abilities in the use of some archaic, legacy modes so that they may be placed in our communications toolbox. Is that about it?

I couldn't fit the "live and let live" thing into the philosophy anywhere.

Dave K8MN

843. Re: Automatic Link Establishment (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 01:48:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C8969E8.914E644E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 36838

Len Over 21 wrote:

> For anyone seriously interested in Automatic Link Establishment
> they can look in and download whatever they want from Fed Std
> 1045A at www.its.bldrdoc.gov/fs-1045a/
>
> That's a link from NTIA. Fed Std 1045A was released on 18 Oct 93,
> although much of the work on getting agreement on all the parts of
> a rather huge document had been going on for years.
>
> Fed Std 1052 on RF Modems can be downloaded as desired from
> www.its.bldrdoc.gov/fs-1052/
>
> In between 1045 and 1052 are a number of other Federal Standards
> pertaining to specific techniques in HF communications. There are
> links to those, too.
>
> A problem with getting the information directly is that it isn't pre-
> digested wtih pretty pictures for the "expert" paddle-twitchers. One
> has to actually STUDY (horrors!) the material without any possibility
> of a "reward" by another hang-it-on-the-wall credential. :-)

I can't help but feel that your use of a "smiley" doesn't really indicate humor. You've used the occasion to take another swipe at the ARRL and at mere radio amateurs.

You have illustrated that while California does not have a monopoly on flakes, it certainly has a surplus. Good luck with that 5 wpm.

Dave K8MN

844. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 02:12:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C896FA5.14A8F7A9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 36839

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C88C93C.3DB21DA9@earthlink.net...
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C8669B8.5BB8F267@earthlink.net...
> > > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > It might be a place for you to *listen,* but no, you're right, just
> > > keep
> > > > > bumbling along.
> > > > >
> > > > I see that you've decided to take this beyond ridiculous.
> > >
> > > Sorry you don't see any benefit in knowing the band plans for the one's
> you
> > > need. Your loss.
> >
> > What have I lost, Brian? What have I missed? How do you know that I
> > missed anything audible here? Finally, what is it to you personally?
>
> You claimed to know something of DX, that's all. Maybe you just have a lot
> of time on your hands and can afford to waste it listening in parts of the
> band where they're not supposed to be. Smart DXers spend their time
> listening to the parts of the band where the DX is supposed to be (i.e.,
> authorized).

Did one of 'em tell you that, Brian? You haven't provided one single
item in my quest to become a better DXer--unless it would be your
suggestion to memorize each authorized band allocation for each of the
world's DX entities. I'd say the smart guys know where to find the
information if it is needed.
>
> > > > > You need a strategy.
> > > > >
> > > > I have a really good one: They shows up. I works 'em.
> > >
> > > That works for a while.
> >
> > Yeah, the next part is, I work 'em before they show up.
>
> Now that would be PFM.

That can be the only logical step after working stations when they show up (which you claim "works for a while"). Tell us, what do you do?

> > > > > > > > What are you going to do to alleviate the problem?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Nothing.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > That's what's wrong with the youth of today. Some can see a
> problem
> > > but
> > > > > > > don't wish to get involved. I did my part. It is time for you to
> > > step
> > > > > > > up and do yours.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Nope.
> > > > >
> > > > Then your show of concern for potential hams in other countries was
> only
> > > > artificial at best.
> > > >
> > > Its just not worth discussing with you, that's all. Sorry.
> >
> > You seemed to think so earlier--you know, before you ran out of credible
> > statements.
>
> I made a mistake. Not much is worth discussing with you.

I understand that you made a mistake. You thought perhaps that you'd bowl me over with questions on what can be done to promote local activity in rare DX spots. I provided information on what had been tried in some of those countries. Remember, you indicated concern. Now you say you don't intend to do anything to alleviate that concern. Why all the noise then?

> > > > The one thing they are making more of is people. People generate
> demand
> > > > and demand increases prices. I don't see land getting any cheaper.
> > > > >
> > > > > > But of course, I'm a boomer too, and I've got to pay the price if I
> want
> > > a
> > > > > > piece of it. When I leave it to my kids it won't be worth a wooden
> > > nickel.
> > > > >
> > > > I think you and your kids might be surprised.
> > >
> > > I'd like to suprise my kids.
> >
> > We'll see what happens to the stock market when the 1st few years of
> boomers
> > > retire and start pulling money out of their retirement plans. Then
> about 10

> > > years later when they pass on and all their homes are put on the market.
> >
> > More folks are investing all the time as they begin to see the wisdom in
> > savings. As for the homes, who will be the beneficiaries of the sales
> > of boomer homes? Think it might be their children? I'm not going to
> > start worrying about what might take place after I die. That'd be like
> > worrying about 6m ops in another country who stray from their authorized
> > band segments.
>
> Working the French out of band after you die? Now that would be PFM.

No, worrying about something which I can do nothing about.

I
> wonder if heaven has an FCC, or maybe it'll be the other place.

You wonder if heaven will be hell?

Dave K8MN

845. Wiseman's ISP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 02:18:21 UTC
From: Anon <Anon@AnonAnonNoOne.com>
Message-ID: <a6brbmkku0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 36840
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.flame,alt.flamenet

Roger,

Am I correct, I am told that your ISP is OVIS.NET
and that your e-mail address is ab8mq@ovis.net

Is this correct information Roger?

I see that OVIS.NET is run by a Mr. Anthony Lemons
at 1816 7th St. in Moundsville WV 26041 and his
e-mail address is alemons@ovis.net tel. (304)-843-5090

846. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 02:34:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C8974B5.E8B493B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 36841

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <N2EY@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:975b4ea9.0203081157.33187550@posting.google.com...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
> news:<3c86b89c_1@news7.fast.net>...
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:9f4bfe89.0203061538.43ddaf1b@posting.google.com...
> > > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
> > > news:<3c865294_2@news7.fast.net>...

> > Dave Heil, K8MN, says the situation is not so rosy in Europe. He's the
> > most qualified DXer here that I know of.
>
> I'm sorry ... I think Dave is a pompus jerk and I don't trust or
> value his opinion on much of anything ... (there, I was brutally
> honest again ... but in fairness, I'm sure Dave thinks I'm a jerk,
> too ...)

The word is "pompous". I don't think you're a jerk, Carl. I think you
are clumsy and arrogant in dealing with human beings. Can you say
"archaic legacy modes" three times, very rapidly? Okay, now try
"beeping real fast".

> > How much of the world's active ham population with HF privs beyond QRP
> > lives outside the USA?
>
> I don't know the exact numbers, but it's a sizable population ...
>
> > > Give me a break ... WHAT "crowding on the 'phone bands" ???
> >
> > If there's no crowding, why the ARRL BoD "refarming" initiative?
>
> I agree completely "Why the ARRL BoD 'refarming' initiative?"
> I think it's a stupid, ill-advised idea aimed at pandering to the
> SSB-only crowd.

There's an example of Carl being brutally honest...

What you call "brutally honest", others may describe as a complete lack
of interpersonal skills.

> > > Even last weekend with the DX contest, I was able to find space
> > > to operate in the phone bands without any real problem ...
> >
> > Which bands? Didja know that 17 and 12 meters are not in the contest?

>
> I wasn't counting the WARC bands ... just 80/40/40/15/10 ...

They're HF bands, Carl. Why wouldn't you count them? You could've even dazzled 'em with digital modes or CW on 30m.

> > So any digital mode that doesn't do so is to be banned? What about
> > PACTOR mailboxes and such?

> Not a totally horrible idea if you HAVE to balkanize things ... but
> on the other hand, it's still more rigid, stifling, and less efficient
> than completely dynamic frequency allocation.

You should try 40m from Europe (they no longer balkanize in the Balkans) or Africa. On any weeknight, SSB signals crowd the CW and digital mode users (bandplans exist but are ignored by many). Now let's listen on an SSB contest weekend where there is nowhere for a casual CW QSO to take place. The situation reverses itself during a CW contest weekend. Your dynamic frequency allocation goes *poof*. Dynamic frequency allocation is much like communism--nice theory but it doesn't work.

> Why this sudden reversion to preferential treatment for modes
> just because they're narrow ... they could be narrow simply
> because they're slow and inefficient (like OOK Morse :-)

Speed of throughput is not an indicator of the value of a mode.

Dave K8MN

847. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 02:44:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308214406.08730.00000314@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36842

From: N2EY@aol.com (N2EY)

>But if what you say is true, why do you say that US hams using 'phone
>cannot be counted on to behave reasonably but those using digital
>modes
>can be counted on to do so?

I don't see lots of evidence that either will behave badly. How well do the phone and image people on HF manage to stay out of each others' way? How well do they manage to stay out of the way of other ops using the same mode? How about the CW and digital ops on that part of the band?

>Dave Heil, K8MN, says the situation is not so rosy in Europe. He's the
>most
>qualified DXer here that I know of.

Most of the QRM I have received while operating CW has come from other CW ops. That isn't so rosy, either.

>> Give me a break ... WHAT "crowding on the 'phone bands" ???

>If there's no crowding, why the ARRL BoD "refarming" initiative?

To address underuseage?

>> ROTFLMAO!!!!!!!!!! All digital modes, including CW, are
>> presently on an equal footing ...

>That may change in the future.

In what direction? The FCC has been leaning toward less regulation by mode and sub-band, not more.

>Suppose there were a 25 kHz CW-only subband on each HF band, down at
>the
>low end. The digital folks could say that ALL CW should be down there,
>not
>in the "digital" part of the band.

They could say that, but what would the rules say? If you are saying that there does not need to be such a CW-only setaside, I agree.

>After all, how much routine digital or CW operation goes on in the
>'phone bands?

Non-voice digital operation is not permitted in the phone/image bands. I think I have used CW in the phone bands on about two separate occasions in my life, in one case due to a microphone failure and another due to (is Dick ready for this one?) the fact that copy on SSB from my mobile setup was just too weak.

It was a cross mode QSO, with the other op staying on CW.

>In fact, that might be the best argument AGAINST CW-only subbands.
>Create them,
>and there may be a movement to push ALL CW operation down there. VERY
>BAD IDEA!

If it is a bad idea for one mode, why is not a bad idea for all modes?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

848. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 02:51:04 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308215104.08730.00000316@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36843

From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net

>Depends on how old he is.... if he is in his thirties, he may be working
>many more years. I haven't a clue as to how old Ed is.

Ed is young enough to have fun and old enough to know how. His wife says he is old enough to know better.

I am 51 right now, FWIW.

>By the way Ed, I was speaking with John, WB8RCR a local friend of mine and
>he said he had a QSO with ya in the past. Thought that was kinda neat.

That was a QSO with me operating the original Tuna Tin 2, if memory serves. He probably told you about the Certifi-cat?

>Hopefully sometime in the future we may have a QSO in some form or another
>over the radio.

I haven't been on much of late, but look for me near 7040 kHz when I do get on.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

849. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 02:53:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308215337.08730.00000318@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36845

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>I met Ed at the Ft. Tuthill Hamfest. He's just a young sprout.

I will be there again this year, if anyone can make it. Look for me at the
ARRL booth or hanging out in the back corner with the QRPers. :-)

And for those who just have to see my ugly mug, see:

http://www.arrl.org/news/rfi/2001/1214.html

That will also give a very brief summary of the work I do.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

850. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 02:54:44 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C89797A.11F6C96F@adelphia.net>
Source record: 36844

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Why did you choose to argue - incorrectly - some words in an old,
> rewritten "Amateur's Code" which clearly state the ARRL's
> claim to being the ONLY national/international organization "through
> which amateur radio is represented?"
>
> You attempt petty squablings over words because you feel someone
> has sullied some personal pride you have. You've been put down
> and refuse to acknowledge that, preferring to engage in word fights.

Good Grief, sir. You speak of petty squabbling over words only one paragraph after a new extrapolation of the amateurs code by you.

And to try to turn this into a free speech issue is quite absurd.

A good discussion is always fun, and evenwide divergences in opinion can be expressed if the participants are civil about it.

But I can see that you are mainly interested in "winning" the argument, and are willing to go to some humorous extremes to do so.

But it serves no purpose.

851. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 02:58:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308215837.08730.00000320@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36846

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>Glad someone noticed the smiley...

I noticed it, Carl, but it was a lot more fun not to let on. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

852. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 03:01:32 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308220132.08730.00000324@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36847

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Note that even PSK31 didn't soar in popularity until it was free.

I think that PSK-31 was free from the getgo. What increased its use quite a bit was being featured in QST and CQ pretty much simultaneously, if memory serves. Steve Ford decided it was cool. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

853. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 03:06:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308220608.08730.00000327@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36848

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Why
>should Cecil
>-or you- find it so strange that someone posts who is familiar with Cecil,
>the
>numero uno poster
>in numbers of posts to this NG?

I don't find that strange at all.

>Does Cecil -or you- believe that
>only those who
>have properly introduced themselves to him should be familiar with him? Do
>You?

>Are both
>of you daft?

No. What Cecil said is that the fellow was no stranger to HIM.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

854. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 03:57:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308225725.12293.00000079@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 36851

Submitted for your approval....

Here's a list of desireable radio operator skills for hams.

Operator Skills

1) The skill to speak clearly, concisely and distinctly, at a steady rate, level and tone.
2) The skill to listen carefully and understand a transmission under both good and poor conditions.
3) The skill to judge radio conditions on a given frequency and how they are changing.
4) The skill to determine the mode of a received signal by ear or other means.
5) The skill to properly tune in a signal for best reception.
6) The skill to tune up and operate transmitters so as to maximize effectiveness and minimize interference.
7) The skill to correctly judge the radio conditions over a given path and adjust transmissions for best results.
8) The skill to correctly judge the skills of other operators and adjust transmissions for best results.
9) The skill to communicate effectively in less than optimum settings (heat, cold, lack of sleep, etc.)
10) The skill to communicate effectively under less than optimum radio conditions.
11) The skill to communicate effectively with less than optimum equipment.
12) The skill to use the standard phonetic alphabet smoothly and effectively, and judge when its use is needed.
13) The skill to use appropriate abbreviations and prosigns, and judge when they are needed.
14) The skill to write down received transmissions legibly and neatly so that others can easily read them.
15) The skill to write clear, coherent formal messages in standard form.
16) The skill to type, error free, at a rate that makes best use of the transmission mode.
17) The skill to deal with hostile and/or illegally operated stations.
18) The skill to do several things at once while on the air.
19) The skill to have situational awareness in all operating situations.
20) The skill to project a welcoming, friendly and helpful attitude on the air.

73 de Jim, N2EY

855. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 03:57:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308225726.12293.00000080@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 36849

In article <3C88D7D1.C7D40FBC@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Probably 2/3 of coded hams cannot carry on a
>decent CW QSO anymore. 1/3 don't like CW and 1/3 don't care enough about CW
>to keep their skill polished. Mix a bunch of hams whose code skills are rusty
>to nonexistent with an emergency and you have a second disaster in the
>making.

Not if they have other modes avaialble.

What percentage of hams do you think can use packet, PSK31, PACTOR, or any
of the other data modes? In a given bunch of hams, how many do you think will
be able to communicate using the same digital mode?

>No other mode relies so heavily on labor intensive operator skill.

Voice is more work for me than Morse.

>It doesn't work to test a ham's Morse code in 1960 and then expect him to be
>able to operate CW under emergency conditions 40 years later.

It doesn't work to test a ham's skill or knowledge of anything and then expect
it
to be useful X years later without practice. There are plenty of hams
who think they are "emergency prepared" who couldn't make a simple 80 meter
dipole without detailed instructions even if you gave them all the tools and
materials.

73 de Jim, N2EY

856. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 03:57:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308225727.12293.00000081@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 36850

In article <3C88FF93.70F6BE85@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Seems odd to me that things like multiband capability, ALE, propagation
>> prediction, and other tools are considered reasonable additions to the
>> toolbox, but Morse skill isn't.
>
>Nobody had said that Morse skill isn't useful.

Sure they have, Cecil. You just don't read their posts.

> Hams are free to add
>any of the above items (and more) to their toolbox.

They all sound like good ideas to me.

>There is no
>requirement for multiband capability, ALE, propagation prediction
>either.

They are all part of the requirement to be prepared. Some have higher
priority than others.

73 de Jim, N2EY

857. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 03:57:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308225729.12293.00000082@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 36852

In article <3c893425_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020308121030.22805.00000026@mb-cb.aol.com...
>> In article <3c87f203_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>>
>> >"If the frequencies are available at the stations involved" ... this
>> >sounds like a matter of proper preparation and planning to me.
>>
>> Sure - but how much preparation is "proper"? Is two bands enough, or maybe
>> three or four, or what? How much power?
>
>Whatever it takes ... I can run all bands from 160m to 70cm all
>modes

That's good.

> I don't have (and don't envision needing)
>an amplifier ...

There may be times when an amplifier is needed.

>I can run from QRP to 100W ... I don't HAVE
>to talk to the other side of the world ... just outside of (or into
>an adjoining) disaster area ... or within the disaster area ...
>it's not like I'm going to need to talk to Vanawatu to help in
>an Eastern PA disaster ... and if the disaster is in Vanawatu,
>there will be people better positioned to help them than me
>here in Eastern PA ...

Power is not always needed for DX - and QRP is not always effective for
local communications. There may be times when getting through requires
more than 100W.
>
>> Many emergencies wipe out commercial power
>
>I don't need commercial power ... all of my gear can be run
>from 12VDC ... I have large, deep-cycle batteries and the
>means to charge them without commercial power (it's called
>vehicles, and gas to run them) This is part of being properly
>and adequately prepared.

For as long as the fuel holds out. One of the problems in the ice storms of
1997 was fuel supplies running low.

>
>> and take out the antennas as well.
>> Like the ice storms of '97.
>
>I can (and have) strung antennas in the dark in freezing
>rain, sleet, and snow ... no big deal ... if they come down, put
>new ones up.

Been there, done that.

> (Having a decent spool of suitable wire ... and
>other suitable replacements and backup gear ... is also part
>of being properly and adequately prepared)

Of course.
>
>> And the alternate frequencies may be no better.
>
>Come on ... with 160m to 70cm to work with, I can find
>a workable frequency for virtually anything without resorting
>to having to fall back on CW as a "last resort."

All depends on the situation. How usable will a makeshift wire antenna
be on VHF/UHF if the repeaters in your area fail?

> And there
>are always relays in case of "skip zones."

If there are stations available to do that job. Relay - nets - starting to
sound like NTS - lots of good ideas.

>> > if it's not available, fine ... that's where operator
>> >knowledge and experience come in ...
>>
>> Agreed! That's one of the skills on my list.
>
>You equate operator skill and experience with CW proficiency.

CW proficiency is actually a whole set of skills, not one skill. But I do
not equate operator skill and experience solely with CW skills.

IOW, CW skills are a subset of operator skill and experience.

In fact, several years back I worked up a whole list of operating skills
every ham should strive to have. I posted it here - I can dig it up again
if you'd like. You might like it.

>I place far more value on things that I know to be more useful
>and important.

I know that CW skill is useful and important. Not all-important, of course.
Just another tool in the toolbox.

>> >> > Another thing which would be very useful for disaster
>> >> > and emergency communications ... and also for routine
>> >> > skeds to talk with friends (but would obviously not apply
>> >> > to or appeal to DX chasers and contesters) is the potential
>> >> > of using ALE "Automatic Link Establishment" software.
>> >>
>> >> Sure - IF the stations that need it, have it available.
>> >
>> >I said it could be a useful tool in one's toolbox ... not that
>> >it was a necessity ... I tend to focus on planning and
>> >preparation ... not on relying on spur of the moment use
>> >of "minimalist" techniques ...
>>
>> OK - how much planning and preparation is adequate? How many
>> different types of emergency should we prepare for? The last hurricane
>> to come through EPA and do any significant damage was Floyd in late
>> 1999. How much hurricane preparation is adequate?
>
>However much it takes to have a reasonable assurance that
>stations can be fielded to provide communications ... that means
>backups of gear, power sources, antennas, and operators.

Sure.
>
>It's sort of like the old joke about the guy who asked "How do
>I get to Carnegie Hall?" and the guy answered "Practice, practice,
>practice." You have to plan, prepare, and practice if you're going
>to be effective ...

Of course.

> you can't just say "I know Morse." and think
>that's going to get the job done ...

When did I EVER say such a thing? Morse is just one tool, not the whole
box.

>as someone (was it Ed or
>maybe Cecil?) pointed out ... the majority of the ops you'll contact
>out there (outside of the disaster area) are probably not competent
>to handle real traffic in Morse ...

Sadly true.

However, it seems to me that you are taking great pains to keep Morse out
of the toolbox.
>
>> ALE's a great idea for hams, but for it to work somebody has to develop it
>> and make it available in an inexpensive, easy to use form. Like what was
>> done with PSK31. Are you volunteering, Carl?
>
>While I can write code in a several different programming languages,
>I'm more of a system architect/hardware designer sort of guy ... I'm

>sure that there are more competent programmers who could do a
>better job of this task than me ... but I'd be willing to collaborate with
>someone on the systems aspects and the hardware/software interface
>and integration ...

That's what I mean about "bell the cat" kind of job.
>
>> >> > (Yes, someone will grumble "That's not REAL HAM
>> >> > RADIO!", but my point is that for emergency and
>> >> > disaster communications, "making it work" is the
>> >> > name of the game, NOT "following tradition.")
>> >>
>> >> Actually, the tradition is to make it work.
>
>Making it work is about being prepared to make it work WELL,
>not waiting for all hell to break loose, then hoping that "Morse
>will save the day."

I don't know where you get those ideas, Carl. Certainly not from me.

>> >> The problem is having all of this stuff available and working when
>needed,
>> >> with people who know how to use it.
>
>Like Dick ... you seem to have a fundamental hangup about
>doing the basic planning and preparation ...

Nope. I have NO hangup about preparation at all.
>
>> >There we are back to proper planning and preparation ... instead
>> >of relying on throwing something together willy-nilly after it's hit
>> >the fan ...
>>
>> I agree 100%. But even the best preparations go awry, like having one's
>> antennas fall down in an emergency.
>
>As I said, if the antennas come down, you put new ones up (you
>did plan ahead and have extra wire, coax, etc. on hand, right?)

Right here in the "Antenna Goodies" box. (It actually says that on the box).

>> Or you use up the emergency fuel supply
>> and it's impossible or difficult to get more.
>
>If you run out of power, you didn't plan adequately. Period.

Now you're being unrealistic, Carl. How much fuel can the average ham store
without it being a hazard? Oil heat and a diesel generator is one option.
>
>I could keep my radios going for weeks without commercial
>power ...

Without any more fuel?

>'course I'd be eating canned foods and making
>coffee over a wood fire, but I'd still have enough eat and I'd
>still be on the air.

I've got it - wood-fired steam engines.
>
>> Seems odd to me that things like multiband capability,
>> ALE, propagation prediction, and other tools are considered
>> reasonable additions to the toolbox, but Morse
>> skill isn't. Of course Morse skill isn't guaranteed by testing.
>
>Bingo ... that's why I am unwilling to rely on Morse skill as
>the "backbone" or "fall-back" position ... it's the weakest
>link in the chain ... and not the most effective mode for the
>type of communications required.

So what are you willing to rely on?
>
>If you want to have fun with it, fine ... but don't bet the farm
>on it when "it hits the fan" ... cover that bet with good planning
>and preparedness and backup gear and supplies and you can
>more easily and effectively use better modes.

Preparation is always a good idea.

But I note that you try very hard to deny Morse ANY role, and use
phrases like "better modes".

My expereience is that for many purposes Morse is a better mode than
SSB voice, given operators with decent Morse skills.

73 de Jim, N2EY

858. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 04:00:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6c2ef$3hu$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36855

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C88FF93.70F6BE85@IEEE.org...
> N2EY wrote:
> > Seems odd to me that things like multiband capability, ALE, propagation
> > prediction, and other tools are considered reasonable additions to the
> > toolbox, but Morse skill isn't.
>
> Nobody had said that Morse skill isn't useful. Hams are free to add
> any of the above items (and more) to their toolbox. There is no
> requirement for multiband capability, ALE, propagation prediction
> either. What is wrong with live and let live?
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

Let me add my voice of agreement that if a ham wants to
"add morse skill and capability" to his/her ham operation,
that's fine with me. The issue isn't to do so or not, the issue
is still the test requirement. As Cecil notes, there's NO requirement
for a ham to have ANY capability.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

859. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 04:07:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020308230754.05062.00000060@mb-mt.aol.com>
Source record: 36853

In article <3C89797A.11F6C96F@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> Why did you choose to argue - incorrectly - some words in an old,
>> rewritten "Amateur's Code" which clearly state the ARRL's
>> claim to being the ONLY national/international organization "through
>> which amateur radio is represented?"
>>
>> You attempt petty squablings over words because you feel someone
>> has sullied some personal pride you have. You've been put down
>> and refuse to acknowledge that, preferring to engage in word fights.
>
> Good Grief, sir. You speak of petty squabbling over words only one
>paragraph after a new extrapolation of the amateurs code by you.

Not a "new extrapolation" but a repeat of the original.

> And to try to turn this into a free speech issue is quite absurd.

I've never found any absurdity in guaranteed free speech. Have you?

> A good discussion is always fun, and evenwide divergences in opinion
>can be expressed if the participants are civil about it.

Then look back at your own interjections. Hardly "fun" in attempting
ridicule.

> But I can see that you are mainly interested in "winning" the argument,
>and are willing to go to some humorous extremes to do so.

Since I had already proved the point without a shadow of a doubt,
you had NO chance of "winning" your point. You didn't have a
chance so your only hope was diversion and misdirection. That
didn't work either.

> But it serves no purpose.

Sorry, but it does. It proves the shallowness of some opinions
that rely on myth...and some brainwashing by a large organization.

Now if you want some examples of "civility" and bone-deep "humer,"
take a look at the output of the Dynamic Duo, Ratman and Wobblin.

One became the ONLY ham station in an important, vital nation
on a great continent courtesy of another federal Department. The
other one doesn't seem to hold his liquor or anything else back.

Fun guys, right? :-)

860. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 04:16:15 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16f32b924d68ddea9896a8@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36854

In article <20020308081427.06044.00000388@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
says...

> The old testing scheme did not universally give you what you feel should be
> available as a last resort, and if I need to depend on something that is
> available to only a small percentage of hams, I am going to look for something
> better.

Well, there goes all those digital modes. Sorry, Carl.

joshua houk
ac7ri

861. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 04:19:31 UTC
From: dianechilds2002@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <44fc159d.0203082019.240aafaf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 36856

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:<Nfci8.808$i04.114335894@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020308090028.17139.00000230@mb-mr.aol.com...
> > >Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> > >From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
> > >Date: 03/08/02 07:17 Eastern Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <WZ1i8.29$5g4.22024304@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
>
> > >I'd like to suprise my kids.
> >
> > The surprising part is that you figured out what to do to CREATE
> kids. Of
> > course even a dog can make babies

check out these babies:

http://dirtypolitics.50megs.com/bare.htm

and not know what "intercourse" means.
>
> Steve, you really need to stop drinking. At least stay off the newsgroups
> when you're drunk.

862. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 04:41:03 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8j3i3if12c5b2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 36857

CAM wrote :

>You "two" [Mr. Carroll and myself] are the only people
>in the world who have ever called me "worthless".

I find that hard to believe [:-)] but no matter. I should
not have called you "worthless" and I apologize for that
usage. What I should have said is that I had found your
UseNet postings to this newsgroup "worthless," and
had gleaned that this general view was shared by
Mr. Carroll, who has never, to my knowledge, called you,
yourself, "worthless." Sorry about my hyperbole.

However, I must say it's a rather minor offense compared
to what else has been going on around here of late!

Val Germann
Columbia, Missouri

P.S. In general, when someone makes unwarranted
accusations of the type "CAM" has made about
Mr. Carroll (setting up a second, hidden, identity) it's
usually because they have done so themselves or
are thinking about doing it. It's called "projection"
and it could well apply in this particular case. That
is, "CAM" could well be "projecting" his own evil
plans and intent onto his "enemy." Happens all the
time, especially on UseNet!

**

863. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 04:51:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8979EE.337E12F8@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36858

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> Making it work is about being prepared to make it work WELL,
> not waiting for all hell to break loose, then hoping that "Morse
> will save the day."

You code haters just won't get off that nonsense, will you? NO ONE EVER SAID that
morse would likely save the day. It's another tool to use, one that can be useful when
other more convenient and possibly more efficient modes are either not working or not
even available. If it saves the day then the day would have been lost without it because
no other mode was available to use for the purpose. You and the rest of the codehaters
are simply dishonest, and that's about the most generous way it can be said.

864. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 04:51:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C897D89.84D090D2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36859

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C88D2F2.43ACF370@worldnet.att.net...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > >
> > > Simple ... provide more variety in "services" and more
> > > capabilities in a spectrally efficient manner with less
> > > interference and contention ... make the "product" more
> > > attractive to a larger range of people than it is now ...
> > > have a little vision (and an open mind), man!
> > >
> > > Carl - wa6vse
> >
> > Big fly in your ointment, Carl. There is now no truly effective
> > way to monitor the Internet for the purposes of preserving
> > national security, ours or anyone else's. So do you
> > really believe that regulators will ever loosen things up to the
> > point where ham radio will be allowed to go as far in the same
> > direction? I seriously doubt it. It would only add to the enormous
> > problem already at hand.
>
> Big lack of intelligent content in your response, Dick ... first,
> I think you'd be surprised at how sophisticated some of
> the 3-letter agencies might be at snooping on the internet ...
> second, what makes you think that ham radio NOW is any
> easier (or harder) to snoop on than the internet???
>

And what makes you think that regulators or lawmakers would even
consider
making a seriously deficient situation even more questionable for no
better reason
than to give you a digital playhouse free of restriction?

>
> "Secret messages" can be hidden in seemingly innocent
> plain language messages ...
>

This is news?

>
> Your entire paragraph above is nothing more than a touch
> of "huff and puff" mixed with a LOT of pure, senseless
> babbling ...

>

Now, now, be the nice NEW Carl, not your naturally nasty self.

>
> > Surely we all know, now, how important national security
> > is. It's a matter of survival.
>
> Yes, it's a serious matter ... one so serious that you should
> not stoop so low as to attempt to capitalize on it to forward
> your Morse-centric distortion of the world through senseless,
> baseless insinuations that somehow modernizing ham radio
> would "compromise national security."
>

I'll make you an even wager that between the FCC and the rest of the US
government
they wouldn't even consider doing what you suggested. I know that you
seem to live and
breathe digits for all, and for sure you seem to think that your agenda
is the most important
thing on anybody's scheduled but the bad news is you and your agenda are
not even on
anybody's radar screen, even at the lowest altitude.

>
> My God, man ... get a life and wake up ... there's a real world
> out here and it doesn't revolve around, or depend on, your
> Morse-centric fantasy land of the 1940's and 50's ...
>

ME get a life??? Finally YOU have been handed something resembling one,
after a
quarter century of bitching and
bellyaching, and ..... just how full of crap are you capable of
becoming before your eyes turn brown and your hair is pushed by the
roots?
For your information, I'll repeat it for at least the 23rd time- CW
isn't even my 'favorite'
mode! Last CW contact I made was over a month ago. And what do you
suppose I've been doing in the meantime? Could possibly be doing ahem,
digital mode, PSK31, Hellschrieber,
RTTY, even some MFSK. And what are YOU doing, catching up on your SSB
rachetjawing? Just so you'll know, I don't even know where my microphone
is.

So now who is the retro? I'm quite satisfied to let the readers decide.

>
> > I hope no ham would advocate placing survival at high
> > risk for the purposes of "modernizing" ham radio. Would we?
>

> Your assertion that such is in any way the case borders on
> the obscene, given the events of Sept. 11th, the serious
> nature of national security, and the fact that modernizing ham
> radio could CONTRIBUTE to the national security, rather
> than, as you baselessly allege "compromise" it.

Once again, we'll see what the real experts in the field have to say
about it.
Guaranteed, you won't win this one.

865. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 04:51:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C897E11.1A631594@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36860

Brian P Burke wrote:

> > Sure it does. It makes all the sense in the world. Lennie the Loser
> has
> > NO experience (beyond the theoretical) from which to address matters
> pertaining
> > to Amateur radio policy or practice.
> >
> > NONE.
>
> Nor does Colin Powell's kid. But he's doing it.

No he's not. He's rubber-stamping what Bill Cross puts on his desk.

866. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 04:57:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C89964F.6AEDE481@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36861

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Ok, so I challenge you to show where I ever called you worthless.

Good Lord, Dick, you have called me every name under the sun including
some a lot worse than worthless.

> First one needs a reason to go to the trouble...

You have every reason in the world to need a new persona.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

867. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 05:01:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C89972A.FAE9E300@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36862

Valentine Germann wrote:
> P.S. In general, when someone makes unwarranted
> accusations of the type "CAM" has made about
> Mr. Carroll (setting up a second, hidden, identity) it's
> usually because they have done so themselves or
> are thinking about doing it.

Only a sneaky underhanded yellow bellied scoundrel would do such.
With me, what you see is what you get, warts and all.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

868. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 05:03:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8997A0.6FE975AD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36863

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > > I'm not trying to win any argument, in fact you and Ed are doing all the
> > > > > I merely state what I know to be factual, and as you can see it is once
> > > > > again backed up by authoritative sources.
> > > >
> > > > Authoritative sources????? Shirley, you jest. You haven't offered one iota
> > > > of proof that anyone rote-memorizes 1000 Q&A on their way to passing an exam.
> > >
> > > That's exactly right, I haven't offered any such proof. And just for the record, yet
> > > one more time, I DID NOT make any such claim, thus I intend to offer no such proof.
> >
> > You state what you "know" to be factual, backed up by authoritative sources
> > and in the next breath, deny that you ever stated those facts backed up by
> > authoritative sources??????
>
> Having more reading comprehension troubles Cec? I said I offered no proof and don't plan
to.

You said you state facts backed up by authoritative sources. Then you say you offer no
proof. One of those statements is a lie.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

869. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 05:07:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C89987D.EF9DBBBB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36864

Dave Heil wrote:
> The word is "pompous".

Good Lord! I have never seen a better example of the pot calling
the kettle black.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

870. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 05:09:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C89990E.CF03C4AD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36865

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Big fly in your ointment, Carl. There is now no truly effective way to
> monitor the Internet for the
> purposes of preserving national security, ours or anyone else's.

The NSA would be amazed to hear that, Dick.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

871. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 05:11:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C899997.2EE6ABA5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36866

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Now that the maximum code test speed is 5wpm, truly no one is being even
> seriously inconvenienced by any code test.

On the contrary, Dick, if they, as you say, are being dumbed down by the
5wpm code test, that is a serious inconvenience.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

872. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 05:14:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C899A28.46EAF1B9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36867

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >I met Ed at the Ft. Tuthill Hamfest. He's just a young sprout.
>
> I will be there again this year, if anyone can make it. Look for me at the
> ARRL booth or hanging out in the back corner with the QRPers. :-)

I certainly will try to make it and buy you that lobster dinner I owe you.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

873. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 05:18:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C899B35.F10ED92B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36868

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > And therein lies CW's weakness. Probably 2/3 of coded hams cannot carry on a
> > decent CW QSO anymore. 1/3 don't like CW and 1/3 don't care enough about CW
> > to keep their skill polished. Mix a bunch of hams whose code skills are rusty
> > to nonexistent with an emergency and you have a second disaster in the making.
>
> As for your Ass-ertions, they are no more than uneducated guesses. If you want to see
> for yourself
> how many hams are able to use CW, just take a good listen to the HF bands when
> a CW contest is on. You'll get the surprise of your life. No, I won't be there, I'm not
> a contester.

So you really believe that there are 230,000 hams on CW during a contest? That's
how many there would have to be for my "uneducated guesses" to be wrong.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

874. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 05:23:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C899C3F.5B30A095@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36869

N2EY wrote:
> >Nobody had said that Morse skill isn't useful.
>
> Sure they have, Cecil. You just don't read their posts.

Please list the people who have said Morse skill isn't useful.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

875. Re: If I won the lottery (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 05:24:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020309002421.16305.00000166@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 36870

In article <20020308075636.06044.00000384@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>>I used to say that if I won the big one, I was going to go to work and
>quit.
>>>I
>>>have changed my mind. If I win the big one, I am going to go to work and
>>they
>>>are going to fire me!
>
>>Why would you get fired if you went to work after winning the lottery?
>
>Surely you understood my post, Larry.

Ed:

Hmmm. I cannot possibly imagine your going to work after winning
the lottery, and doing something untoward enough to get you fired!
Are we seeing some passive hostility toward your employer here?
I thought everything was beer and skittles up there in Newington...

73 de Larry, K3LT

876. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 05:35:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C899F2C.D4E0158D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36871

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Note that even PSK31 didn't soar in popularity until it was free.
>
> I think that PSK-31 was free from the getgo. What increased its use quite a bit
> was being featured in QST and CQ pretty much simultaneously, if memory serves.
> Steve Ford decided it was cool. :-)

Before PSK31 was available on PC's it was available on a Motorola DSP
eval board which cost money. That's what I meant. At first, the hardware
wasn't free in the sense that one had to purchase a piece of hardware
that one probably didn't already have.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

877. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 05:38:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C899FC0.B8209470@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36872

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Valentine Germann wrote:
> > > CAM, attempting to be moderately intelligent, wrote:
> > > >If you have been reading this newsgroup for "quite some time",
> > > >you already know what everyone thinks about your views which
> > > >are, strangely enough, identical to Dick's.
> > >
> > > Sorry, guy, that's lame even by YOUR standards.
> >
> > You sure are reacting just like Dick reacts. Instead of explaining
> > what's wrong with my statement, you just call it lame. If you are
> > not Dick, you sure have been taking lessons from him.
>
> Not everyone has to have everything explained in detail for them. As
> for you,
> it's a matter of you wanting it all in the most detailed form merely
> so that you
> can pick it apart with changes of context, manipulations of meaning,
> generalized
> "logical" trolling, and if all that fails, you can always
> "dictionaryize" it to death.
> If Webster's won't do it, there's always the IEEE job.

Dang, Dick, you and Val are two peas out of the same pod. There's
always some reason for y'all not to have to respond rationally.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

878. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 05:48:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C89A210.ABF4D81D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36873

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Typical of your version of trolling, not quite as awful as Cecil's, but not too far
> behind.

Anybody notice that when Dick has been cornered and has no rational comeback,
he invariably calls the poster a troll?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

879. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 05:53:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89A205.57797A81@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36874

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Ok, so I challenge you to show where I ever called you worthless.
>
> Good Lord, Dick, you have called me every name under the sun including
> some a lot worse than worthless.
>
> > First one needs a reason to go to the trouble...
>
> You have every reason in the world to need a new persona.

That's YOUR take, but then who made you the judge?

880. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 05:53:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89A252.70551C47@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36875

CAM wrote:

> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > P.S. In general, when someone makes unwarranted
> > accusations of the type "CAM" has made about
> > Mr. Carroll (setting up a second, hidden, identity) it's
> > usually because they have done so themselves or
> > are thinking about doing it.
>
> Only a sneaky underhanded yellow bellied scoundrel would do such.
> With me, what you see is what you get, warts and all.

So that's why *you* set up a ghost account then accused me of doing
it for sneaky reasons?

881. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 05:53:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89A31A.C58E9737@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36876

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > > > I'm not trying to win any argument, in fact you and Ed are doing all the
> > > > > > I merely state what I know to be factual, and as you can see it is once
> > > > > > again backed up by authoritative sources.
> > > > >
> > > > > Authoritative sources????? Shirley, you jest. You haven't offered one iota
> > > > > of proof that anyone rote-memorizes 1000 Q&A on their way to passing an exam.
> > > >
> > > > That's exactly right, I haven't offered any such proof. And just for the record,
yet
> > > > one more time, I DID NOT make any such claim, thus I intend to offer no such proof.
> > >
> > > You state what you "know" to be factual, backed up by authoritative sources
> > > and in the next breath, deny that you ever stated those facts backed up by
> > > authoritative sources??????
> >
> > Having more reading comprehension troubles Cec? I said I offered no proof and don't
plan to.
>
> You said you state facts backed up by authoritative sources. Then you say you offer no
> proof. One of those statements is a lie.
>
>

The only liar clearly visible here is YOU, pal. I said another authoritative source. the educator (Mr Germann) had just confirmed what I had said. I offered no proof, yet you say I did. Your statement is clearly way off base. I won't say you deliberately lied, but then who
am I to argue with Websters?

882. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 05:53:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89A35F.5F2D0886@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36877

CAM wrote:

> Dave Heil wrote:
> > The word is "pompous".
>
> Good Lord! I have never seen a better example of the pot calling
> the kettle black.
>

There was no "kettle" in this dogfight. Dave was just correcting
his misspelling.

883. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 06:01:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C89A51C.B49BFD85@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36878

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > You have every reason in the world to need a new persona.
>
> That's YOUR take, but then who made you the judge?

Oh, that God would give the gift to us,
to see ourselves as others see us.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

884. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 06:05:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C89A619.EA76EF04@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36879

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Valentine Germann wrote:
> > > P.S. In general, when someone makes unwarranted
> > > accusations of the type "CAM" has made about
> > > Mr. Carroll (setting up a second, hidden, identity) it's
> > > usually because they have done so themselves or
> > > are thinking about doing it.
> >
> > Only a sneaky underhanded yellow bellied scoundrel would do such.
> > With me, what you see is what you get, warts and all.
>
> So that's why *you* set up a ghost account then accused me of doing
> it for sneaky reasons?

You are a liar if you say I ever set up a ghost account, Dick. But
lies are all the newsgroup has come to expect from you. All my
accounts have exhibited my name, or initials, or callsign.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

885. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 06:07:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C89A6A2.141BD26E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36880

Dick Carroll wrote:
> The only liar clearly visible here is YOU, pal. I said another authoritative source. the
> educator (Mr Germann) had just confirmed what I had said.

Someone nobody knows is an authoritative source????? That's worse than a lie.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

886. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 06:42:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89A3FE.9B164E8E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36882

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Big fly in your ointment, Carl. There is now no truly effective way to
> > monitor the Internet for the
> > purposes of preserving national security, ours or anyone else's.
>
> The NSA would be amazed to hear that, Dick.

After September 11, I think not.
It was learned in the caves of Afghanistan that
the terrorists were using the internet to communicate. NSA evidently didn't
know, or do you prefer to think they just ignored it all and let September
11 happen?

887. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 06:42:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89A469.9ED1C3AF@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36881

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Now that the maximum code test speed is 5wpm, truly no one is being even
> > seriously inconvenienced by any code test.
>
> On the contrary, Dick, if they, as you say, are being dumbed down by the
> 5wpm code test, that is a serious inconvenience.

It seems evident that the lack of a 20 wpm test that you avoided for your Extra
Lite
has dumbed you down rather seriously. What else would you rather attribute it
to?

888. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 06:42:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89A54E.9CC5F8BB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36883

CAM wrote:

>
> So you really believe that there are 230,000 hams on CW during a contest?

Of course not, a great many don't care for contesting, as I don't. But MY educated guess is that there are ten times as many CW qualified hams as there are CW contesters. So, do I believe there are 23,000 CW hams on the air on a contest weekend? Certainly.

> That's
> how many there would have to be for my "uneducated guesses" to be wrong.

So much for your guesses.

889. Re: If I won the lottery (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 06:42:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89A5CC.96083F82@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36884

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
> I thought everything was beer and skittles up there in Newington...

More like scotch and skewers.

890. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 06:42:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C831502.156FE98A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36885

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Typical of your version of trolling, not quite as awful as Cecil's, but not too far
> > behind.
>
> Anybody notice that when Dick has been cornered and has no rational comeback,
> he invariably calls the poster a troll?

He, Cecil, I hate to tell you but at those times there either IS NO rational response since
the "question" was nothing but pure troll anyway, or the question was just too off the wall
to even bounce. Somehow you have come to think of yourself as the Leader of RRAP, the only soul present here with any intelligence. Sorry to burst your bubble, but it just ain't so.

891. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 06:42:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C83157A.87F3A864@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36886

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > You have every reason in the world to need a new persona.
> >
> > That's YOUR take, but then who made you the judge?
>
> Oh, that God would give the gift to us,
> to see ourselves as others see us.

Take your own advice, o great one. Doc, suture self.

892. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 06:42:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C831687.74E684D4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36887

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Valentine Germann wrote:
> > > > P.S. In general, when someone makes unwarranted
> > > > accusations of the type "CAM" has made about
> > > > Mr. Carroll (setting up a second, hidden, identity) it's
> > > > usually because they have done so themselves or
> > > > are thinking about doing it.
> > >
> > > Only a sneaky underhanded yellow bellied scoundrel would do such.
> > > With me, what you see is what you get, warts and all.
> >
> > So that's why *you* set up a ghost account then accused me of doing
> > it for sneaky reasons?
>
> You are a liar if you say I ever set up a ghost account, Dick. But
> lies are all the newsgroup has come to expect from you. All my
> accounts have exhibited my name, or initials, or callsign.
>

Hmmmm.... You accused me of setting up a 'netserver account', just like
you did...
YOU said it, I only repeated it. If it was not a ghost account, why did
you accuse me of
setting up one to use clandestinely, "just like you did"???
Hey, remember Webster's, the liar doesn't have to know he's lying. I'm
sure you've
had to hide behind that one many times.

893. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 06:42:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C83170A.1C5BBD59@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36888

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > The only liar clearly visible here is YOU, pal. I said another authoritative source. the
> > educator (Mr Germann) had just confirmed what I had said.
>
> Someone nobody knows is an authoritative source????? That's worse than a lie.
>

Who really "knows" anyone on usenet? Either you take people at face value or everyone is a troll. Some are more than obvious, but he openly invited you to check him out, which you clearly avoided doing.

894. Re: Whorass Admits his wife is a fat sow with sagging breasts and a dog's ass for a face

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 11:15:10 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a6cuammdc1@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 36889
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.doug-smith,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dicksucking Doug" <Doug14313@DougISbossOF14313.com> wrote in message
news:a6bngg$c43$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "AB8MQ" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:a6bl7i$76c$3@pita.alt.net...
> > "Big John" <Evvy@75meterNetgang.org> wrote in message
> > news:a6b5v0$357$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > "AB8MQ" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message:
> > > > > No call, no credibility..and go fuck yourself. You seem to need
> some
> > > > > > counseling yourself, since you're so obsessed with what I write.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > --
> > > > > > 73 de Roger/ AB8MQ
> > >
> > > Curtains
> >
> > Yes, you can do curtains, Gopher face. Did you run up ro Richland and
fuck
> > your mommy up the ass? Next time get some balls, Turdeater.
> >
> >
> Like the poster said,

Says the CHICKENSHIT too cowardly to use his call. I DO get on the radio,
you slobbering, HIV-positive fuckwit.

895. Re: Anon COWARD's rimjobbing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 11:19:11 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a6cuanmdc2@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 36890
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Anon COWARD" <Anon@AnonAnonNoOne.com> wrote in message
news:a6brbmkku0@pita.alt.net...
> Roger,
>
> Am I correct, \ Bullshit/

No you are never correct, Lardaasssssssssssssssssssssssssssssssssssssss.
So? Do you see ovis.net on any of the posts, No. Besides , you had said I
was with hgo.net. Maybe I'm posting from my "job" at American Heuristics.
Get better "intel," DUMBFUCK. And altopia will just tell you to go fuck
yourself if you complain, didn't they?

896. Re: B2 RADIO ! We're spanking gorgeous !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 11:34:32 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a6cuatmdc7@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 36891
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.packet,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,alt.cocksucker.douglas-gerry

"Stagger 'TexASS TURD' Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
news:3C896529.F5EB91B@houston-hunks.com...
> B2RADIO wrote:
> >
> > B2:RADIO! is a live broadcast internet radio station hosted by the good
> > people at Live365.com and promises to have a good poke around the vile
> > underbelly of Internet society.
>
> Does \ /

Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit
"Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
revealed what a hypocrite he is and ironically admits he has no credibility
in message
<3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com> :

"Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own anonymous
status makes the story even less credible."

Stagger Lee will try to cheat you by selling you non-fucntional equipment,
just like he's done to a few hams at hamfests in the past.
--
Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit
"Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
revealed what a hypocrite he is and ironically admits he has no credibility
in message
<3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com> :

"Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own anonymous
status makes the story even less credible."

897. Re: Anon COWARD's rimjobbing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 13:39:58 UTC
From: Boris@bed-wetter.com
Message-ID: <61086561A.13357CF23@bed-wetter.com>
Source record: 36892
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sat, 9 Mar 2002 06:19:11 -0500, AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote:
> "Anon COWARD" <Anon@AnonAnonNoOne.com> wrote in message
> news:a6brbmkku0@pita.alt.net...
> > Roger,
> >
> > Am I correct, \ Bullshit/
>
> No you are never correct, Lardaasssssssssssssssssssssssssssssssssssssss.
> So? Do you see ovis.net on any of the posts, No. Besides , you had said I
> was with hgo.net. Maybe I'm posting from my "job" at American Heuristics.
> Get better "intel," DUMBFUCK. And altopia will just tell you to go fuck
> yourself if you complain, didn't they?

you ain't a good liar slope haid. looky at the telnet log I saved.

```
===
alibama% telnet ovis.net.ovisnet.mail1.psmtp.com 25
Trying 64.75.1.251...
Connected to ovis.net.ovisnet.mail1.psmtp.com.
Escape character is '^]'.
220 Postini ESMTP r2_1_2c1 ready
helo frumdaddy
250 Postini says hello back
mail from: <anon@anon.com>
250 Ok
rcpt to: <ab8mq@ovis.net>
250 Ok
quit
221 Catch you later
Connection closed by foreign host.
===
```

them boys at postini ga run teed old ovis net security iffen postini wuz hired by ovis to do their mails. but postini is coughin up your email address, el stupido. ovis done waisted their money on postini.

you sum fool alrite. "wise"man you are not, wiseman.

898. Re: Automatic Link Establishment (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 13:41:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020309084106.15878.00000245@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 36893

>Subject: Re: Automatic Link Establishment (was Re: Radio Policy)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/08/02 14:10 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020308141005.06778.00000043@mb-bh.aol.com>

>A problem with getting the information directly is that it isn't pre-
>digested wtih pretty pictures for the "expert" paddle-twitchers. One
>has to actually STUDY (horrors!) the material without any possibility
>of a "reward" by another hang-it-on-the-wall credential.

Another gratuitous swipe from the Putz who decries gratuitous swipes.

Started off with good info...Not Amateur Radio policy, but radio stuff
none-the-less. Then you screw it up (as if we expected something else?) and
act like a twit.

Whatta Putz.

899. Re: Automatic Link Establishment (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 13:43:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020309084333.15878.00000246@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 36894

>Subject: Re: Automatic Link Establishment (was Re: Radio Policy)
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 03/08/02 20:48 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C8969E8.914E644E@earthlink.net>

>You have illustrated that while California does not have a monopoly on
>flakes, it certainly has a surplus. Good luck with that 5 wpm.

Tahellwith the 5WPM, Dave...The putz doesn't have the facilities to pass the written, so what's the 5WPM test gonna do for him...???

73

Steve, K4YZ

900. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 13:47:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020309084758.15878.00000247@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 36895

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>Date: 03/08/02 18:59 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <Nfci8.808$i04.114335894@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>

>Steve, you really need to stop drinking. At least stay off the newsgroups
>when you're drunk.

Is that it, Brian? Was THAT your best shot?

Sheesh!

Steve

901. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 13:50:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020309085034.15878.00000248@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 36896

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>Date: 03/08/02 19:24 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <CCci8.825$Mu4.116289705@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>

>Steve, "cowardly scum," "self-diddling self," putz?" Just what is your
>problem?

My "problem" is people like you and Lennie who feel it necessary to start stuff off with this kind of exchange, and then duck for cover when it get's sent back to ya, Putz.

>Try being civil and less of a buffoon, and I'll let you drink
>yourself to death without further comment.
>

Again...THIS is your "best shot"...?!?! Sheesh!

Steve

902. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 13:56:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020309085649.15878.00000249@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 36897

>Subject: Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/08/02 23:07 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020308230754.05062.00000060@mb-mt.aol.com>

>Since I had already proved the point without a shadow of a doubt,
>you had NO chance of "winning" your point. You didn't have a
>chance so your only hope was diversion and misdirection. That
>didn't work either.

And herein lies another of Lennie's failings...one he'll never be able to accept. That his "points" are often anything BUT "points", and very infrequently correct.

>Fun guys, right?

When using YOU as a milestone...?!?! You betcha!

903. Re: Reciprocal license for Mexico

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 14:18:25 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020309091825.03939.00000478@mb-bh.news.cs.com>
Source record: 36898

>>Anyone have any experience in doing something like this in mexico? Is it
>>possible to obtain the permit before leaving home? Would love to hear
>>suggestions, advice, or anything that might help. Thanks very much,
>
> Depends on who you know and who THEY know, and the size of the salad
> that you buy the local radio inspector (I heard that phrase used by
> one on a visit to the US)

Extremely accurate! While Mexico is not my forte, other South American countries (...and some in the Carribean basin) will quite literally issue an amateur radio license in exchange for a crisp "leaf of lettuce."

Trying to do it the "right" way can be troublesome...but is better for both conscience and piece of mind. Good luck sir.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

904. Comments on Jim's list of "desirable skills for hams"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 14:45:17 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c8a2861_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36953

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020308225725.12293.00000079@mb-cs.aol.com...
> Submitted for your approval....
>
> Here's a list of desireable radio operator skills for hams.

Sorry, Jim ... while I *agree* that most of these are
useful attributes for an operator, I think that MOST of
them can't be tested ... nor would a "time in grade"
experience requirement for advancement provide
any assurance that the "skill" had been acquired.

Additionally, I don't think you can have an exhaustive
"one size fits all" list without unnecessarily discriminating
against people who don't fit your "cookie cutter" image
of "the perfect operator" ... for example, people with
disabilities.

Since ham radio is, in part, about "self-education,"
I still think it best to keep the license qualifications
limited to rules/regs/practices and the necessary,
basic technical knowledge necessary to meet the
government's legitimate regulatory interests (which
include electrical and RF safety for the operator and
others and recognizing/avoiding/mitigating interference
problems).

Most of the stuff you list below is/can be learned by
doing ... the license allows one to do ... get it?

> Operator Skills
>
> 1) The skill to speak clearly, concisely and distinctly, at a steady rate,
> level and tone.

This would discrminate against people with speech problems ... who
could be perfectly good CW/Digital operators without anyone even
knowing that they had a speech problem.

> 2) The skill to listen carefully and understand a transmission under both
good
> and poor conditions.

This would discrminate against people with hearing problems ... who
could be perfectly good Digital operators without anyone even
knowing that they had a hearing problem.

> 3) The skill to judge radio conditions on a given frequency and how they
are
> changing.

Useful ... but how do you test it?

> 4) The skill to determine the mode of a received signal by ear or other
means.

Useful ... again, how do you test it (other than the "by ear" part,
using tapes ... probably impractical at a VE session and leaves
out the "other means" which are just as valid IMO.

> 5) The skill to properly tune in a signal for best reception.

Clearly useful, but how do you test it practically at a VE session?

> 6) The skill to tune up and operate transmitters so as to maximize
> effectiveness and minimize interference.

Clearly useful, but how do you test it practically at a VE session?

> 7) The skill to correctly judge the radio conditions over a given path and
> adjust transmissions for best results.

Clearly useful, but how do you test it practically at a VE session?

> 8) The skill to correctly judge the skills of other operators and adjust
> transmissions for best results.

Clearly useful, but how do you test it practically at a VE session?

> 9) The skill to communicate effectively in less than optimum settings
(heat,
> cold, lack of sleep, etc.)

This is starting to sound like a "How do we make the qualifications so
absurd that nobody will want to bother?" item ... I think that most hams,
in an emergency situation will "Do what needs doing." To suggest that
this is even measurable, let alone testable, is a BIG stretch ... what
would you do? Torture people to see how much heat, cold, sleep
deprivation, etc. they could/would tolerate before saying "Uncle!" ?
At what level of torture tolerance would YOU deem an applicant "worthy"
of being granted an amateur license?

> 10) The skill to communicate effectively under less than optimum radio
> conditions.

Clearly useful, but how do you test it practically at a VE session?

> 11) The skill to communicate effectively with less than optimum equipment.

Useful, but again, with proper planning and preparation, good, working
equipment, antennas, etc. should be available and there should be no
need to rely on "minimalist radio" techniques.

> 12) The skill to use the standard phonetic alphabet smoothly and
effectively,
> and judge when its use is needed.

Clearly useful, but how do you test it practically at a VE session?

> 13) The skill to use appropriate abbreviations and prosigns, and judge
when
> they are needed.

This seems more oriented towards Morse operation than a general
requirement that needs to be applied to all.

> 14) The skill to write down received transmissions legibly and neatly so
that
> others can easily read them.

What about typing? What about those with handicaps ... would you deny
them licenses on the basis of not being able to write "legibly and neatly"?
Who's the judge of what's "legible and neat"? You? My 1st grade teacher
(rest her soul)? Some elite corps of "handwriting police"?

> 15) The skill to write clear, coherent formal messages in standard form.

What about typing? What about those with handicaps ... would you deny
them licenses on the basis of not being able to write "legibly and neatly"?
Who's the judge of what's "legible and neat"? You? My 1st grade teacher
(rest her soul)? Some elite corps of "handwriting police"?

The emphasis of this item on "formal message" seems to indicate
the "radiogram" format ... something that's hardly ever used in REAL
emergency communications ... for H&W traffic, e-mail formats would
be more efficient and more commonly recognized ... in fact, once
the message gets out of the disaster area, in many cases e-mail
delivery would be the most efficient means of delivery. (Yes, I know,
to some using anything but "pure ham radio" is sacreligious, but all
I care about is what works best when it comes to emergency comms.)

> 16) The skill to type, error free, at a rate that makes best use of the
> transmission mode.

A usefull skill no doubt ... but really a stretch if you're about to
suggest that it should be a license requirement.

> 17) The skill to deal with hostile and/or illegally operated stations.

A useful skill no doubt ... but really a stretch if you're about to
suggest that it should be a license requirement. How would you
test this in a VE session? Who would decide what was pass
and what was fail?

> 18) The skill to do several things at once while on the air.

A useful skill no doubt ... but really a stretch if you're about to
suggest that it should be a license requirement. How would you
test this in a VE session? Who would decide what was pass

and what was fail?

> 19) The skill to have situational awareness in all operating situations.

This sounds like it boils down to "Watch your back." ... for example,
"Make sure the brush fire doesn't surround you.", or "Don't set up
your station in/near a building that's likely to collapse in an aftershock."

How would you test this?

Are you trying to put the "Darwin Awards" out of business? :-)

> 20) The skill to project a welcoming, friendly and helpful attitude on the
air.

A useful attribute not doubt. How would you test this in a VE session?
Who would decide what was pass and what was fail?

Also, how would you propose to purge all of the existing ops who
couldn't "cut the mustard" according your "cookie-cutter" standards,
assuming that you could develop a means to practically test all of
this (and were made the "standards police" so that you could enforce
it) ??? Or would old timers be 'inherently OK' even if they did not
meet all of these standards?

Carl - wa6vse

905. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 14:52:14 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <ykpi8.1207$th1.168083579@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 36900

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020309084758.15878.00000247@mb-fy.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> >From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
> >Date: 03/08/02 18:59 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <Nfci8.808$i04.114335894@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
>
> >Steve, you really need to stop drinking. At least stay off the
newsgroups
> >when you're drunk.
>
> Is that it, Brian? Was THAT your best shot?
>
> Sheesh!
>
> Steve

It wasn't meant to be a "best shot" Steve. It was a suggestion. Brian

906. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 15:05:07 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8k84dhrluep47@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 36899

Hello, all!

Certain things are pretty much obvious from inspection,
it seems to me. I haven't done a literature search on
"academic cheating" but what the Ham Tests have now
is what frat houses KILL for on college campuses: THE
BOOK on a particular class! That is, in a standard
academic setting, if the questions and answers are
published, in the EXACT form that they will appear
on the test, well, someone is CHEATING, big time!
And, at least for me, it is plain fact that should such
material become available then students WILL use
it -- in whatever way they can!

Some people, perhaps "many" people, will do almost
ANYTHING rather than truly learn the material.

I can speak from experience on THAT one!

Val Germann
Columbia, Missouri

**

907. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 15:09:59 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c8a2e47_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36956

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020308225729.12293.00000082@mb-cs.aol.com...
> In article <3c893425_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020308121030.22805.00000026@mb-cb.aol.com...
> >> In article <3c87f203_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >"If the frequencies are available at the stations involved" ... this
> >> >sounds like a matter of proper preparation and planning to me.
> >>
> >> Sure - but how much preparation is "proper"? Is two bands enough, or
maybe
> >> three or four, or what? How much power?
> >
> >Whatever it takes ... I can run all bands from 160m to 70cm all
> >modes
>
> That's good.

I'm glad we agree ... I should also point out that I have more
than one rig that's capable of covering all of that, plus a couple
of 2m/70cm FM dual-banders as well (plus a decent scanner
and general coverage receiver for monitoring other services).

> > I don't have (and don't envision needing)
> >an amplifier ...
>
> There may be times when an amplifier is needed.

Not from my experience ... I've never found it essential
to have more than 100W to be able to make a contact
outside of the area, or anywhere inside the surrounding
area (for example the area my ARES/RACES group would
cover or respond into to support adjacent units).

> >I can run from QRP to 100W ... I don't HAVE
> >to talk to the other side of the world ... just outside of (or into
> >an adjoining) disaster area ... or within the disaster area ...
> >it's not like I'm going to need to talk to Vanawatu to help in
> >an Eastern PA disaster ... and if the disaster is in Vanawatu,
> >there will be people better positioned to help them than me
> >here in Eastern PA ...

>
> Power is not always needed for DX - and QRP is not always effective for
> local communications. There may be times when getting through requires
> more than 100W.

See above ... my experience doesn't bear this out.

> >> Many emergencies wipe out commercial power
> >
> >I don't need commercial power ... all of my gear can be run
> >from 12VDC ... I have large, deep-cycle batteries and the
> >means to charge them without commercial power (it's called
> >vehicles, and gas to run them) This is part of being properly
> >and adequately prepared.
>
> For as long as the fuel holds out. One of the problems in the ice storms
of
> 1997 was fuel supplies running low.

Planning and preparation ... nothing more.

> >> and take out the antennas as well.
> >> Like the ice storms of '97.
> >
> >I can (and have) strung antennas in the dark in freezing
> >rain, sleet, and snow ... no big deal ... if they come down, put
> >new ones up.
>
> Been there, done that.
>
> > (Having a decent spool of suitable wire ... and
> >other suitable replacements and backup gear ... is also part
> >of being properly and adequately prepared)
>
> Of course.
> >
> >> And the alternate frequencies may be no better.
> >
> >Come on ... with 160m to 70cm to work with, I can find
> >a workable frequency for virtually anything without resorting
> >to having to fall back on CW as a "last resort."
>
> All depends on the situation. How usable will a makeshift wire antenna
> be on VHF/UHF if the repeaters in your area fail?

I have a PD-220 "SuperStationmaster" on 2m ... used to use
them in in commercial installations on mountaintops ... seen
them take 6" of iceload and 100mph wind and not come down.
With my location on the exact top of the highest hill in the area,
I can BE the repeater ... from here, I've talked (simplex) to
mobiles 50-60 miles away with a 5W HT and rubber duckie.
(I planned ahead for ham radio when I bought this place ...)

> > And there
> >are always relays in case of "skip zones."
>
> If there are stations available to do that job. Relay - nets - starting to
> sound like NTS - lots of good ideas.

I never said that relays were "bad" ... better if you don't
need them, but workable if you do.

I never said nets were bad ... I used to be NCS on ARES fire
nets in So Cal a LOT ... wish I could spend as many days/nights
diving in Cozumel as I've spent on ARES nets over the past
25 years.

> >> > if it's not available, fine ... that's where operator
> >> >knowledge and experience come in ...
> >>
> >> Agreed! That's one of the skills on my list.
> >
> >You equate operator skill and experience with CW proficiency.
>
> CW proficiency is actually a whole set of skills, not one skill. But I do
> not equate operator skill and experience solely with CW skills.
>
> IOW, CW skills are a subset of operator skill and experience.

But you ALWAYS make sure to emphasize that "CW skills MUST
be there" ... that is the error ... they can be useful under some
situations (but most of the time using CW is a matter of operator
choice/preference, NOT necessity by any means), but they are
not NECESSARY ... planning and preparation are FAR more
important in emergency communications.

> In fact, several years back I worked up a whole list of operating skills
> every ham should strive to have. I posted it here - I can dig it up again
> if you'd like. You might like it.
>
> >I place far more value on things that I know to be more useful
> >and important.
>
> I know that CW skill is useful and important. Not all-important, of
course.
> Just another tool in the toolbox.

But it always comes up as the only one that you think deserves
a separate, pass/fail test ... curious (not really ...)

> >> OK - how much planning and preparation is adequate? How many
> >> different types of emergency should we prepare for? The last hurricane
> >> to come through EPA and do any significant damage was Floyd in late
> >> 1999. How much hurricane preparation is adequate?
> >
> >However much it takes to have a reasonable assurance that

> >stations can be fielded to provide communications ... that means
> >backups of gear, power sources, antennas, and operators.
>
> Sure.
> >
> >It's sort of like the old joke about the guy who asked "How do
> >I get to Carnegie Hall?" and the guy answered "Practice, practice,
> >practice." You have to plan, prepare, and practice if you're going
> >to be effective ...
>
> Of course.
>
> > you can't just say "I know Morse." and think
> >that's going to get the job done ...
>
> When did I EVER say such a thing? Morse is just one tool, not the whole
> box.

But it always comes up as the only one that you think deserves
a separate, pass/fail test ... curious (not really ...)

> >as someone (was it Ed or
> >maybe Cecil?) pointed out ... the majority of the ops you'll contact
> >out there (outside of the disaster area) are probably not competent
> >to handle real traffic in Morse ...
>
> Sadly true.

Sad to you ... totally inconseqential to me ... I prefer to plan
and prepare adequately to be in a position to use better,
more effective modes for the task.

> However, it seems to me that you are taking great pains to keep Morse out
> of the toolbox.

Not exactly ... I'm like Cecil ... live and let live ... freemarket of
modes.
If you want to spend the time becoming really good at Morse, be my
guest ... I'm not the least bit interested and would not, therefore, waste
my time doing so ... does that mean I want to stop you? No! Does
that mean that I want to "take something away from you"? No!

ALL it means is that I am convinced that Morse is no longer the
best means of conducting emergency comunications for a number
of reasons and I encourage others to plan and be prepared, rather
than hoping that (the) Morse (that they learned 20-30 years ago
and haven't remained proficient at) will somehow magically save
their bacon when it hits the fan.

I think that's good, sound advice.

As far as using emergency communications "needs" as a
"justification" for keeping Morse testing .... that's a bunch of

trumped-up hogwash ... for all of the reasons I've elaborated
in many replies to you and others.

Enjoy it if you do ... but don't create fantasy-world inventions
in order to try to keep forcing Morse on everyone through
regulatory requirements.

Carl - wa6vse

> >
> >> ALE's a great idea for hams, but for it to work somebody has to develop
it
> >> and make it available in an inexpensive, easy to use form. Like what
was
> >> done with PSK31. Are you volunteering, Carl?
> >
> >While I can write code in a several different programming languages,
> >I'm more of a system architect/hardware designer sort of guy ... I'm
> >sure that there are more competent programmers who could do a
> >better job of this task than me ... but I'd be willing to collaborate
with
> >someone on the systems aspects and the hardware/software interface
> >and integration ...
>
> That's what I mean about "bell the cat" kind of job.
> >
> >> >> > (Yes, someone will grumble "That's not REAL HAM
> >> >> > RADIO!", but my point is that for emergency and
> >> >> > disaster communications, "making it work" is the
> >> >> > name of the game, NOT "following tradition.")
> >> >>
> >> >> Actually, the tradition is to make it work.
> >
> >Making it work is about being prepared to make it work WELL,
> >not waiting for all hell to break loose, then hoping that "Morse
> >will save the day."
>
> I don't know where you get those ideas, Carl. Certainly not from me.
>
> >> >> The problem is having all of this stuff available and working when
> >needed,
> >> >> with people who know how to use it.
> >
> >Like Dick ... you seem to have a fundamental hangup about
> >doing the basic planning and preparation ...
>
> Nope. I have NO hangup about preparation at all.
> >
> >> >There we are back to proper planning and preparation ... instead
> >> >of relying on throwing something together willy-nilly after it's hit
> >> >the fan ...

> >>
> >> I agree 100%. But even the best preparations go awry, like having one's
> >> antennas fall down in an emergency.
> >
> >As I said, if the antennas come down, you put new ones up (you
> >did plan ahead and have extra wire, coax, etc. on hand, right?)
>
> Right here in the "Antenna Goodies" box. (It actually says that on the
box).
>
> >> Or you use up the emergency fuel supply
> >> and it's impossible or difficult to get more.
> >
> >If you run out of power, you didn't plan adequately. Period.
>
> Now you're being unrealistic, Carl. How much fuel can the average ham
store
> without it being a hazard? Oil heat and a diesel generator is one option.
> >
> >I could keep my radios going for weeks without commercial
> >power ...
>
> Without any more fuel?
>
> >'course I'd be eating canned foods and making
> >coffee over a wood fire, but I'd still have enough eat and I'd
> >still be on the air.
>
> I've got it - wood-fired steam engines.
> >
> >> Seems odd to me that things like multiband capability,
> >> ALE, propagation prediction, and other tools are considered
> >> reasonable additions to the toolbox, but Morse
> >> skill isn't. Of course Morse skill isn't guaranteed by testing.
> >
> >Bingo ... that's why I am unwilling to rely on Morse skill as
> >the "backbone" or "fall-back" position ... it's the weakest
> >link in the chain ... and not the most effective mode for the
> >type of communications required.
>
> So what are you willing to rely on?
> >
> >If you want to have fun with it, fine ... but don't bet the farm
> >on it when "it hits the fan" ... cover that bet with good planning
> >and preparedness and backup gear and supplies and you can
> >more easily and effectively use better modes.
>
> Preparation is always a good idea.
>
> But I note that you try very hard to deny Morse ANY role, and use

> phrases like "better modes".
>
> My expereience is that for many purposes Morse is a better mode than
> SSB voice, given operators with decent Morse skills.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

908. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 15:12:00 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8k8h9t9f8t5d1@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 36951

Hello, all!

What you say is all well and good. HOWEVER, an "A"
from Central Missouri State University is NOT the same
thing as an "A" from Harvard, though both are quite
"authoritative" in their own way. Taking tests over
complicated material, "blind," in what amounts to a
true academic setting, is VASTLY more difficult than
what is going on today vis-a-vis the Ham Tests.

This is REGARDLESS of the fact that an Extra-class
test passed today is just as "authoritative" as one
passed years ago. That is, both may be equal before
the rulebook but HARDLY EQUAL as social facts.

Surely, this is too obvious to require further elucidation?

Val Germann
Columbia, Missouri

909. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 15:16:06 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <WGpi8.1211$LF1.169623586@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 36952

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C896FA5.14A8F7A9@earthlink.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > > > Sorry you don't see any benefit in knowing the band plans for the
one's
> > you need. Your loss.
> > >
> > > What have I lost, Brian? What have I missed? How do you know that I
> > > missed anything audible here? Finally, what is it to you personally?
> >
> > You claimed to know something of DX, that's all. Maybe you just have a
lot
> > of time on your hands and can afford to waste it listening in parts of
the
> > band where they're not supposed to be. Smart DXers spend their time
> > listening to the parts of the band where the DX is supposed to be (i.e.,
> > authorized).
>
> Did one of 'em tell you that, Brian? You haven't provided one single
> item in my quest to become a better DXer--unless it would be your
> suggestion to memorize each authorized band allocation for each of the
> world's DX entities. I'd say the smart guys know where to find the
> information if it is needed.

Yes, knowing where to listen would benefit you quest for DXCC. Sorry if its
not a big enough boost, but you need to take things in steps. As far as
smart guys go, I wasn't the one working out of band French stations on 6m,
and I do know where to find the information when needed. Remember, I'm the
one who provided it to you.

And you're the one using the word, "memorize." I haven't used it, so don't
pull a Cecil on me.

> > > > > > You need a strategy.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I have a really good one: They shows up. I works 'em.
> > > > >
> > > > > That works for a while.
> > > >
> > > > Yeah, the next part is, I work 'em before they show up.
> > >
> > > Now that would be PFM.
> >
> > That can be the only logical step after working stations when they show

> up (which you claim "works for a while"). Tell us, what do you do?

Dave, it all depends on where you're listening. If you're not listening where they show up, then opportunity missed. If you're listening where they show up, then that works, for a while. You must have a magic radio that can listen to all 2 megahertz of 160M or all 4 megahertz of 6M, simultaneously. The rest of us have to tune around and while we're on this side of the band we can't be listening to that side of the band. Then an awareness of the target DX frequency authorizations would be useful in closing out the last few contacts for DXCC. Memorize if you must, or slide a cheat sheet under the plexiglass. That's all.

> > > > > Then your show of concern for potential hams in other countries was
> > only
> > > > > > artificial at best.
> > > > >
> > > > > Its just not worth discussing with you, that's all. Sorry.
> > >
> > > You seemed to think so earlier--you know, before you ran out of credible
> > > statements.
> >
> > I made a mistake. Not much is worth discussing with you.
>
> I understand that you made a mistake. You thought perhaps that you'd
> bowl me over with questions on what can be done to promote local
> activity in rare DX spots. I provided information on what had been tried
> in some of those countries. Remember, you indicated concern. Now you
> say you don't intend to do anything to alleviate that concern. Why all
> the noise then?
>
> > > More folks are investing all the time as they begin to see the wisdom in
> > > savings. As for the homes, who will be the beneficiaries of the sales
> > > of boomer homes? Think it might be their children? I'm not going to
> > > start worrying about what might take place after I die. That'd be like
> > > worrying about 6m ops in another country who stray from their authorized
> > > band segments.
> >
> > Working the French out of band after you die? Now that would be PFM.
>
> No, worrying about something which I can do nothing about.
>
> I
> > wonder if heaven has an FCC, or maybe it'll be the other place.
>
> You wonder if heaven will be hell?

No, I don't wonder that.

Brian

910. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 15:27:32 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <ERpi8.1218$VS1.170476710@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 36954

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020309085034.15878.00000248@mb-fy.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> >From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
> >Date: 03/08/02 19:24 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <CCci8.825$Mu4.116289705@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
>
> >Steve, "cowardly scum," "self-diddling self," putz?" Just what is your
> >problem?
>
> My "problem" is people like you and Lennie who feel it necessary to
start
> stuff off with this kind of exchange, and then duck for cover when it
get's
> sent back to ya, Putz.

Then I'm sorry. Your post lacked a contextual understanding. I figured
there was a reason for it.

> >Try being civil and less of a buffoon, and I'll let you drink
> >yourself to death without further comment.
>
> Again...THIS is your "best shot"...?!?! Sheesh!

I thought it was good enough. What else could I have said to get rid of
you?

73, Brian

911. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 15:32:10 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <_Vpi8.1221$h%1.171016351@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 36955

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C897E11.1A631594@worldnet.att.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > > Sure it does. It makes all the sense in the world. Lennie the
Loser
> > has
> > > NO experience (beyond the theoretical) from which to address matters
> > pertaining
> > > to Amateur radio policy or practice.
> > >
> > > NONE.
> >
> > Nor does Colin Powell's kid. But he's doing it.
>
> No he's not. He's rubber-stamping what Bill Cross puts on his desk.

So a non amateur can sign in to law what amateurs do, but only an amateur
can have an opinion...

Different planet? Parallel worlds? That's the only explanation for this
discontinuity. Beam me up, Scotty.

73, Brian

912. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 16:11:20 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c8a3d1f_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36963

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C897D89.84D090D2@worldnet.att.net...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C88D2F2.43ACF370@worldnet.att.net...

[snipped a couple of screens worth of Dick's babbling, to cut
to the core of his lack of understanding]

> > > I hope no ham would advocate placing survival at high
> > > risk for the purposes of "modernizing" ham radio. Would we?
> >
> > Your assertion that such is in any way the case borders on
> > the obscene, given the events of Sept. 11th, the serious
> > nature of national security, and the fact that modernizing ham
> > radio could CONTRIBUTE to the national security, rather
> > than, as you baselessly allege "compromise" it.
>
> Once again, we'll see what the real experts in the field have to say
> about it.
> Guaranteed, you won't win this one.

From the ARRL:

"NEWINGTON, CT, Jan 31, 2002--President George W. Bush spoke
today via Amateur Radio to members of the Northern Florida Amateur
Radio Emergency Service Net (NFAN). The president was in Florida
to spotlight five volunteer groups--among them the Volusia County
Amateur Radio Emergency Service (ARES)--for their value to the new
Office of Homeland Security."

Note the last phrase Dick ... "for their value to the new Office of
Homeland Security."

Clearly, the government is viewing amateur radio as a valuable,
even vital, asset in terms of national security ...

You'd already lost your bet before you made it, Dick ...

Perhaps you should not bet on or spout off about things
that you obviously know little or nothing about.
('course I'm afraid that will seriously restrict your available
topics for conversation :-)

Carl - wa6vse

p.s. The whole story can be viewed at:

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2002/01/31/1/?nc=1

913. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 16:24:38 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a6dcqo01hbk@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 36964

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C83157A.87F3A864@worldnet.att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > You have every reason in the world to need a new persona.
> > >
> > > That's YOUR take, but then who made you the judge?
> >
> > Oh, that God would give the gift to us,
> > to see ourselves as others see us.
>
> Take your own advice, o great one. Doc, suture self.

Hey, Dick, suture this...

http://www.sparklet.com/~royce/trams/youare.swf

914. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 16:27:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8A3808.987CE34D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36957

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > So you really believe that there are 230,000 hams on CW during a contest?
>
> Of course not, a great many don't care for contesting, as I don't. But MY educated guess
> is that there are ten times as many CW qualified hams as there are CW contesters. So,
> do I believe there are 23,000 CW hams on the air on a contest weekend? Certainly.

Duuuuhhhhhhh Dick, when you say there are 23,000 hams on the air during a contest weekend and 90% of CW qualified hams don't care for contesting, you are accepting my guesstimate of 230,000 CW qualified hams which is 1/3 of all hams.

You are agreeing that 230,000 CW fluent hams, 230,000 CW non fluent hams, and 230,000 hams who don't ever use CW is a reasonable guesstimate.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

915. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 16:37:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8A3A40.71FA3B43@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36958

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Hmmmm.... You accused me of setting up a 'netserver account', just like
> you did... YOU said it, I only repeated it.

Not a netserver account, Dick, a news-server account. I subscribe to
spamkiller.newsfeeds.com separately and in addition to the news server
provided by my ISP. Val subscribes to Supernews.com in the same way
that I subscribe to Newsfeeds.com. So I thought you had subscribed
to Supernews. There's nothing untoward about subscribing to a news-
server different from one's ISP. Get with the program, will you?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

916. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 16:39:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8A3AA6.BC4BA3F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36959

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > The only liar clearly visible here is YOU, pal. I said another authoritative source.
the
> > > educator (Mr Germann) had just confirmed what I had said.
> >
> > Someone nobody knows is an authoritative source????? That's worse than a lie.
>
> Who really "knows" anyone on usenet? Either you take people at face value or everyone
> is a troll.

You certainly don't take people at face value, so by your own admission,
you consider everyone to be a troll.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

917. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 16:43:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8A3BC9.AFDBCD72@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36960

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Big fly in your ointment, Carl. There is now no truly effective way to
> > > monitor the Internet for the
> > > purposes of preserving national security, ours or anyone else's.
> >
> > The NSA would be amazed to hear that, Dick.
>
> After September 11, I think not.
> It was learned in the caves of Afghanistan that
> the terrorists were using the internet to communicate. NSA evidently didn't
> know, or do you prefer to think they just ignored it all and let September
> 11 happen?

Nobody knew who was involved in Sept 11 until after it happened so
your statement doesn't make any sense. There is no effective way to
monitor telephones if you don't know whose phone to tap. There is
no effective way to tail people if you don't know who to tail. There
is no effective way to catch people who cheat on their income tax
if you don't know who to audit. Internet is no different.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

918. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 16:46:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8A3C4C.1479B275@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36961

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Now that the maximum code test speed is 5wpm, truly no one is being even
> > > seriously inconvenienced by any code test.
> >
> > On the contrary, Dick, if they, as you say, are being dumbed down by the
> > 5wpm code test, that is a serious inconvenience.
>
> It seems evident that the lack of a 20 wpm test that you avoided for your Extra
> Lite
> has dumbed you down rather seriously. What else would you rather attribute it
> to?

You speak out of both sides of your mouth, Dick. Either ham exams dumb
down the new hams or they don't. You cannot have it both ways depending
upon which side of the bed you get up on.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

919. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 16:47:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8A3C89.C74C32D3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36962

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Typical of your version of trolling, not quite as awful as Cecil's, but not too far
> > > behind.
> >
> > Anybody notice that when Dick has been cornered and has no rational comeback,
> > he invariably calls the poster a troll?
>
> He, Cecil, I hate to tell you but at those times there either IS NO rational response
> since the "question" was nothing but pure troll anyway, ...

You just proved my point, Dick. Thanks.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

920. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 17:10:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020309121014.20892.00000058@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 36965

In article <20020307060339.06023.00000172@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>It was the only mode available that would get through under the conditions
>>experienced.
>
>In most cases, it is a much better choice to change frequencies than to
>change
>modes.

I think you mean "change bands". In most cases the propagation does not significantly vary across an amateur band.

> Perhaps that is what we should be teaching new hams.

Sure. And having more bands available is definitely part of being prepared.

But for the change bands idea to work, all stations involved must have the bands
available, there must be agreement on alternate frequencies and a way to coordinate the shift.

Example: A 75 meter net starts to lose copy of a station in the emergency area that has important traffic to send. What alternate frequency should be used? Does the whole net go there or just one or two well-equipped stations? What if the alternate frequency is already in use, or the copy there is even worse?

Seems to me a quick shift of modes could be more effective. If the stations all have, say, lappers and PSK31, they could shift to that mode to pass the traffic - probably in less time than it would take to retune makeshift antennas and find
each other on a different band. If they're prepared, that is.

73 de Jim, N2EY

921. Steve's personal vendetta against Len

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 17:13:39 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c8a42f8_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36966

Steve,

With all due respect, your personal vendetta against
Len has taken a life of its own and it's getting really
tiresome to see you respond to every single post
Len makes with tirades of "putz", etc.
(and no redeeming content from you).

I'd personally just as soon not "killfile" you because
you are, IMHO, an (otherwise) rational and intelligent
person who might, just might, if you get off of this
vendetta, say something worth listening to ...

How about you give us all a break, give it a rest,
and see if you can come up with some more valuable
commentary here instead of offering nothing more than
a constant stream of gratuitous insults directed at Len?

(Yes, I admit that occasionally I get frustrated or PO'd
to the point that I insult someone ... but your thing with
Len is different ... it's not an occasional slip ... it's a
constant flood.)

Please consider this in the spirit in which it's intended.

73,
Carl - wa6vse

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020309084333.15878.00000246@mb-fy.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Automatic Link Establishment (was Re: Radio Policy)
> >From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >Date: 03/08/02 20:48 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3C8969E8.914E644E@earthlink.net>
>
> >You have illustrated that while California does not have a monopoly on
> >flakes, it certainly has a surplus. Good luck with that 5 wpm.
>
> Tahellwith the 5WPM, Dave...The putz doesn't have the facilities to
pass the
> written, so what's the 5WPM test gonna do for him...???
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

922. Re: Anon COWARD's rimjobbing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 17:34:46 UTC
From: GenderBender <alterego@msnn.com>
Message-ID: <WIri8.11046$hO6.1077097@bin4.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
Source record: 36967
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

What does all this have to do with the topic of this group?

"Doug" <Herbie@BARFforever.com> wrote in message
news:a6deg2jkc0@pita.alt.net...
> > : > ===
> > : > alibama% telnet ovis.net.ovisnet.mail1.psmtp.com 25
> > : > Trying 64.75.1.251...
> > : > Connected to ovis.net.ovisnet.mail1.psmtp.com.
> > : > Escape character is '^]'.
> > : > 220 Postini ESMTP r2_1_2c1 ready
> > : > helo frumdaddy
> > : > 250 Postini says hello back
> > : > mail from: <anon@anon.com>
> > : > 250 Ok
> > : > rcpt to: <ab8mq@ovis.net>
> > : > 250 Ok
> > : > quit
> > : > 221 Catch you later
> > : > Connection closed by foreign host.
> > : > ===
> > : >
> > : > them boys at postini ga run teed old ovis net security iffen postini
> wuz
> > : > hired by ovis to do their mails. but postini is coughin up your
email
> > : > address, el stupido. ovis done waisted their money on postini.
> > : >
> > : > you sum fool alrite. "wise"man you are not, wiseman.
> > :
> > : YUP! dat ole Mr Postini sure is reliable. He keep coughing
> > : up ab8mq@ovis.net everey time youse asks him to say if'n
> > : Wogey has an account wif them.
> > : Youse busted Wogey! OVIS.NET is one of your ISPs,
> > : maybe your only one.....curtains boy!
> > :
> > : AB8MQ@OVIS.NET is Wiseman's valid address.
> >
> > Come Monday, he'll call up Ohio Valley Internet Services (ovis) and have
> > the address changed to something else. And he calls others "anonymous
> > cowards?"
> >
> > Oh the irony of it all (to quote a Dimmy post on flame_fest).
> >

> > [Cyrnfr Ze fcnzzre, jevgr gb jbtre.]
>
> Guaroteed! in 24 to 72 hours mr Postini will begin returning
> negatives on ab8mq@ovis.net rite after Wogey begs
> Mr Lemons to once again change Wogey email address!!!!!
> In da mean times, Postini is still returning info showing
> Wogey's address ab8mq@ovis.net as a good address for
> wittle wogey.....ho ho ho
>
>
>
>
>
>

923. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 17:36:20 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c8a485d_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36968

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C8974B5.E8B493B@earthlink.net...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >
> > "N2EY" <N2EY@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:975b4ea9.0203081157.33187550@posting.google.com...
> > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
> > news:<3c86b89c_1@news7.fast.net>...
> > > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:9f4bfe89.0203061538.43ddaf1b@posting.google.com...
> > > > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:<3c865294_2@news7.fast.net>...
> >
> > > > Dave Heil, K8MN, says the situation is not so rosy in Europe. He's the
> > > > most qualified DXer here that I know of.
> > >
> > I'm sorry ... I think Dave is a pompus jerk and I don't trust or
> > value his opinion on much of anything ... (there, I was brutally
> > honest again ... but in fairness, I'm sure Dave thinks I'm a jerk,
> > too ...)
> >
> The word is "pompous".

Well, EXCUSE me for the typo ... I don't type nearly as well as
I used to years ago because I have some lack of coordination
in my hands and fingers due to a spinal chord injury.

I use your nit-picky correction of such a simple, inconseqential
error as further evidence that you are, in fact, a pompous jerk :-P

> I don't think you're a jerk, Carl. I think you
> are clumsy and arrogant in dealing with human beings. Can you say
> "archaic legacy modes" three times, very rapidly? Okay, now try
> "beeping real fast".

Did them both "real fast" ... no problem ... that proves every bit
as much relative to my worth as a ham as a Morse test would.
(in other words, zip, nada, zilch, zero ...)

> > I agree completely "Why the ARRL BoD 'refarming' initiative?"
> > I think it's a stupid, ill-advised idea aimed at pandering to the
> > SSB-only crowd.
> >
> There's an example of Carl being brutally honest...

Yup ... totally honest, no punches pulled. I honestly can't think
of a truly sugar-coated "politically correct" way to describe
how stupid and ill-advised the "refarming intiative' really is ...

> What you call "brutally honest", others may describe
> of interpersonal skills.

Many people have told me that they appreciate my
candor and the fact that they know where I stand
by what I tell them, rather than having to try to play
mind games "reading between the lines" on a bunch
of mealy-mouthed, "politically correct" crap.

BTW, Dave, your "intrapersonal skills," as evidenced
here, are not the best I've ever seen ... that's why I
think you're a pompous jerk.

> > > > Even last weekend with the DX contest, I was able to find space
> > > > to operate in the phone bands without any real problem ...
> > >
> > > Which bands? Didja know that 17 and 12 meters are not in the contest?
> >
> > I wasn't counting the WARC bands ... just 80/40/40/15/10 ...
>
> They're HF bands, Carl. Why wouldn't you count them? You could've even
> dazzled 'em with digital modes or CW on 30m.

Would they have made the situation look more "crowded"?
I don't think so ...

> Speed of throughput is not an indicator of the value of a mode.

No, Dave ... I didn't say that "pure speed of throughput" was
a metric of "goodness" ... read what I said again ... I said that
the two metrics that I believe in most are "bits/sec/Hz" ... that
is essentially a time/throughput/bandwidth factor ... and "Eb/No"
which is the ratio of the (required) energy per bit to the noise
power density.

BTW .. those are not simply "Carl's prefered metrics" ...
they are metrics that are virtually universally accepted in
the engineering community (of course, that will probably
result in an immediate reply "So what, we're hams, not
engineers?" ... if not from you, almost certainly from
Dick ... but the point is that they ARE two of the best,
most valid metrics against which to evaluate any modulation
or modulation/coding scheme.)

Carl - wa6vse

924. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 17:54:07 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c8a4ca5_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 36970

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C89964F.6AEDE481@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Ok, so I challenge you to show where I ever called you worthless.
>
> Good Lord, Dick, you have called me every name under the sun including
> some a lot worse than worthless.
>
> > First one needs a reason to go to the trouble...
>
> You have every reason in the world to need a new persona.

Cecil,

If he's anything in real life like he is here,
getting a new persona here is the least of his
problems :-)

Carl - wa6vse

925. Onmag.com - The Online Creativity Magazine

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 17:55:32 UTC
From: webmaster@onmag.com
Message-ID: <310e9a9d.0203090955.7b2078c6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 36969

Check out www.onmag.com - The Online Creativity Magazine, encouraging creative writing, photography, music, computer related art, filming & more...

With the millions of websites on the World Wide Web today, and with the list of websites growing ever so fast, what is it that endears us to only a selected few sites? What makes us want to visit and re-visit only a chosen few from that abysmal ocean of websites? Besides other things, it’s primarily the content, the use, the entertainment value, the attractiveness, the quality of information and the opportunities offered by the particular website. But unfortunately there are very few sites that have all these characteristics. Today, the world is fast shrinking into a global village. It is the age of Internet journalism, where there’s an urgent need for a website where we can openly express ourselves. We need a site where there’s no hassles of having to deal with editors, no cut-throat competition, no restrictions – Just Pure Creativity.

Onmag.com has recieved overwhelming response for its previous & current issues. The current issue has new selection of poems, articles, stories & photography stored in it from national & international contributors. From this issue there will be prizes for Best Article & Best Poem and there will even be prizes for registering to the online magazine for free. Very soon there will be i-movies section on the magazine, for those who are interested in making movies. The first Onmag.com presentation 'Kilbisa - the guilt' will be premiered soon on the magazine. We are looking forward for your further support for encouraging new writers & photographers and remember at Onmag.com YOU come FIRST .

So, what are you waiting for just go ahead and log on to www.onmag.com & read on...

Submit your work to Deep Malhotra at webmaster@onmag.com

926. Re: Anon COWARD's rimjobbing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 18:06:30 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a6dlit$71b$3@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 36971
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"GenderBender" <alterego@msnn.com> wrote in message
news:WIri8.11046$hO6.1077097@bin4.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com...
> What does all this have to do with the topic of this group?

They want to show how stupid they are since postini doesn't offer that type
of ping.

927. Re: Anon COWARD's rimjobbing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 19:05:19 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a6dmtr$an7$1@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 36973
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

Kiddie porn downloading pervert "Stagger 'TexASS TURD' Lee"
<SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
news:genderbender.go.away@houston-hunks.com...
>
> On Sat, 09 Mar 2002 17:34:46 GMT, GenderBender <alterego@msnn.com> wrote:
> : What does all this have to do with the topic of this group?
>
> Well, top poster, which group is "this group?" The thread appeared in
> three news groups until you trimmed your post.
>
> And \ /

Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit
"Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
revealed what a hypocrite he is and ironically admits he has no credibility
in message
<3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com> :

"Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own anonymous
status makes the story even less credible."

Faggot Lee pretends he has a ham call, he's really too chickenshit to give
one, even if somehow he could cheat the exam and actually get a license.

Faggot Lee pretends to actually "know" things, (despite evidence to the
contrary) just like when he "claimed" that Kevin Mitnick "posted" to
alt.2600 newsgroup, the regulars responded with in
3b21a9f5.1576859@news.irvn1.occa.home.com:

"First off, you don't know what a real hacker is which is pretty much
evident from you mentioning Kevin Mitnick, he got caught being a
criminal, not a hacker. Kevin Mitnick was in prison for several years,
and until recently, as a condition of his parole, he was prohibited
from using a computer, or even talking about them, so it's pretty much
a given that he is not posting here. If he was, he sure as hell
wouldn't be calling himself Kevin Mitnick. Emmanuel Goldstein has
enough troubles, and has an all consuming lawsuit to deal with, I
doubt he has the time or energy to post here, or anywhere for that
matter. I don't know who the hell Susan Thunder is, but it doesn't
really matter, because there are enough knowledgeable people that post
here to more than make up for some mythical "superhacker". If you
don't like the FAQ, write a new one, I'll be waiting to see if you can
do better.
The porn postings are beyond the control of this group, and are being
dealt with at the ISP level. You should know as well as I that you can

not control what is posted to a newgroup, although I know you would
like to control it. This in it's self makes you an idiot.
What further makes you an idiot, is that you have now insulted just about
everybody in this group (alt.2600) with your statements. I hope you have a
good firewall."

Stagger Lee, Idiot-at-large and the Gomer Pyle of Shit of Usenet.

--
Fuckwit Lee finally admits his SPANK at AB8MQ's hands yet another time in
3C4AE592.6A0CDA7E@houston-hunks.com , but hypocritically answers erach and
every post just proves what a Xtian liar he is:

"[Any followups by Wiseman will be ignored.]"

928. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 19:14:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C8A5EDC.B83B21DB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 36972

```
Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C8974B5.E8B493B@earthlink.net...
> > Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > >
> > > "N2EY" <N2EY@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:975b4ea9.0203081157.33187550@posting.google.com...
> > > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
> > > news:<3c86b89c_1@news7.fast.net>...
> > > > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:9f4bfe89.0203061538.43ddaf1b@posting.google.com...
> > > > > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:<3c865294_2@news7.fast.net>...
> > >
> > > > > Dave Heil, K8MN, says the situation is not so rosy in Europe. He's the
> > > > > most qualified DXer here that I know of.
> > > >
> > > > I'm sorry ... I think Dave is a pompus jerk and I don't trust or
> > > > value his opinion on much of anything ... (there, I was brutally
> > > > honest again ... but in fairness, I'm sure Dave thinks I'm a jerk,
> > > > too ...)
> > >
> > > The word is "pompous".
> >
> Well, EXCUSE me for the typo ... I don't type nearly as well as
> I used to years ago because I have some lack of coordination
> in my hands and fingers due to a spinal chord injury.
>
> I use your nit-picky correction of such a simple, inconseqential
> error as further evidence that you are, in fact, a pompous jerk :-P

No, you used my correction of your error (and elevated yourself to
victim status by tying your error to a spinal chord injury) to hurl
another insult.

> > I don't think you're a jerk, Carl. I think you
> > are clumsy and arrogant in dealing with human beings. Can you say
> > "archaic legacy modes" three times, very rapidly? Okay, now try
> > "beeping real fast".
> >
> Did them both "real fast" ... no problem ... that proves every bit
> as much relative to my worth as a ham as a Morse test would.
> (in other words, zip, nada, zilch, zero ...)
```

I'll take that result and add it to my estimate of your "worth as a
ham". Damn! It still comes up zip, nada, zilch, zero, nil.

> > > I agree completely "Why the ARRL BoD 'refarming' initiative?"
> > > I think it's a stupid, ill-advised idea aimed at pandering to the
> > > SSB-only crowd.
> >
> > There's an example of Carl being brutally honest...
>
> Yup ... totally honest, no punches pulled. I honestly can't think
> of a truly sugar-coated "politically correct" way to describe
> how stupid and ill-advised the "refarming intiative' really is ...

You must have read a different plan than the one I read. I saw it as a
consensus view from the board. It appears to me that much work went
into it. What would you have come up with? What alternative do you
offer?

> > What you call "brutally honest", others may describe
> > of interpersonal skills.
>
> Many people have told me that they appreciate my
> candor and the fact that they know where I stand
> by what I tell them, rather than having to try to play
> mind games "reading between the lines" on a bunch
> of mealy-mouthed, "politically correct" crap.

I'll bet you've been told that you're a good dancer and that your
cologne smells nice. You've railed here against the ARRL plan for
refarming the bands. In all of your brutally honest candor, you've
neglected to tell us anything much except that you consider it, "stupid
and ill-advised" and "mealy-mouthed, 'politically correct' crap".
Those folks who told you that they appreciated your candor and the fact
that they know where you stand when you tell them something were being
politically correct.

> BTW, Dave, your "intrapersonal skills," as evidenced
> here, are not the best I've ever seen ... that's why I
> think you're a pompous jerk.

Why would you object to my being brutally honest, Carl? After all,
loads of people love and respect you for that very trait.

> > > > > Even last weekend with the DX contest, I was able to find space
> > > > > to operate in the phone bands without any real problem ...
> > > >
> > > > Which bands? Didja know that 17 and 12 meters are not in the contest?
> > >
> > > I wasn't counting the WARC bands ... just 80/40/40/15/10 ...
> >
> > They're HF bands, Carl. Why wouldn't you count them? You could've even
> > dazzled 'em with digital modes or CW on 30m.
>

> Would they have made the situation look more "crowded"?
> I don't think so ...

They're HF bands, Carl. Why would you not have included them?

> > Speed of throughput is not an indicator of the value of a mode.
>
> No, Dave ... I didn't say that "pure speed of throughput" was
> a metric of "goodness" ... read what I said again ... I said that
> the two metrics that I believe in most are "bits/sec/Hz" ... that
> is essentially a time/throughput/bandwidth factor ... and "Eb/No"
> which is the ratio of the (required) energy per bit to the noise
> power density.

That's not what I read. I refer to your anti-morse slap.

> BTW .. those are not simply "Carl's prefered metrics" ...
> they are metrics that are virtually universally accepted in
> the engineering community (of course, that will probably
> result in an immediate reply "So what, we're hams, not
> engineers?" ... if not from you, almost certainly from
> Dick ... but the point is that they ARE two of the best,
> most valid metrics against which to evaluate any modulation
> or modulation/coding scheme.)

You and Len have a common writer?

Dave K8MN

929. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 19:15:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C8A5F75.68480192@earthlink.net>
Source record: 36974

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C89964F.6AEDE481@IEEE.org...
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Ok, so I challenge you to show where I ever called you worthless.
> >
> > Good Lord, Dick, you have called me every name under the sun including
> > some a lot worse than worthless.
> >
> > > First one needs a reason to go to the trouble...
> >
> > You have every reason in the world to need a new persona.
>
> Cecil,
>
> If he's anything in real life like he is here,
> getting a new persona here is the least of his
> problems :-)

Darn, Carl. That reads like something I'd write about you :-)

Dave K8MN

930. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 19:37:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8A646F.F9F016C1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36975

N2EY wrote:
> Example: A 75 meter net starts to lose copy of a station in the emergency area
> that has important traffic to send. What alternate frequency should be used?

Whatever first, second, and third alternate frequencies have been previously
selected. I assume you do plan ahead?

> Does the whole net go there or just one or two well-equipped stations? What if
> the alternate frequency is already in use, or the copy there is even worse?

Emergency traffic gets the frequency. A new frequency can be negotiated
if another frequency is needed. If the copy is worse try second and third
alternates. This ain't rocket science.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

931. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 19:43:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8A65E0.7CB9284A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36976

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> If he's anything in real life like he is here,
> getting a new persona here is the least of his
> problems :-)

Dick reminds me of a Bantam Rooster I used to have. Unfortunately,
he died during the seventh cock fight with a White Leghorn.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

932. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 19:53:35 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6dpbg$9g3$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36978

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u8k84dhrluep47@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all!
>
> Certain things are pretty much obvious from inspection,
> it seems to me. I haven't done a literature search on
> "academic cheating" but what the Ham Tests have now
> is what frat houses KILL for on college campuses: THE
> BOOK on a particular class! That is, in a standard
> academic setting, if the questions and answers are
> published, in the EXACT form that they will appear
> on the test, well, someone is CHEATING, big time!

BUNK... No one is cheating because of public
availability of the question pools. The FCC tests have a similar
set of publicly published Q&As.

Cheating implies an "illegal" or unethical means by
which the person obtained the questions. Since the Q&As are
made available with full approval, consent and,
indeed, by regulation, no one can be said to be cheating
on a ham test simply because the person has had access
to the questions and answers beforehand.

> And, at least for me, it is plain fact that should such
> material become available then students WILL use
> it -- in whatever way they can!

The ham Q&As are made available for that specific purpose.
Are you confused as to the FCC intent?

> Some people, perhaps "many" people, will do almost
> ANYTHING rather than truly learn the material.

Memorizing hundreds of questions and answers seems
to be a consider aommitment in time and effort. Additionally,
a great deal of ham knowledge that is on the tests can
ONLY be "learned" by pure rote memorization. For
example...there is nothing conceptual that can be learned
that will impart the ability to anyone to be able to know
the band limits for operation other than straight memorization.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

933. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 19:54:30 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C8A6876.4EC9D1B5@uci.edu>
Source record: 37246

[No readable article body recovered]

934. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 19:54:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8A6878.9DD4CBCE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36977

Valentine Germann wrote:
> Certain things are pretty much obvious from inspection,
> it seems to me. I haven't done a literature search on
> "academic cheating" but what the Ham Tests have now
> is what frat houses KILL for on college campuses: THE
> BOOK on a particular class! That is, in a standard
> academic setting, if the questions and answers are
> published, in the EXACT form that they will appear
> on the test, well, someone is CHEATING, big time!

You reminded me that we are discussing ham licenses, not
pilots' licenses. I'll just remind you that we are discussing
ham licenses, not college degrees.

You may share Dick's view that a ham license is equivalent
to a college degree but it is just not true. Ham radio
is a hobby where examinees are expected to meet *minimum*
requirements. Q&A for many government issued privileges
are published.

I say anyone who can rote-memorize 1000 questions and
answers should be given a medal and welcomed into ham radio
because such a person is a genius. If you don't believe it,
please respond by memorizing the definitions of 1000 Russian
words. Dick has declined to do so.

I've been in ham radio for over 50 years and as far back as
I can remember, the Q&A were published in one form or another.
If ham radio testing is broken today, it has been broken for
the past 50 years. I rote-memorized my way to an all-frequency
privileges amateur radio license in 1952 when you were still
messing your diapers.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

935. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 19:55:40 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6dpfe$p03$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36988

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u8k8h9t9f8t5d1@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all!
>
> What you say is all well and good. HOWEVER, an "A"
> from Central Missouri State University is NOT the same
> thing as an "A" from Harvard, though both are quite
> "authoritative" in their own way. Taking tests over
> complicated material, "blind," in what amounts to a
> true academic setting, is VASTLY more difficult than
> what is going on today vis-a-vis the Ham Tests.

Who cares, so what? Does that have any relavence
to ham licensing tests?

> This is REGARDLESS of the fact that an Extra-class
> test passed today is just as "authoritative" as one
> passed years ago. That is, both may be equal before
> the rulebook but HARDLY EQUAL as social facts.

Again, who cares, so what?

> Surely, this is too obvious to require further elucidation?

Ditto my above.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

936. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 19:56:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C838EFD.724F7C20@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36979

Valentine Germann wrote:

> Hello, all!
>
> What you say is all well and good. HOWEVER, an "A"
> from Central Missouri State University is NOT the same
> thing as an "A" from Harvard, though both are quite
> "authoritative" in their own way. Taking tests over
> complicated material, "blind," in what amounts to a
> true academic setting, is VASTLY more difficult than
> what is going on today vis-a-vis the Ham Tests.
>
> This is REGARDLESS of the fact that an Extra-class
> test passed today is just as "authoritative" as one
> passed years ago. That is, both may be equal before
> the rulebook but HARDLY EQUAL as social facts.
>
> Surely, this is too obvious to require further elucidation?

Indeed, it should be quite obvious, Val. But it clearly is
not, to the code-hating "geniuses"
here on rrap. That would be MORSE code-hating. Too much
computer code has fogged their thinking.

Thanks, Val. I'm glad you showed up here on rrap. Best wishes
on your new hobby, and I'm
sure you will find the tests to be a breeze. See you on the
air.

Dick W0EX

937. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 19:56:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C83913F.F3FC3F7E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36980

Valentine Germann wrote:

> Hello, all!
>
> Certain things are pretty much obvious from inspection,
> it seems to me. I haven't done a literature search on
> "academic cheating" but what the Ham Tests have now
> is what frat houses KILL for on college campuses: THE
> BOOK on a particular class! That is, in a standard
> academic setting, if the questions and answers are
> published, in the EXACT form that they will appear
> on the test, well, someone is CHEATING, big time!
> And, at least for me, it is plain fact that should such
> material become available then students WILL use
> it -- in whatever way they can!
>
> Some people, perhaps "many" people, will do almost
> ANYTHING rather than truly learn the material.
>
> I can speak from experience on THAT one!

Val, if CAM now follows the same form that he has followed
in answering my posts
for so long, he will now accuse YOU of having participated
in the "do almost anything to avoid learning the material"
since you did not qualify exactly where your position in
that situation is located. In short, that's his methodology
to "win". And his trolling mechanism. He's a real
genius, in fact if you search the Google archives you'll
learn just how much of a genius he
claims to be. (Don't geniuses always claim to be?)

938. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 19:56:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C83C658.D7DDC627@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36981

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > So you really believe that there are 230,000 hams on CW during a contest?
> >
> > Of course not, a great many don't care for contesting, as I don't. But MY educated
guess
> > is that there are ten times as many CW qualified hams as there are CW contesters. So,
> > do I believe there are 23,000 CW hams on the air on a contest weekend? Certainly.
>
> Duuuuhhhhhhh Dick, when you say there are 23,000 hams on the air during a contest
> weekend and 90% of CW qualified hams don't care for contesting, you are accepting
> my guesstimate of 230,000 CW qualified hams which is 1/3 of all hams.
>
> You are agreeing that 230,000 CW fluent hams, 230,000 CW non fluent hams, and
> 230,000 hams who don't ever use CW is a reasonable guesstimate.

Duuuuuuuuh, Cecil, that means that 2/3 of ham radio have passed a CW test, and that
indicates
they had working skills in the mode. Never since the days of CW only has everyone who held
a
license also been a CW operator. If a full 1/3 of hams are fluent in the use of CW
the chances are excellent there will always be a CW operator on hand. Got a problem with
that?

939. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 19:56:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C83C69D.75CFF25E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36982

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Hmmmm.... You accused me of setting up a 'netserver account', just like
> > you did... YOU said it, I only repeated it.
>
> Not a netserver account, Dick, a news-server account. I subscribe to
> spamkiller.newsfeeds.com separately and in addition to the news server
> provided by my ISP. Val subscribes to Supernews.com in the same way
> that I subscribe to Newsfeeds.com. So I thought you had subscribed
> to Supernews. There's nothing untoward about subscribing to a news-
> server different from one's ISP

Yet you accused ME of doing so for enigmatic reasons! Doctor, heal thyself.

940. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 19:56:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C83C6CE.81641905@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36984

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > The only liar clearly visible here is YOU, pal. I said another authoritative source. the
> > > > educator (Mr Germann) had just confirmed what I had said.
> > >
> > > Someone nobody knows is an authoritative source????? That's worse than a lie.
> >
> > Who really "knows" anyone on usenet? Either you take people at face value or everyone
> > is a troll.
>
> You certainly don't take people at face value, so by your own admission,
> you consider everyone to be a troll.
>

You show the natural face of a troll, sorry.

941. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 19:56:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C83C725.4AA2B6C4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36983

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > Big fly in your ointment, Carl. There is now no truly effective way to
> > > > monitor the Internet for the
> > > > purposes of preserving national security, ours or anyone else's.
> > >
> > > The NSA would be amazed to hear that, Dick.
> >
> > After September 11, I think not.
> > It was learned in the caves of Afghanistan that
> > the terrorists were using the internet to communicate. NSA evidently didn't
> > know, or do you prefer to think they just ignored it all and let September
> > 11 happen?
>
> Nobody knew who was involved in Sept 11 until after it happened so
> your statement doesn't make any sense. There is no effective way to
> monitor telephones if you don't know whose phone to tap. There is
> no effective way to tail people if you don't know who to tail. There
> is no effective way to catch people who cheat on their income tax
> if you don't know who to audit. Internet is no different.

So now that Sept 11 is past, we know exactly whose internet connection to watch.

Right, genius!

942. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 19:56:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C83C79C.2B21F77D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36985

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > Now that the maximum code test speed is 5wpm, truly no one is being even
> > > > seriously inconvenienced by any code test.
> > >
> > > On the contrary, Dick, if they, as you say, are being dumbed down by the
> > > 5wpm code test, that is a serious inconvenience.
> >
> > It seems evident that the lack of a 20 wpm test that you avoided for your Extra
> > Lite
> > has dumbed you down rather seriously. What else would you rather attribute it
> > to?
>
> You speak out of both sides of your mouth, Dick. Either ham exams dumb
> down the new hams or they don't.

Is that some more of your "advanced logic"?? The statement is as wrong as it can
be, and]
if you don't know it you're beyond dumb. The fact is that the same license issues
whether or
not the individual ham has any knowledge on the testing subject material.

943. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 19:56:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C83C7D1.5D44F8AE@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36986

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > Typical of your version of trolling, not quite as awful as Cecil's, but not too far
> > > > behind.
> > >
> > > Anybody notice that when Dick has been cornered and has no rational comeback,
> > > he invariably calls the poster a troll?
> >
> > He, Cecil, I hate to tell you but at those times there either IS NO rational response
> > since the "question" was nothing but pure troll anyway, ...
>
> You just proved my point, Dick. Thanks.

For showing you up as a troll extraordinaire? You're more than welcome.

944. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 19:56:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C83C861.8BFA8EA8@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36987

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C897D89.84D090D2@worldnet.att.net...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C88D2F2.43ACF370@worldnet.att.net...
>
> [snipped a couple of screens worth of Dick's babbling, to cut
> to the core of his lack of understanding]
>
> > > > I hope no ham would advocate placing survival at high
> > > > risk for the purposes of "modernizing" ham radio. Would we?
> > >
> > > Your assertion that such is in any way the case borders on
> > > the obscene, given the events of Sept. 11th, the serious
> > > nature of national security, and the fact that modernizing ham
> > > radio could CONTRIBUTE to the national security, rather
> > > than, as you baselessly allege "compromise" it.
> >
> > Once again, we'll see what the real experts in the field have to say
> > about it.
> > Guaranteed, you won't win this one.
>
> From the ARRL:
>
> "NEWINGTON, CT, Jan 31, 2002--President George W. Bush spoke
> today via Amateur Radio to members of the Northern Florida Amateur
> Radio Emergency Service Net (NFAN). The president was in Florida
> to spotlight five volunteer groups--among them the Volusia County
> Amateur Radio Emergency Service (ARES)--for their value to the new
> Office of Homeland Security."
>
> Note the last phrase Dick ... "for their value to the new Office of
> Homeland Security."
>
> Clearly, the government is viewing amateur radio as a valuable,
> even vital, asset in terms of national security ...
>
> You'd already lost your bet before you made it, Dick ...
>
> Perhaps you should not bet on or spout off about things
> that you obviously know little or nothing about.

> ('course I'm afraid that will seriously restrict your available
> topics for conversation :-)
>
> Carl - wa6vse
>
> p.s. The whole story can be viewed at:
>
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2002/01/31/1/?nc=1

I read the story when it was fresh. So you really believe, then, that the government will just
hand out carte blanche to you to design and use whatever digital coding you wish.
Dream on, for that's as far as it's going.

945. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 20:01:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8A6A26.A520F5F7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36989

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> Hello, all!
>
> What you say is all well and good. HOWEVER, an "A"
> from Central Missouri State University is NOT the same
> thing as an "A" from Harvard, though both are quite
> "authoritative" in their own way. Taking tests over
> complicated material, "blind," in what amounts to a
> true academic setting, is VASTLY more difficult than
> what is going on today vis-a-vis the Ham Tests.
>
> This is REGARDLESS of the fact that an Extra-class
> test passed today is just as "authoritative" as one
> passed years ago. That is, both may be equal before
> the rulebook but HARDLY EQUAL as social facts.
>
> Surely, this is too obvious to require further elucidation?

What is too obvious to require further elucidation apparently
has escaped you. Amateur radio privileges are open to *all*
citizens who meet a minimum level of qualifications, not just
to those who can pass a college exam. Amateur radio exams
are not supposed to be "so vastly more difficult" such
that the average citizen cannot meet the requirements. You
are comparing apples and oranges. You are also beating a
dead horse. The FCC seems to think the present ham population
is just about right.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

946. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 20:14:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8A6D1C.4A829BCC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36990

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > So you really believe that there are 230,000 hams on CW during a contest?
> > >
> > > Of course not, a great many don't care for contesting, as I don't. But MY educated
guess
> > > is that there are ten times as many CW qualified hams as there are CW contesters. So,
> > > do I believe there are 23,000 CW hams on the air on a contest weekend? Certainly.
> >
> > Duuuuhhhhhhh Dick, when you say there are 23,000 hams on the air during a contest
> > weekend and 90% of CW qualified hams don't care for contesting, you are accepting
> > my guesstimate of 230,000 CW qualified hams which is 1/3 of all hams.
> >
> > You are agreeing that 230,000 CW fluent hams, 230,000 CW non fluent hams, and
> > 230,000 hams who don't ever use CW is a reasonable guesstimate.
>
> Duuuuuuuuh, Cecil, that means that 2/3 of ham radio have passed a CW test, and that
indicates
> they had working skills in the mode.

The important word in your sentence is "had", Dick. I know many hams who passed their original code exam and promptly forgot everything they knew about Morse code. Those are the people I am grouping in the 1/3 who are non fluent in CW. They couldn't carry on a decent CW QSO if their lives depended on it.

Your error is in thinking that CW is like the Southern Baptist Religion. "Once saved, always saved", does not spill over to, "Once Morsed, always Morsed". I know a lot of older General hams who are no better at CW than my dog. Old Rascal learned to recognize --... ...-- as a sign to head for the bedroom. CW has not had a majority following in many decades. I believe that fully 1/2 of coded hams (or more) would have trouble handling a decent CW QSO nowadays. I'm the only CW operator in the Madison County Amateur Radio Club and my CW leaves a lot to be desired.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

947. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 20:19:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8A6E59.271894C3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36991

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Nobody knew who was involved in Sept 11 until after it happened so
> > your statement doesn't make any sense. There is no effective way to
> > monitor telephones if you don't know whose phone to tap. There is
> > no effective way to tail people if you don't know who to tail. There
> > is no effective way to catch people who cheat on their income tax
> > if you don't know who to audit. Internet is no different.
>
> So now that Sept 11 is past, we know exactly whose internet connection to watch.
> Right, genius!

You have completely lost the point of the exchange, Dick. The point is that the internet is no more difficult to monitor than any other medium. In fact, with the latest equipment, it becomes easier to monitor than many other mediums since it can be automated. My ISP has notified me that anything I send over the internet may be monitored by a government agency.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

948. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 20:24:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8A6F6A.3FB3B530@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36992

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > You speak out of both sides of your mouth, Dick. Either ham exams dumb
> > down the new hams or they don't.
>
> Is that some more of your "advanced logic"?? The statement is as wrong as it can
> be, and]
> if you don't know it you're beyond dumb. The fact is that the same license issues
> whether or
> not the individual ham has any knowledge on the testing subject material.

I know you have an immense problem with logic, Dick, but something either exists or it doesn't. Dumbing down either exists or it doesn't. Please explain how I, as you say, am dumber after upgrading from Advanced to Extra? I purchased a license manual, looked over the material, and refreshed my memory on a few points. Exactly how did that act of learning dumb me down?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

949. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 20:29:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8A7092.52E9943A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36993

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Hmmmm.... You accused me of setting up a 'netserver account', just like
> > > you did... YOU said it, I only repeated it.
> >
> > Not a netserver account, Dick, a news-server account. I subscribe to
> > spamkiller.newsfeeds.com separately and in addition to the news server
> > provided by my ISP. Val subscribes to Supernews.com in the same way
> > that I subscribe to Newsfeeds.com. So I thought you had subscribed
> > to Supernews. There's nothing untoward about subscribing to a news-
> > server different from one's ISP
>
> Yet you accused ME of doing so for enigmatic reasons! Doctor, heal thyself.

Nope, you are just wrong, Dick. Subscribing to a new newsfeed had absolutely
nothing to do with my suspicions. Please pay attention. The problem was that
I thought you were using an alias.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

950. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 20:30:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8A70E1.8565BD12@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36994

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You show the natural face of a troll, sorry.

There goes that crystal ball again. You can tell I'm a troll just by looking at my picture? I suspect you are just jealous of my good looks.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

951. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 20:36:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8A724B.D9740E4D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36995

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > Some people, perhaps "many" people, will do almost
> > ANYTHING rather than truly learn the material.
> > I can speak from experience on THAT one!
>
> Val, if CAM now follows the same form that he has followed
> in answering my posts
> for so long, he will now accuse YOU of having participated
> in the "do almost anything to avoid learning the material" ...

Dick, I can't get over the erie feeling that you are talking to yourself.
And I cannot take credit for the above concept. I do believe it was
Ed who first comprehended exactly what you are saying when you tell
newcomers that the easiest way to pass a ham exam is to rote-memorize
the Q&A while avoiding learning anything in the process.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

952. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 20:43:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8A73EE.729507C0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36996

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > This is REGARDLESS of the fact that an Extra-class
> > test passed today is just as "authoritative" as one
> > passed years ago. That is, both may be equal before
> > the rulebook but HARDLY EQUAL as social facts.
>
> Indeed, it should be quite obvious, Val. But it clearly is
> not, to the code-hating "geniuses" here on rrap. That would
> be MORSE code-hating.

Note the near-identical styles of writing.

"authoritative" - "geniuses"
"HARDLY EQUAL" - "MORSE"
"Extra-class" - "code-hating"

I still suspect that Dick is so desperate for support that
he is having Pal Val post his words.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

953. Re: Anon COWARD's rimjobbing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 22:54:47 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a6e4itigh2@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 36997
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.douglas-gerry

```
"Stagger 'TexASS TURD' Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
news:a6dq3n$gad$1@dosa.alt.net...
>
> On Sat, 9 Mar 2002 13:02:58 -0500, AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote:
> : "jizzswallowing joanie" <joanie@ISaPussy.net> wrote in message
> : news:a6d6t5$rld$0@dosa.alt.net...
> : >
> : > "Boris Prisonbitch" <Boris@bed-wetter.com> wrote in message
> : > news:61086561A.13357CF23@bed-wetter.com...
> : > >
> : > > On Sat, 9 Mar 2002 06:19:11 -0500, AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote:
> : > > > "Anon COWARD" <Anon@AnonAnonNoOne.com> wrote in message
> : > > > news:a6brbm$kku$0@pita.alt.net...
> : > > > > Roger,
> : > > > > >
> : > > > > Am I correct, \ Bullshit/
> : > > > >
> : > > > No you are never correct,
> : > Lardaasssssssssssssssssssssssssssssssssssssss.
> : > > > So? Do you see ovis.net on any of the posts, No. Besides , you had
> : said
> : > I
> : > > > was with hgo.net. Maybe I'm posting from my "job" at American
> : > Heuristics.
> : > > > Get better "intel," DUMBFUCK. And altopia will just tell you to go
> : fuck
> : > > > yourself if you complain, didn't they?
> : > >
> : > > you ain't a good liar slope haid. looky at the telnet log I saved.
> : >
> : You aren't a good hacker, either, since they done have your intrusion in
> : their system logs. Try harder, Lllardasssssssssssssss.
>
> Maybe \ /

Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit
"Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
revealed what a hypocrite he is and ironically admits he has no credibility
in message
<3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com> :

"Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own anonymous
status makes the story even less credible."
```

When you going to post using your callsign, COWARD? And what do ~you~ know about anything, you misinformed moron.

[Space reserved for Faggot Lee's backpedaling and excuses as to why he won't identify himself, even though we all know it's that yellow streak down his flab-ridden back.]
--
Staggering Drunk Lee, the "Pulitzer prize award-winning writer" slobbered the following Ebonics in <9a56ue$hi0$0@dosa.alt.net>:

"I hope yourself takes the advice you are giving to yourself."

954. Re: Anon COWARD's rimjobbing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 22:54:58 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a6e4ivigh3@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 36998
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.douglas-gerry

Computer illiterate "Stagger 'TexASS TUIRD' Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
wrote in message news:a6dpdqgad0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> On Sat, 9 Mar 2002 13:06:30 -0500, AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote:
> : "GenderBender" <alterego@msnn.com> wrote in message
> : news:WIri8.11046$hO6.1077097@bin4.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com...
> : > What does all this have to do with the topic of this group?
> :
> : They want to show how stupid they are since postini doesn't offer that
type
> : of ping.
>
> Care to \ /

Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit
"Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
revealed what a hypocrite he is and ironically admits he has no credibility
in message
<3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com> :

"Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own anonymous
status makes the story even less credible."

Do your own research, you lazy fuckwad and fuck off, butt-plug.
But like the "research" you did investigating the terms "libel" and
"slander," there's not much hope for you to get ~anything~ right.

--
Faggot Stagger Lee, who fails to "grasp" the concept that "slander" is
spoken and "libel" is written, would be better served if he just stuck
to grasping nutsacks, incoherently babbled
in <3C4AE592.6A0CDA7E@houston-hunks.com>:

"COTSE seemed to have the laughable notion that what Wiseman was doing
was exercising freedom of speech. Slander is of course not protected
speech in the US, but the concept that even free speech has its limits
seemed to be impossible for Steve Gielda -- COTSE's owner -- to grasp."

955. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-09 23:29:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C83D4D7.245E9ABA@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36999

CAM wrote:

> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > If he's anything in real life like he is here,
> > getting a new persona here is the least of his
> > problems :-)
>
> Dick reminds me of a Bantam Rooster I used to have. Unfortunately,
> he died during the seventh cock fight with a White Leghorn.

And you remind me of an old Swede I used to know whose favorite was
"Why are there always more horses ass than there are horses?"

956. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 00:53:49 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8AAE89.842AE5A1@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37000

W1RFI wrote:

> Non-voice digital operation is not permitted in the phone/image bands. I think
> I have used CW in the phone bands on about two separate occasions in my life,
> in one case due to a microphone failure and another due to (is Dick ready for
> this one?) the fact that copy on SSB from my mobile setup was just too weak.
> It was a cross mode QSO, with the other op staying on CW.
>
>
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

I cannot wait for non-voice digital or even voice digital operation to be permitted in the phone bands. That will be so cool! I notice even Mr. Bodson and Mr. Milnes support adding digital to the phone segments in a motion to petition change of Part 97 by adding "data" to each line in 97.305 and deletion of "image and phone" in 97.307(f)(2). Looks like this idea is gaining support in the ARRL BoD. I assume the Newington crowd is 100% behind this also.

73,
Clay N4AOX

957. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 00:57:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020309195701.07720.00000315@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 36901

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>Date: 03/09/02 09:52 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <ykpi8.1207$th1.168083579@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>

>
>It wasn't meant to be a "best shot" Steve. It was a suggestion.

And it failed at THAT, too.

Are you used to the failures in your life, Brian, or just oblivious to
them?

Steve

958. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 01:10:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020309201040.06023.00000606@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 36902

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>Some people, perhaps "many" people, will do almost
>ANYTHING rather than truly learn the material.

So you believe "many" people want to become amateur operators so they won't learn anything?

73,
Ed Hare,W1RFI

959. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 01:12:02 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8AB2CE.F20A1EFC@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36903

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Note that even PSK31 didn't soar in popularity until it was free.
>
> I think that PSK-31 was free from the getgo. What increased its use quite a bit
> was being featured in QST and CQ pretty much simultaneously, if memory serves.
> Steve Ford decided it was cool. :-)
>

If you look at the cronology of the rise of popularity of
PSK31, it appears that the QST article was a "...me too.."
catch up story for the ARRL, AFTER PSK31 had secured very
popular acceptance in the worldwide amateure community.

PSK31 from the beginning had all of the necessary attributes
to be promoted and accepted in the HF ARS bands as a new,
conversational, digital mode, eg. extremely narrow band,
good noise immunity, easy to implement, open architecture by
its inventor(s), etc. I would have to agree with Cecil,
that one of its attributes that made it accepted and
promoted even by some of the most die-hard conservatives was
that the computer/sound card implementation was free.

73,
Clay N4AOX

960. Re: Steve's personal vendetta against Len

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 01:29:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020309202929.07720.00000316@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 36904

>Subject: Steve's personal vendetta against Len
>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>Date: 03/09/02 12:13 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <3c8a42f8_1@news7.fast.net>

>With all due respect, your personal vendetta against
>Len has taken a life of its own and it's getting really
>tiresome to see you respond to every single post
>Len makes with tirades of "putz", etc.
>(and no redeeming content from you).

First of all, Carl, it's not a vendetta. I simply refuse to allow this creep to villify Amateur Radio the way he does without repsonse.

And I do NOT repsond to "every single post" the creep makes. He does, on occassion, manage to say something without being insulting or accusing. Witness Hans' occassional posting of who the most significant users of RRAP are. The numbers aren't there to support your contention.

And he IS a Putz.

>I'd personally just as soon not "killfile" you because
>you are, IMHO, an (otherwise) rational and intelligent
>person who might, just might, if you get off of this
>vendetta, say something worth listening to ...

Carl, if there was a whole lot of content in this NG that warranted any significant interaction, I would gladly participate in it.

Although certainly more civil, with the recent exception of Jim, N2EY's historical perspectives, there is nothing being said here by ANYONE that hasn't been said over and over and over and...Well, you get the picture...

"Code get's through when nothing else will"

"Digital Modes are the salvation of Amateur Radio"

"Beepers are the damnation of Amateur Radio"

"I know more than you know and knew it before you did"

Take a stroll through any given nights' offerings and keep those four lines in mind. You will see what I mean.

A couple years ago I suggested a mutual effort by all those assembled here to get the Spectrum Protection Act through Congress. A couple folks said "...Well, everyone AGREES on that idea, so it's not worthy of debate or discussion" and it died a quiet death.

Well, so has the last couple of attempts to get it through The Hill.
Guess it wasn't as popular as some thought, eh?

This NG is nothing about "policy", the name notwithstanding. It's about exerting frustrations that most wouldn't dare vent on the air. And with good cause.

>(Yes, I admit that occasionally I get frustrated or PO'd
>to the point that I insult someone ... but your thing with
>Len is different ... it's not an occasional slip ... it's a
>constant flood.)

Recent history is ripe with examples of people allowing the likes of Leonard H. Anderson to walk all over them. I am not one of them.

Lennie opened those gates, and he has it at his discretion to close them. He won't. He can't. To do so would invalidate his years of calculated hatred and personal vendetta against US. He's not that much of a man, Carl.

Since we are discussing it, Carl, may I ask WHY, when things were so much more civil and balanced, were YOU not at Lennie for his profanities, name calling and like behaviour?

>Please consider this in the spirit in which it's intended

I do, Carl. You know I won't lay into you like Lennie would lay into you if you suggested to him that changing his abusive and callous bile towards Amateurs might earn him a bit of respect and tolerance and simultaneously cool the flames.

I am sorry you disapprove, Carl. Your objections are duly noted. Thanks for taking the time.....

73

Steve, K4YZ

961. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 02:39:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C8AC75F.A9B7DF03@adelphia.net>
Source record: 36905

I respectfully disagree, Valentine. The pools do not show up in the exact form. I took the extra test a few weeks ago, and the answers were all switched around. If I had been stupid enough to try to memorize the tests instead of learning what was on the tests, I would not have passed.

In general, the answers are in a textbook also. You just have to read it.

I didn't buy a study guide because I am cheap. I downloaded the question pool, sat down with the pool and reference material I already had. Anything I couldn't find, I looked up on the web. I learned the needed material.

The effort took me around five days of studying between 2-3 hours a day. It takes quite a while to work through around a thousand questions. Memorizing the questions would have taken a whole lot longer. And wouldn't have worked anyhow.

- Mike -

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> Hello, all!
>
> Certain things are pretty much obvious from inspection,
> it seems to me. I haven't done a literature search on
> "academic cheating" but what the Ham Tests have now
> is what frat houses KILL for on college campuses: THE
> BOOK on a particular class! That is, in a standard
> academic setting, if the questions and answers are
> published, in the EXACT form that they will appear
> on the test, well, someone is CHEATING, big time!
> And, at least for me, it is plain fact that should such
> material become available then students WILL use
> it -- in whatever way they can!
>
> Some people, perhaps "many" people, will do almost
> ANYTHING rather than truly learn the material.
>
> I can speak from experience on THAT one!
>
> Val Germann
> Columbia, Missouri
>
> **

962. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 02:44:02 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C8AC878.32D1A08D@adelphia.net>
Source record: 36906

Ham radio is going to hell in a handcart, Cecil! And has been since the early 1900's! ;^)

- Mike -

CAM wrote:

> I've been in ham radio for over 50 years and as far back as
> I can remember, the Q&A were published in one form or another.
> If ham radio testing is broken today, it has been broken for
> the past 50 years. I rote-memorized my way to an all-frequency
> privileges amateur radio license in 1952 when you were still
> messing your diapers.

963. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 03:28:11 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c8c266e_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 37034

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020306231247.05142.00000250@mb-ba.aol.com...
> In article <3c856f99$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Aren't you a little on the chunky side to be saying things like you'll
pay
> >someone money in 2105? You just don't look all that healthy, Larry.
Unless
> >you're talking about some kind of "trust" you'll establish for Cecil in
the
> >event of your demise.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> I'm 49 years old, 5'11" tall, and weigh 175 lbs. You're what -- 5'5" and
> flatten the bathroom scale at 210? If I were you, I'd be a bit careful
about
> calling people "chunky." Unfortunately, I can't say I'd be willing to bet
> that you'll be around in 2105.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

And neither will you. Your 175 must all be in your double cheeks and chin.

Kim W5TIT

964. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 03:29:27 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c8c26b9_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 37035

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020307054847.06023.00000167@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >And, as usual, this finally dawns on Kim after several other people
> >have said the same thing. Funny how that works, isn't it?
>
> Can we infer from this that it has finally dawned on you, too?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

ROFLMAO!!

Kim W5TIT

965. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 03:46:06 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <2GAi8.1475$792.237204518@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 36907

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020309195701.07720.00000315@mb-mb.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> >From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
> >Date: 03/09/02 09:52 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <ykpi8.1207$th1.168083579@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
>
> >
> >It wasn't meant to be a "best shot" Steve. It was a suggestion.
>
> And it failed at THAT, too.
>
> Are you used to the failures in your life, Brian, or just oblivious
to
> them?
>
> Steve

I must be oblivious to them.

966. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 04:30:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C840467.2BBFF8E5@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36908

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> news:u8k8h9t9f8t5d1@corp.supernews.com...
> > Hello, all!
> >
> > What you say is all well and good. HOWEVER, an "A"
> > from Central Missouri State University is NOT the same
> > thing as an "A" from Harvard, though both are quite
> > "authoritative" in their own way. Taking tests over
> > complicated material, "blind," in what amounts to a
> > true academic setting, is VASTLY more difficult than
> > what is going on today vis-a-vis the Ham Tests.
>
> Who cares, so what? Does that have any relavence
> to ham licensing tests?
>

Who cares if the ham radio tests actually test for knowledge?
Obviously not you.

>
> > This is REGARDLESS of the fact that an Extra-class
> > test passed today is just as "authoritative" as one
> > passed years ago. That is, both may be equal before
> > the rulebook but HARDLY EQUAL as social facts.
>
> Again, who cares, so what?
>
> > Surely, this is too obvious to require further elucidation?
>
> Ditto my above.
>

Well, thanks for clearing that up. You don't know and you don't
care.

>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

967. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 04:31:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C840605.9B3A65CC@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36909

CAM wrote:

>I know many hams who passed their

> original code exam and promptly forgot everything they knew about Morse code. Those
> are the people I am grouping in the 1/3 who are non fluent in CW. They couldn't carry
> on a decent CW QSO if their lives depended on it.

How do you know? Maybe they could, indeed, if their lives actually DID depend on it, maybe they could
remember it well enough to bail themselves out, after all!

>
>
> Your error is in thinking that CW is like the Southern Baptist Religion. "Once saved,
> always saved", does not spill over to, "Once Morsed, always Morsed".

That's the error in YOUR thinking, for levels of 13wpm at least. It's not something one completely forgets, sort of like how to ride a bicycle. That assumes the individual actually
did learn it, and didn't scam the system.

> I know a lot
> of older General hams who are no better at CW than my dog. Old Rascal learned to
> recognize --... ...-- as a sign to head for the bedroom. CW has not had a
> majority following in many decades.

A dog that does code better than a NCI member??? Curses! Don't let the FCC hear about it!

> I believe that fully 1/2 of coded hams (or
> more) would have trouble handling a decent CW QSO nowadays.

Beliefs are like navels, Cecil, everyone has one.

> I'm the only CW
> operator in the Madison County Amateur Radio Club and my CW leaves a lot to
> be desired.
>

So the other member is a nocode tech?

968. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 04:31:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C84075C.5E33EF1C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36910

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Nobody knew who was involved in Sept 11 until after it happened so
> > > your statement doesn't make any sense. There is no effective way to
> > > monitor telephones if you don't know whose phone to tap. There is
> > > no effective way to tail people if you don't know who to tail. There
> > > is no effective way to catch people who cheat on their income tax
> > > if you don't know who to audit. Internet is no different.
> >
> > So now that Sept 11 is past, we know exactly whose internet connection to watch.
> > Right, genius!
>
> You have completely lost the point of the exchange, Dick. The point is that the
> internet is no more difficult to monitor than any other medium. In fact, with
> the latest equipment, it becomes easier to monitor than many other mediums since
> it can be automated. My ISP has notified me that anything I send over the
> internet may be monitored by a government agency.

Well, how 'bout that! And so your ISP will monitor you, mine might monitor me, but who
is
gonna monitor BinLaden?

The point of all this was not the internet anyway, that was just used as a point of
reference. The point was that FCC nor the government in general will be in any way
inclined to turn
ham radio loose to do anything anyone might way to do with ham radio re Carl's bright
ideas for an idealistic digital nirvana in ham radio. It would set us up to become an
underground illicit means of international communication that could easily harbor
hidden
terrorist communications which might escape detection, at least until too late to be
effective
Carl thinks he has all this figured out. He needs a new abacus.

969. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 04:31:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C84084E.A9925473@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36911

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > You speak out of both sides of your mouth, Dick. Either ham exams dumb
> > > down the new hams or they don't.
> >
> > Is that some more of your "advanced logic"?? The statement is as wrong as it can
> > be, and]
> > if you don't know it you're beyond dumb. The fact is that the same license issues
> > whether or
> > not the individual ham has any knowledge on the testing subject material.
>
> I know you have an immense problem with logic, Dick, but something either exists
> or it doesn't. Dumbing down either exists or it doesn't.

I know you have an immense problem with the real world, Cecil. Sometimes a thing
exists in some areas but not in others. Got it? If an engineer passes the ham radio
tests
on the basis that he already knows electronics, and a near-illiterateCBer passes the
same
test on the basis that he wasn't required to learn anything, both get the same license.
Now tell me nothing is dumbed down.

> Please explain how I, as
> you say, am dumber after upgrading from Advanced to Extra? I purchased a license
> manual, looked over the material, and refreshed my memory on a few points. Exactly
> how did that act of learning dumb me down?

Best I can tell you were born dumbed down and someone convinced you that you
were a genius.

970. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 04:31:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8408B2.3C8662A0@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36912

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > You show the natural face of a troll, sorry.
>
> There goes that crystal ball again. You can tell I'm a troll just by looking at
> my picture? I suspect you are just jealous of my good looks.

I might be if you had any. You look too much like Dennis Weaver (an old MO boy)
for me.

971. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 04:31:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C84092B.7A294E32@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36913

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Valentine Germann wrote:
> > > This is REGARDLESS of the fact that an Extra-class
> > > test passed today is just as "authoritative" as one
> > > passed years ago. That is, both may be equal before
> > > the rulebook but HARDLY EQUAL as social facts.
> >
> > Indeed, it should be quite obvious, Val. But it clearly is
> > not, to the code-hating "geniuses" here on rrap. That would
> > be MORSE code-hating.
>
> Note the near-identical styles of writing.
>
> "authoritative" - "geniuses"
> "HARDLY EQUAL" - "MORSE"
> "Extra-class" - "code-hating"
>
> I still suspect that Dick is so desperate for support that
> he is having Pal Val post his words.
>

This is just to comical for words. So I won't waste any more on
it.

972. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 04:42:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8AE41D.95184AC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36914

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> >I know many hams who passed their
> > original code exam and promptly forgot everything they knew about Morse code. Those
> > are the people I am grouping in the 1/3 who are non fluent in CW. They couldn't carry
> > on a decent CW QSO if their lives depended on it.
>
> How do you know? Maybe they could, indeed, if their lives actually DID depend on it,
maybe they could
> remember it well enough to bail themselves out, after all!

We are talking about hams functioning well under emergency conditions, not merely
bailing themselves out. I'm talking about CW emergency nets.

> > Your error is in thinking that CW is like the Southern Baptist Religion. "Once saved,
> > always saved", does not spill over to, "Once Morsed, always Morsed".
>
> That's the error in YOUR thinking, for levels of 13wpm at least. It's not something one
> completely forgets, sort of like how to ride a bicycle. That assumes the individual
actually
> did learn it, and didn't scam the system.

You really think someone can effectively use CW after not using it for half a
century? It is my belief that he would simply be in the way in a CW emergency
net.

> > I'm the only CW
> > operator in the Madison County Amateur Radio Club and my CW leaves a lot to
> > be desired.
>
> So the other member is a nocode tech?

The other twenty some odd are mostly Generals who use SSB almost exclusively.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

973. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 04:46:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8AE518.477C129@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36915

Dick Carroll wrote:
> If an engineer passes the ham radio tests
> on the basis that he already knows electronics, and a near-illiterateCBer passes the
> same test on the basis that he wasn't required to learn anything, both get the same
> license. Now tell me nothing is dumbed down.

OK Dick, I give up. Which one of those new hams was dumbed down by the exams?
Was the engineer dumber after he took the test or was the CBer dumber after
he took the tests? Were you dumber after you took your tests?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

974. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 05:10:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310001020.20892.00000071@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 36916

In article <3c8a2e47_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020308225729.12293.00000082@mb-cs.aol.com...
>> In article <3c893425_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20020308121030.22805.00000026@mb-cb.aol.com...
>> >> In article <3c87f203_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> >> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >"If the frequencies are available at the stations involved" ... this
>> >> >sounds like a matter of proper preparation and planning to me.
>> >>
>> >> Sure - but how much preparation is "proper"? Is two bands enough, or
>maybe
>> >> three or four, or what? How much power?
>> >
>> >Whatever it takes ...

>> > I don't have (and don't envision needing)
>> >an amplifier ...
>>
>> There may be times when an amplifier is needed.
>
>Not from my experience ... I've never found it essential
>to have more than 100W to be able to make a contact
>outside of the area, or anywhere inside the surrounding
>area (for example the area my ARES/RACES group would
>cover or respond into to support adjacent units).

In all of the places I've lived as a radio amateur, I've never experienced a
power outage that lasted longer than a few hours. Does that mean I need only
provide
enough backup energy for a few hours and I'll be adequately prepared?

>> >> Many emergencies wipe out commercial power
>> >
>> >I don't need commercial power ... all of my gear can be run
>> >from 12VDC ... I have large, deep-cycle batteries and the
>> >means to charge them without commercial power (it's called
>> >vehicles, and gas to run them) This is part of being properly
>> >and adequately prepared.

>>
>> For as long as the fuel holds out. One of the problems in the ice storms
>of
>> 1997 was fuel supplies running low.
>
>Planning and preparation ... nothing more.

The best laid plans of mice and men...

>> All depends on the situation. How usable will a makeshift wire antenna
>> be on VHF/UHF if the repeaters in your area fail?
>
>I have a PD-220 "SuperStationmaster" on 2m ... used to use
>them in in commercial installations on mountaintops ... seen
>them take 6" of iceload and 100mph wind and not come down.

If the house underneath stays up...

>With my location on the exact top of the highest hill in the area,
>I can BE the repeater

You have standby duplexers, I presume.

> ... from here, I've talked (simplex) to
>mobiles 50-60 miles away with a 5W HT and rubber duckie.

Consistently? Or once in a while?

>(I planned ahead for ham radio when I bought this place ...)

That's good. Most hams have to compromise on the choice of a home.

And all that stuff is at your home.

>> >> > if it's not available, fine ... that's where operator
>> >> >knowledge and experience come in ...
>> >>
>> >> Agreed! That's one of the skills on my list.
>> >
>> >You equate operator skill and experience with CW proficiency.
>>
>> CW proficiency is actually a whole set of skills, not one skill. But I do
>> not equate operator skill and experience solely with CW skills.
>>
>> IOW, CW skills are a subset of operator skill and experience.
>
>But you ALWAYS make sure to emphasize that "CW skills MUST
>be there" ...

Where have I EVER said that? Produce the post.

>that is the error ... they can be useful under some
>situations

I am glad to see you finally admit that.

>(but most of the time using CW is a matter of operator
>choice/preference, NOT necessity by any means), but they are
>not NECESSARY ... planning and preparation are FAR more
>important in emergency communications
>
>> In fact, several years back I worked up a whole list of operating skills
>> every ham should strive to have. I posted it here - I can dig it up again
>> if you'd like. You might like it.

Did you see the list?
>>
>> >I place far more value on things that I know to be more useful
>> >and important.
>>
>> I know that CW skill is useful and important. Not all-important, of
>course.
>> Just another tool in the toolbox.
>
>But it always comes up as the only one that you think deserves
>a separate, pass/fail test ... curious (not really ...)

It needs a separate pass-fail test for reasons that have been rehashed
time and again here. If you've read my posts, you'll see that I don't give
emergency use of Morse as one of the reasons.

>> > you can't just say "I know Morse." and think
>> >that's going to get the job done ...
>>
>> When did I EVER say such a thing? Morse is just one tool, not the whole
>> box.
>
>But it always comes up as the only one that you think deserves
>a separate, pass/fail test ... curious (not really ...)
>
You have not produced the post, however. Curious (not really)

It suddenly occurs to me that you might think I was arguing for code testing
based on emergency use. That's not my point at all. I'm simply
pointing out that Morse/CW is useful in emergencies, and is in fact used
by hams in emergencies. And not just because of operator preference.

The test is a whole other issue. It's a dead issue for over 2 years now. FCC
gutted what was left of code testing so that all we have is a bare minimum 5wpm
test, propped up by S25.5. It's clear from the R&O to 98-143 that FCC will drop
all code testing as soon as the treaty allows.

And if porcine aviation intervenes, and S25.5 somehow survives WRC 2003
(bear with me, Carl, miracles do happen), all the FCC will do is retain that
bare
minimum.

>> >as someone (was it Ed or
>> >maybe Cecil?) pointed out ... the majority of the ops you'll contact

>> >out there (outside of the disaster area) are probably not competent
>> >to handle real traffic in Morse ...
>>
>> Sadly true.
>
>Sad to you ... totally inconseqential to me ... I prefer to plan
>and prepare adequately to be in a position to use better,
>more effective modes for the task.

What "better, more effective modes"? SSB and/or FM?
>
>> However, it seems to me that you are taking great pains to keep Morse out
>> of the toolbox.
>
>Not exactly ... I'm like Cecil ... live and let live ... freemarket of
>modes.

Which means what? No mode tests or no mode subbands?

>If you want to spend the time becoming really good at Morse, be my
>guest ... I'm not the least bit interested and would not, therefore, waste
>my time doing so ... does that mean I want to stop you? No! Does
>that mean that I want to "take something away from you"? No!

After years of reading your diatribes against the mode and its users,
Carl, I'm just a wee bit skeptical.

Y'know, you sure do preach to the choir about preparation. Seems to me
that part of preparation would be getting the license with the most privileges,
even if you didn't agree with all the requirements.

73 de Jim, N2EY

975. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 07:08:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020310020836.24806.00000194@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 36917

In article <3c882eb6_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>
>While PSK31 has met with pretty good success at adoption,
>and I agree that there are regulatory barriers that need fixing,
>I still think the masses could use a bit of a kick in the backside
>in the direction of progress :-).

Carl:

Hunh? I thought that reducing the code testing requirements to
the level of insignificance (i.e. 5 WPM) was supposed to do that!
We are now supposed to be enjoying a Renaissance of technical
progress in the ARS, but you say we need a "kick in the backside."
Wassamatta?

73 de Larry, K3LT

976. Re: Anon COWARD's rimjobbing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 12:42:49 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a6floq$1bc$4@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 36918
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.lloyd-davies

"Loose as a Goose Catamite Murray" <Loose@aGooseCatamiteMurray3855.net>
rimjobbed in message news:a6emgj$c15$0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "AB8MQ" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:a6dliq$71b$1@dosa.alt.net...
> >
> > You aren't a good hacker, either, since they done have your intrusion in
> > their system logs. Try harder, Lllardasssssssssssss.
> >
> >
> Wiseman, who claims he is on the Dean's List and majoring in
> Computer Science,

I was on the Dean's list, but get the major right, you slobbering moron.
Lllllllllardasssssss
Lllllllllllllllloyd who could only manage a "certificate" from a junior college, is casting aspersions (waits until the nutsack slurper looks that one up) upon somebody who already has a 4 year degree (not to mention credits towards a Master's which I'll finish someday) and working, and pursuing a 2 year degree, in which I'm almost finished, BTW. But what do you do? You deliver pizzas and sell obsolete computer parts at a lousy flea market.

What do you do the best besides slurping nutsacks, LLLlllardassss?

> opens his mouth and inserts foot

Yes, you manage that quite regularly, Fatass. And what's with posting tot he internet past 11 PM on a Saturday night? What's the matter, tub of lard, no life?
You know, Lllardasssssssss, you look like a sack of potatoes and with your bald head and those tiny ears, you could pass for Porky Pig.

>when he states the above. Since when is querying a mail host port 25
considered
> hacking

You sound worried there, fatass. My, my, guess when the homeland security people find out your a Bin Laden supporter, your ass will be in Federal prison being Bubba's bitch, which given your subservient nature would be a bonus for your miserable life, wouldn't it? Too cowardly to post using your callsign, my my, do you have trouble coordinating those big lardo's clothes with that yellow streak down your back?

--
"Lloyd Davies" <r74bfrr@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020104131356.23129.00001216@mb-fp.aol.com...
"To many people are saying hatful things about me.
My computer busines is picking up, so i'll be leaveing for good this time."

Ill-educated Llllardasss Llllloyd enlightens us with:
"Do you think they send out retest letters for good amatuer pratice?"
in <9tc95n$4u$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>.

Llllllardasssssssss Lllllllloyd,who has Hitler's lone testicle in his mouth,
slobbered in
<3c75c041_7@news.teranews.com>:
"Listen old zionist pig, I do not have a "ghost writer""

Llllllardasssssss Lllllllloyd fucks up as usual in
<012857CA.1269072F@taranews.net>:
" HAHAHAHAHAHA! roger is going to be a famious guy!!!!!"

Lllllllllllardass Lllllllllllllllllloyd, N0VFP, English illiterate,
ironically slobbers more of his
Xtian academy schooling in <3c813e49_8@news.1usenet.com>:
"Woger feels he does not have to post proof. He never engagages in
intelligent posts."

977. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 13:12:34 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6fmg4nsf1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36919

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C840467.2BBFF8E5@worldnet.att.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> > news:u8k8h9t9f8t5d1@corp.supernews.com...
> > > Hello, all!
> > >
> > > What you say is all well and good. HOWEVER, an "A"
> > > from Central Missouri State University is NOT the same
> > > thing as an "A" from Harvard, though both are quite
> > > "authoritative" in their own way. Taking tests over
> > > complicated material, "blind," in what amounts to a
> > > true academic setting, is VASTLY more difficult than
> > > what is going on today vis-a-vis the Ham Tests.
> >
> > Who cares, so what? Does that have any relavence
> > to ham licensing tests?
>
> Who cares if the ham radio tests actually test for knowledge?
> Obviously not you.

And you Dick, clearly still don't understand that a ham
license is NOT a degree in anything. The license is a
gateway to allow the license holder to be on the air.
What hams have done in the past and still do now is to
follow one or more paths after becoming a ham which
focuses their "advancement, knowledge, skills" into
specific areas.

I passed the Extra over two years ago...and have promptly
forgotten 2/3 of the stuff that was on the test. Why you may
ask? Simple...I have NO need or desire to retain the
amount of time I have to notify the FCC before I conduct
amateur space operations....or the details of VE rules
and regs (and yes, I am a VE...but I help when I can,
I don't run VE sessions myself).

> > > This is REGARDLESS of the fact that an Extra-class
> > > test passed today is just as "authoritative" as one
> > > passed years ago. That is, both may be equal before
> > > the rulebook but HARDLY EQUAL as social facts.
> >
> > Again, who cares, so what?
> >

> > > Surely, this is too obvious to require further elucidation?
> >
> > Ditto my above.
>
> Well, thanks for clearing that up. You don't know and you don't
> care.

So tell us Dick? Who but YOU and several others in
this newsgroup have any concern or care that:

"This is REGARDLESS of the fact that an Extra-class
test passed today is just as "authoritative" as one
passed years ago. That is, both may be equal before
the rulebook but HARDLY EQUAL as social facts."

In addition to telling us WHO? Please tell
us why and the implications of not having it
as it was 20/30/40 years ago.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

978. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 13:16:19 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6fmf0agj1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36920

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C840605.9B3A65CC@worldnet.att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> >I know many hams who passed their
>
> > original code exam and promptly forgot everything they knew about Morse
code. Those
> > are the people I am grouping in the 1/3 who are non fluent in CW. They
couldn't carry
> > on a decent CW QSO if their lives depended on it.
>
> How do you know? Maybe they could, indeed, if their lives actually DID
depend on it, maybe they could
> remember it well enough to bail themselves out, after all!
>
> > Your error is in thinking that CW is like the Southern Baptist Religion.
"Once saved,
> > always saved", does not spill over to, "Once Morsed, always Morsed".
>
> That's the error in YOUR thinking, for levels of 13wpm at least. It's not
something one
> completely forgets, sort of like how to ride a bicycle. That assumes the
individual actually
> did learn it, and didn't scam the system.
>
> > I know a lot
> > of older General hams who are no better at CW than my dog. Old Rascal
learned to
> > recognize --... ...-- as a sign to head for the bedroom. CW has not
had a
> > majority following in many decades.
>
> A dog that does code better than a NCI member??? Curses! Don't let the FCC
hear about it!
>
>
> > I believe that fully 1/2 of coded hams (or
> > more) would have trouble handling a decent CW QSO nowadays.
>
> Beliefs are like navels, Cecil, everyone has one.

One could ponder the thought that Adam and Eve probably didn't.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

979. Re: the pheasants will rise up again, osama

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 14:03:08 UTC
From: Stagger Lee <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
Message-ID: <3C8B679C.F0E98C18@houston-hunks.com>
Source record: 36921
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

```
Boris Pinson wrote:
>
> AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote:
> > "GenderBender" <alterego@msnn.com> wrote in message
> > news:WIri8.11046$hO6.1077097@bin4.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com...
> > > What does all this have to do with the topic of this group?
> >
> > They want to show how stupid they are since postini doesn't offer that type
> > of ping.
>
> ole martian heds talk funny when dey gets busted but it be time it
> happen. I heard that and the ledbetter twins heard that.
>
> incredible butt boy think they ain't no reconin' so he moan and groan
> and piss all over everbody an he hide his email box out of coward dice.
>
> him and his men tore osama are terrorists thru and thru. I heard that.
> it is time they be stood up to an run out of town so good people can
> get on the net without fear and swap illeagle music in piece.
>
> let me hear an amen.

AMEN!!!!!
```

980. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 14:09:23 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6fpi7$7s4$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36922

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020310001020.20892.00000071@mb-mr.aol.com...
> In article <3c8a2e47_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020308225729.12293.00000082@mb-cs.aol.com...
> >> In article <3c893425_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:20020308121030.22805.00000026@mb-cb.aol.com...
> >> >> In article <3c87f203_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >> >> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >"If the frequencies are available at the stations involved" ...
this
> >> >> >sounds like a matter of proper preparation and planning to me.
> >> >>
> >> >> Sure - but how much preparation is "proper"? Is two bands enough, or
> >maybe
> >> >> three or four, or what? How much power?
> >> >
> >> >Whatever it takes ...
>
> >> > I don't have (and don't envision needing)
> >> >an amplifier ...
> >>
> >> There may be times when an amplifier is needed.
> >
> >Not from my experience ... I've never found it essential
> >to have more than 100W to be able to make a contact
> >outside of the area, or anywhere inside the surrounding
> >area (for example the area my ARES/RACES group would
> >cover or respond into to support adjacent units).
>
> In all of the places I've lived as a radio amateur, I've never experienced
a
> power outage that lasted longer than a few hours. Does that mean I need
only
> provide
> enough backup energy for a few hours and I'll be adequately prepared?

You prepare for whatever duration you want. There is NO hard and
fast rule. Emergency preparation decisions are driven by expectations
based on past experience, planning for that rare "worst case"
situation and, in the end, personal ability to support preparedness
in terms of equipment, power, storage capability, and finances.

I could easily have an emergency generator with 100 gallons of
gasolene available...BUT, who wants to have 100 gallons of
gasolene stored at their home. I can, however, have a full tank
of gas in my car, my car has a 12 volt alternator, I can (and do) have
several 12 volt sealed batteries to power my rig. IF the batteries
needed recharging, I could easily connect them to my car and float
them while still running my rig directly off the vehicles 12 volts
for an hour. Off hand, I'd probably be able to run for several
days without ever leaving my property to get gas.

Other possibilities include augmenting via solar panels. You
can certainly get sufficient power from a relatively small panel
to operate in recieve and still be slightly charging the battery.
If your primary purpose was to assist, rather than be the
emergency control operator/hub/node, that may be all you
need. Especially if communications can be maintained using
low power...which is far more the case than any need for
even 100w.

> >> >> Many emergencies wipe out commercial power
> >> >
> >> >I don't need commercial power ... all of my gear can be run
> >> >from 12VDC ... I have large, deep-cycle batteries and the
> >> >means to charge them without commercial power (it's called
> >> >vehicles, and gas to run them) This is part of being properly
> >> >and adequately prepared.
> >>
> >> For as long as the fuel holds out. One of the problems in
> >> the ice storms of 1997 was fuel supplies running low.
> >
> >Planning and preparation ... nothing more.
>
> The best laid plans of mice and men...

What's your alternative then?

> >> All depends on the situation. How usable will a makeshift wire
> >> antenna be on VHF/UHF if the repeaters in your area fail?
> >
> >I have a PD-220 "SuperStationmaster" on 2m ... used to use
> >them in in commercial installations on mountaintops ... seen
> >them take 6" of iceload and 100mph wind and not come down.
>
> If the house underneath stays up...

If my house goes, I'd be far more intent on taking care
of my family than worrying about anyone else's.

> >With my location on the exact top of the highest hill in the area,
> >I can BE the repeater
>
> You have standby duplexers, I presume.

I'll let Carl answer that. The other question to
you is just how much redundancy does YOUR
emergency set-up have? Redundant transciever? Power?
Microphones? Morse Key?

> >> >> > if it's not available, fine ... that's where operator
> >> >> >knowledge and experience come in ...
> >> >>
> >> >> Agreed! That's one of the skills on my list.
> >> >
> >> >You equate operator skill and experience with CW proficiency.
> >>
> >> CW proficiency is actually a whole set of skills, not one skill. But I
do
> >> not equate operator skill and experience solely with CW skills.
> >>
> >> IOW, CW skills are a subset of operator skill and experience.
> >
> >But you ALWAYS make sure to emphasize that "CW skills MUST
> >be there" ...
>
> Where have I EVER said that? Produce the post.

Is it then your opinion that a person with NO morse skills
can, in fact, be a good operator...or, as Carl is trying to
ferret out, must the person have morse skills
for you to consider the person an expert operator?

<snip>

> It suddenly occurs to me that you might think I was arguing for code
testing
> based on emergency use. That's not my point at all. I'm simply
> pointing out that Morse/CW is useful in emergencies, and is in fact used
> by hams in emergencies. And not just because of operator preference.

I have NO problem with that mindset/approach. You then make morse
skill no different than many other optional skills (additional language
capability,
first aid knowledge, etc.) Each of those are not skills or abilities that
a ham must have, but can be useful and/or simply avialable as one of
the tools in that ham's bag of tricks.

> The test is a whole other issue. It's a dead issue for over 2 years now.
> FCC gutted what was left of code testing so that all we have is a bare
> minimum 5 wpm test, propped up by S25.5. It's clear from the R&O
> to 98-143 that FCC will drop all code testing as soon as the treaty
allows.

Agree.

> And if porcine aviation intervenes,

Did I miss something? I have no clue what "porcine aviation" is
in reference to?

> ... and S25.5 somehow survives
> WRC 2003 (bear with me, Carl, miracles do happen), all the
> FCC will do is retain that bare minimum.

Agree.

> >> However, it seems to me that you are taking great pains to keep Morse
out
> >> of the toolbox.
> >
> >Not exactly ... I'm like Cecil ... live and let live ... freemarket of
> >modes.
>
> Which means what? No mode tests or no mode subbands?

We have, except for morse, "no mode tests" now. And, in actuality,
MOST emergency coms are on VHF/UHF which can and does
involve hams that don't require any morse mode test (i.e. Techs).

As to mode subbands, I don't see how that is evident
in what Carl has said above.

> >If you want to spend the time becoming really good at Morse, be my
> >guest ... I'm not the least bit interested and would not, therefore,
waste
> >my time doing so ... does that mean I want to stop you? No! Does
> >that mean that I want to "take something away from you"? No!
>
> After years of reading your diatribes against the mode and its users,
> Carl, I'm just a wee bit skeptical.

Why, you won't find anything from Carl that supports any notion that
Carl, myself or NCI wants to eliminate morse USE.

> Y'know, you sure do preach to the choir about preparation. Seems to me
> that part of preparation would be getting the license with the most
privileges,
> even if you didn't agree with all the requirements.

Why?
In a real emergency, even a nocode Tech can operate HF
(i.e. the license privileges don't prohibit operating on
ham band segments that the license itself wouldn't otherwise
permit.)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

981. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 15:41:55 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310104155.07180.00000882@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 36923

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Hunh? I thought that reducing the code testing requirements to
>the level of insignificance (i.e. 5 WPM) was supposed to do that!
>We are now supposed to be enjoying a Renaissance of technical
>progress in the ARS, but you say we need a "kick in the backside."
>Wassamatta?

I think, Larry, that the rules changes did not have an effect on those already licensed.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

982. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 15:44:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310104405.07180.00000883@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 36924

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>The point was that FCC nor the government in general will be in any way
>inclined to turn ham radio loose to do anything anyone might way to do
>with ham radio re Carl's bright ideas for an idealistic digital nirvana in
>ham radio. It would set us up to become an underground illicit means of
>international communication that could easily harbor hidden
>terrorist communications which might escape detection, at least until too
>late to be effective Carl thinks he has all this figured out. He needs a new
abacus.

Whew, that is a bit far out even for you, Dick. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

983. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 15:49:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310104917.07180.00000884@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 36925

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> If a full 1/3 of hams are fluent in the use of CW
>the chances are excellent there will always be a CW operator on hand. Got a
>problem with that?

I do not believe that 1/3 of hams are proficient enough in CW to be able to accurately handle traffic under failing band conditions. I don't belive that in 1963, 1/3 of all hams were proficient enough to accurately handle traffic in failing band conditions.

I don't believe that 1/3 of all hams could accurately handle formal traffic under ideal band conditions.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

984. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 15:54:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310105422.07180.00000886@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 36927

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>If you look at the cronology of the rise of popularity of
>PSK31, it appears that the QST article was a "...me too.."
>catch up story for the ARRL, AFTER PSK31 had secured very
>popular acceptance in the worldwide amateure community.

To some extent you are correct, Clay, but from what I saw, the popularity increased rapidly after the appearance of articles on the subject. QST's article was not the first, I believe.

>I would have to agree with Cecil,
>that one of its attributes that made it accepted and
>promoted even by some of the most die-hard conservatives was
>that the computer/sound card implementation was free.

As would I; I believe the sound-card aspect of PSK-31 and other digital modes was the dominant factor in its success.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

985. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 15:55:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310105545.07180.00000887@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 36928

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>I certainly will try to make it and buy you that lobster dinner I owe you.

And seeing as it is in Arizona, I would gladly settle for a nice steak. You wouldn't believe how obscenely expensive lobster is there! Honor WILL be served with a steak, as far as I am concerned.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

986. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 16:00:13 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6g01usuc1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36929

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u8n052r8vlojad@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Bill Sohl wrote
>
> >BUNK... No one is cheating because of public
> >availability of the question pools. The FCC tests
> >have a similar set of publicly published Q&As.
>
> I don't think you read my message! I said that
> in an ACADEMIC SETTING the publishing of the
> questions and answers, in advance, is cheating.

Not if they are published by the instructor.

In grade school, I was always provided with
the list of 20 spelling words I'd be tested on each week.
Was I cheating because I had them?

> Just because the Ham Tests now resemble a
> college class that has been compromised by
> a frat house "book" is, unfortunately, the TRUTH!
> Just because it's "legal" doesn't change its
> actual NATURE in this regard.

That's your opinion, and who cares/so what.
Ham licenses are NOT degrees. Never where either.

> Sorry.

Sorry for what?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

987. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 16:04:32 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6g0a2$4rm$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36930

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020310104405.07180.00000883@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >The point was that FCC nor the government in general will be in any way
> >inclined to turn ham radio loose to do anything anyone might way to do
> >with ham radio re Carl's bright ideas for an idealistic digital nirvana
in
> >ham radio. It would set us up to become an underground illicit means of
> >international communication that could easily harbor hidden
> >terrorist communications which might escape detection, at least until too
> >late to be effective Carl thinks he has all this figured out. He needs a
new
> abacus.
>
> Whew, that is a bit far out even for you, Dick. :-)
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Yup, I can hear them black helicopters comin'
in for Dick now.... whup, whup, whup :-)

Funny thing is that you don't even need radio
to pass encrypted messages anymore. POTS (plain
old telephone service) gives you all anyone needs.
POTS plus a modem, a PC and an encryption program
will do it all...text or voice.

Cheers and ROTFLMAO.
Bill K2UNK

988. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 16:07:26 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8n052r8vlojad@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 36926

Bill Sohl wrote

>BUNK... No one is cheating because of public
>availability of the question pools. The FCC tests
>have a similar set of publicly published Q&As.

I don't think you read my message! I said that
in an ACADEMIC SETTING the publishing of the
questions and answers, in advance, is cheating.

Just because the Ham Tests now resemble a
college class that has been compromised by
a frat house "book" is, unfortunately, the TRUTH!
Just because it's "legal" doesn't change its
actual NATURE in this regard.

Sorry.

Val Germann
Columbia, Missouri

989. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 16:23:02 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6g1dgbok1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36933

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u8n15vh9rq15e4@corp.supernews.com...
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> >So you believe "many" people want to become amateur
> >operators so they won't learn anything?
>
> In a word: YES! All they want to do is "learn" how to get a
> hand-held radio and get on the repeater, with as little trouble
> as possible. What 's so strange about this?

Nothing strange, but your comment implies that's wrong....so
what's so wrong with that? If they become good
operators and act as a positive force, what more do you
want?

> That is, I see
> generations "X", "Y" and "Z" in action all the time, and this is
> the way it IS.

Yadda, yadda, yadda...the same old crap about the
shortcomings of current/recent generations.
Strange that in the midst of these new generations
we have the most technological innovation at the
most rapid pace in all of recorded history.

> Classwork, study and "achievement" are just
> part of a "game" for far too many, and there is no intrinsic
> value seen in hard work or getting something because of it.

Generational stereotyping... there have always been those
that could be so described. Likewise, there are millions that
do it all, often with little or no expectation of reward.

> No, the work needed to gain true farmiliarity with a subjectl is
> seen as an "unfair burden" that should be lifted as soon as
> possible, by cheating if necessary, sometimes.

PLEASE...tell us who (how) in amateur licensing is cheating.

> The "deal" today for many, many young people is: "Get it any
> way you can, and DON'T feel bad about it." It's this last that
> has changed over the last ten years or so especially. That is,
> students at least used to feel bad when they took the low road.
> Now they mostly don't. It's quite a disturbing trend, I think.

More generation bashing.

> For whatever reason, the idea of the INTRINSIC value of
> hard work to get something is simply in the dumper. It's the
> LEARNING how to WORK that is simply not valued.

I don't give a damn about how much anyone works...it is
the results that count. Some people can bust their humps
working and accomplish nothing. Others expend 1/2 the
effort and produce major contributions.

> Most
> students today can't even understand the concept. I have
> students who pay hundreds of dollars for my class and then
> cheat because they have a visceral revulsion to actual hard
> intellectual work.

IF you are so certain they are cheating, why do you
accept that.....or is the "cheating" only
speculation on your part?

> That is, the degree today is a hoop, part
> of a game, and not anything valuable in and of itself.

The degree has always been nothing but a gateopener.
What cracks me up...and I've seen this many times...
is the people that expect a lifetime of adulation because
they hold a degree...especially the PHD...yet many
of them rest only on their laurels of academic
stardom and contribute little or nothing.

> What
> counts is GETTING it, by whatever means possible. When
> you have your ticket punched, you done.

Pretty much thecase as one intially enters the career
marketplace. Within a short time, however, the degree
means less in regards to career accomplishments.

> Get with the modern world, guy. Today, unfortunately, MOST
> students only want to know ONE THING -- WHAT'S going to
> BE on the TEST! And many times they just flast ASK THAT,
> and expect to get it, down to every jot and tittle.

Never hurts to ask. You are free to answer or not.

> In an academic setting that is RIDICULOUS, that request,
> but today Ham Radio simply GIVES that material away!

The knowledge to pass the test, be it via question pools or
a short 16 pages of a licnese manual has been the norm for
over 50 years.

> It may be LEGAL, but it ain't, er, a TEST, in my view anyway.

Your opinion, your problem, deal with it.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

990. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 16:25:03 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8n15vh9rq15e4@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 36931

W1RFI wrote:

>So you believe "many" people want to become amateur
>operators so they won't learn anything?

In a word: YES! All they want to do is "learn" how to get a hand-held radio and get on the repeater, with as little trouble as possible. What 's so strange about this? That is, I see generations "X", "Y" and "Z" in action all the time, and this is the way it IS. Classwork, study and "achievement" are just part of a "game" for far too many, and there is no intrinsic value seen in hard work or getting something because of it. No, the work needed to gain true farmiliarity with a subjectl is seen as an "unfair burden" that should be lifted as soon as possible, by cheating if necessary, sometimes.

The "deal" today for many, many young people is: "Get it any way you can, and DON'T feel bad about it." It's this last that has changed over the last ten years or so especially. That is, students at least used to feel bad when they took the low road. Now they mostly don't. It's quite a disturbing trend, I think.

For whatever reason, the idea of the INTRINSIC value of hard work to get something is simply in the dumper. It's the LEARNING how to WORK that is simply not valued. Most students today can't even understand the concept. I have students who pay hundreds of dollars for my class and then cheat because they have a visceral revulsion to actual hard intellectual work. That is, the degree today is a hoop, part of a game, and not anything valuable in and of itself. What counts is GETTING it, by whatever means possible. When you have your ticket punched, you done.

Get with the modern world, guy. Today, unfortunately, MOST students only want to know ONE THING -- WHAT'S going to BE on the TEST! And many times they just flast ASK THAT, and expect to get it, down to every jot and tittle.

In an academic setting that is RIDICULOUS, that request, but today Ham Radio simply GIVES that material away!

It may be LEGAL, but it ain't, er, a TEST, in my view anyway.

Val Germann
Columbia, Missouri

991. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 16:26:03 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16f528221fcbc0179896a9@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 36932

In article <a6fmg4nsf1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>,
billsohl@mindspring.com says...

> I passed the Extra over two years ago...and have promptly
> forgotten 2/3 of the stuff that was on the test. Why you may
> ask?

Because you don't have the knowledge required to be an Extra class
amateur?

joshua houk
ac7ri

992. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 16:32:16 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6g26ilqe1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 36934

"Joshua Houk" <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.16f528221fcbc0179896a9@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> In article <a6fmg4nsf1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>,
> billsohl@mindspring.com says...
>
> > I passed the Extra over two years ago...and have promptly
> > forgotten 2/3 of the stuff that was on the test. Why you may
> > ask?
>
> Because you don't have the knowledge required to be an Extra class
> amateur?

You conveniently left out the specific subject areas I delineated
as being of worthless value to me. Are you saying it is of
any importance that I or any other Extra retain the following
rules and regs minutia:

How long before/after I must notify FCC of satrting/concluding
amateur space operation.
What all the details are about running a VE session.
Etc.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

993. Re: What does your wife/husband/partner think of your hobby?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 16:49:44 UTC
From: Brainbuster <brainbuster@lineone.spamtrap.net>
Message-ID: <a6geou$2gm$8@newsg4.svr.pol.co.uk>
Source record: 37010
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.cb,uk.rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Alan Mears <tech2000@nolineone.netspam> wrote in message
news:cEZg8.48628$Hg1.8187039@news6-win.server.ntlworld.com...
> Nope, still as bad as ever ;-)
===

Hi Alan.

Beats me why they still have customers. Out of all the ISPs I have tried in the last year, they rate as the worst of the lot.
Lineone was running fine, until they got their hands on it. My password started being rejected, newsgroup messages dropped to zero at one point. Outgoing messages took days to appear on the groups... and if they contained my thoughts of WOL, they never got there.
My Lineone addy just fills with Spam, some of the headers give Tiscali servers as the source of the messages.

Still, it has to be worth signing up, just for the free gifts. I got a free CD upon sign-up and I receive "Tiscali" install disks with the latest IE version... the last one had Bodyworks on it!
Whenever I get a free ISP disk, I always explore it for free software. "Supanet" include "World Book" on their free install disk available from a certain chain of computer stores. They say you must sign up to load the software, but that depends on how good you are with your computer.
Supanet lost this group totally for a while last year.

Just take the gifts they offer and run like hell.

I know... Typical CBer, wanting something for nothing. But if the companies are offering, then I am accepting.

Peter.

994. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 17:10:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310121033.13086.00000093@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 36935

In article <3C8A65E0.7CB9284A@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>reminds me of a Bantam Rooster I used to have. Unfortunately,
>he died during the seventh cock fight with a White Leghorn.

"Would that, I say, would that have been a Foghorn Leghorn?"

"That dog, I say, That dog is about as sharp as a bowlin' ball"

"That widder hen reminds me of the road from Fort Worth to Dallas - no curves"

"No, no, no, boy, ye're doin' it all wrong!"

"that dog's about as dumb as a sack of wet mice"

"...this is gonna cause more confusion than a mouse in a burlesque show"

73 de Jim, N2EY

995. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 17:20:22 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a6g4f5025p2@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 36936

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020310020836.24806.00000194@mb-mv.aol.com...
> In article <3c882eb6_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>
> >
> >While PSK31 has met with pretty good success at adoption,
> >and I agree that there are regulatory barriers that need fixing,
> >I still think the masses could use a bit of a kick in the backside
> >in the direction of progress :-).
>
> Carl:
>
> Hunh? I thought that reducing the code testing requirements to
^^^^^^^

That's what your problem is.

996. Re: Anon COWARD's rimjobbing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 17:54:09 UTC
From: GenderBender <alterego@msnn.com>
Message-ID: <55Ni8.21955$8a2.1239157@bin2.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
Source record: 36937
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Stagger, it is better to be a top poster than a "Top" such as yourself.
Read my post again and you will see the 3 newsgroups that were in question,
do your homework before replying with a stupid answer as which group is this
group. The thread appeared in more than 3 NG until I trimmed the fat and
the question remains what does this have to do with amateur radio? Don't be
a smacked ass all your life.

"Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
news:genderbender.go.away@houston-hunks.com...
>
> On Sat, 09 Mar 2002 17:34:46 GMT, GenderBender <alterego@msnn.com> wrote:
> : What does all this have to do with the topic of this group?
>
> Well, top poster, which group is "this group?" The thread appeared in
> three news groups until you trimmed your post.
>
> And if you have to ask the question, chances are that you haven't been
> around the ham news groups for very long anyway.
>
> Do your homework before posting the next time.
>

997. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 18:20:00 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310132000.08770.00000650@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36938

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>W1RFI wrote:
>
>>So you believe "many" people want to become amateur
>>operators so they won't learn anything?
>
>In a word: YES! All they want to do is "learn" how to get a
>hand-held radio and get on the repeater, with as little trouble
>as possible. What 's so strange about this?

Why would they want to do that? It would be like saying that someone wants to take up sailing but doesn't want to learn how to sail.

>That is, I see generations "X", "Y" and "Z" in action all the time, and this
is
>the way it IS. Classwork, study and "achievement" are just
>part of a "game" for far too many, and there is no intrinsic
>value seen in hard work or getting something because of it.
>No, the work needed to gain true farmiliarity with a subjectl is
>seen as an "unfair burden" that should be lifted as soon as
>possible, by cheating if necessary, sometimes.

Ah, one of those "kids today" sort of things. If someone wants to do nothing, there are better ways than Amateur Radio to do it.

The idea that someone wants to rote memorize 1000 questions without understanding so they can do nothing is ridiculous on its face.

And if they do want to take the easy way out, it is easier to learn the underlying material than to do all that memorizing.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

998. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 18:21:23 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310132123.08770.00000651@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36939

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>In grade school, I was always provided with
>the list of 20 spelling words I'd be tested on each week.
>Was I cheating because I had them?

Surely you didn't memorize them!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

999. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 18:23:16 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310132316.08770.00000652@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36940

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> >The point was that FCC nor the government in general will be in any way
>> >inclined to turn ham radio loose to do anything anyone might way to do
>> >with ham radio re Carl's bright ideas for an idealistic digital nirvana
>> >in ham radio. It would set us up to become an underground illicit means of
>> >international communication that could easily harbor hidden
>> >terrorist communications which might escape detection, at least until too
>> >late to be effective Carl thinks he has all this figured out. He needs a
>> >new abacus.

>> Whew, that is a bit far out even for you, Dick. :-)

>Yup, I can hear them black helicopters comin'
>in for Dick now.... whup, whup, whup :-)

The idea that "they" are monitoring the thousands of amateur QSOs that take
place daily is ridiculous on its face.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1000. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 18:26:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310132627.08770.00000653@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36941

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> I agree completely "Why the ARRL BoD 'refarming' initiative?"
> I think it's a stupid, ill-advised idea aimed at pandering to the
> SSB-only crowd.

The Novice/Tech+ segments are virtually unused. The ARRL proposal pretty much divvies them up 50-50 vs phone/image and CW/digital.

Why is not it a stupid, ill-advised idea aimed at pandering to the CW-only crowd? Or the image-only crowd? Or the digital-only crowd?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1001. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 18:31:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310133119.08770.00000654@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36944

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>I cannot wait for non-voice digital or even voice digital
>operation to be permitted in the phone bands.

Digital voice is already permitted in the phone bands.

> I notice even Mr. Bodson and Mr. Milnes support
>adding digital to the phone segments in a motion to petition
>change of Part 97 by adding "data" to each line in 97.305
>and deletion of "image and phone" in 97.307(f)(2). Looks
>like this idea is gaining support in the ARRL BoD.

I am all for it. IMHPO, if there needs to be any limitation on emissions vs frequency, it should be a bandwidth limit. I cannot see why a 5 kHz wide digital voice signal is okay on 14.250 MHz but not a 5-kHz wide digital data signal.

>I assume the Newington crowd is 100% behind this also.

I don't think that 90% of the ARRL HQ staff in Newington cares one way or the other about this issue, Clay. Until there is a Board motion, none of will have any professional responsibility toward this. If the day comes, I might be asked to do some sort of engineering in support of ARRL's position, but in the meantime, my interest is personal.

I don't think I have seen 100% of the Newington staff agree on nearly anything, Clay.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
>73,
>Clay N4AOX
>
>
>
>
>
>

1002. Re: Anon COWARD's rimjobbing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 18:32:05 UTC
From: Stagger Lee <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
Message-ID: <3C8BA6A5.19219DD3@houston-hunks.com>
Source record: 36942
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

GenderBender wrote:
>
> Stagger, it is better to be a top poster than a "Top" such as yourself.
> Read my post again and you will see the 3 newsgroups that were in question,
> do your homework before replying with a stupid answer as which group is this
> group. The thread appeared in more than 3 NG until I trimmed the fat and
> the question remains what does this have to do with amateur radio? Don't be
> a smacked ass all your life.
>
> "Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
> news:genderbender.go.away@houston-hunks.com...
> >
> > On Sat, 09 Mar 2002 17:34:46 GMT, GenderBender <alterego@msnn.com> wrote:
> > : What does all this have to do with the topic of this group?
> >
> > Well, top poster, which group is "this group?" The thread appeared in
> > three news groups until you trimmed your post.
> >
> > And if you have to ask the question, chances are that you haven't been
> > around the ham news groups for very long anyway.
> >
> > Do your homework before posting the next time.
> >

Clearly, you haven't been reading r.r.a.m. or the other news groups to
which the thread was cross posted.

The thread is about a low life ham who has been posting crap for years
in several news groups. Since the thread is about a ham and his Usenet
harassment and filth, plus his on the air jamming, it is unfortunately
about ham radio.

You don't like it? I suggest that you use your OE news filters, or
simply skip the thread. No one is forcing you to read it, and you sure
as hell aren't going to get any of the participants to stop.

P.S. Don't be a smacked ass all your life.

1003. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 18:32:11 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310133211.08770.00000655@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36943

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Dave Heil wrote:

>> The word is "pompous".

>Good Lord! I have never seen a better example of the pot calling
>the kettle black.

He was pointing out a spelling error. Carl had used the word "pompus."

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1004. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 18:33:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310133320.08770.00000656@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36946

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>> The word is "pompous".

>Well, EXCUSE me for the typo ... I don't type nearly as well as
>I used to years ago because I have some lack of coordination
>in my hands and fingers due to a spinal chord injury.

The word is "cord."

>I use your nit-picky correction of such a simple, inconseqential
>error as further evidence that you are, in fact, a pompous jerk :-P

Your turn. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1005. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 18:34:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310133413.08770.00000657@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36945

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>No, you used my correction of your error (and elevated yourself to
>victim status by tying your error to a spinal chord injury) to hurl
>another insult.

The word is "cord."

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1006. Re: Automatic Link Establishment (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 18:39:23 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310133923.08770.00000660@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36947

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>Ed ... 1st, please do see if you can get those articles on the website
>(at least in the members section).

Already sent to the Webmaster. Probably Monday or Tuesday. And they will be in the public part of the website. Paul Rinaldo, W4RI, ARRL's DC Technical Relations Manager, likes to brag about amateur ALE, so I want to give him a brag URL. :-)

Of course, most hams do MLE, or rely on their own good judgement of of what band will be open when.

>2nd, I didn't mean in any way to allude that ARRL had voiced
>any opposition to ALE techniques ...

Didn't take it that way, Carl. I posted the articles just to give those who were interested some pointers.

>3rd ... I still bet that there are more than just a few who will
>grumble (at least privately, if not publicly) that "that's not
>REAL ham radio" (because a machine is assisting.
>

Fewer than you would think, and few enough not to matter. :-)

Hey, my QRP buddies thought that the 2XQRP EME work using long-term integration of a Morse-encoded CW signal was way cool! As soon as the DSP-10 is built, I want to try the technique on HF.

What we REALLY need is a good software-defined/DSP HF radio with open source code. So far, I haven't talked any of my low friends in high places at various manufacturers into doing it.

For that matter, we could use open source on the programmability of the IEEE 802 devices! :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1007. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 18:46:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310134630.08770.00000662@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36948

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>Absent any qualifier word, the loyalty to a national/international
>representative is implicitly ONLY to the ARRL.
>
>Your denial of the obvious and attempts at misdirection do not apply.

What misdirection? We are still talking about the same subject.

And I think that we can let everyone decide for themselves whether it is obvious that ARRL wants people to be loyal only to the League because of the words it chose in its code of conduct.

>No, but I'm glad you feel better in thinking the matter is "settled.".

>I'm sure your employer is happy as well.

Len, my employer could give a rat's butt about rec.radio.amateur.policy. You sure do have an active imagination.

>The ARRL MENTIONS other organizations. Since when did it "promote" them?

Just as one example, I specifically added information about TAPR to the ARRL Tech info pages on anything related to digital. It was done to promote TAPR.

>Are you going to continue this word-game charade to please your
>employer?

Is that a serious question? Do you really expect anyone to believe that I am engaging in conversation on rec.radio.amateur.policy to please my boss? If so, you have a very distorted view of reality.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1008. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 18:57:46 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310135746.08770.00000663@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 36949

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>>>Since very recently. The ARRL has been in existance since 1914.

>>Okay, but if you have to go back to 1914. . . :-)

>Follow the context of a reply. ALL THE WORDS.

>Selective quoting is a very poor technique in debate although it is
>extensively used in Internet squabling. You are engaging in mere
>squabling.

It was a joke, Len. That is why I added the smiley. I then did indeed go on
to quote the rest of.

Relax; you will live longer.

>Your own one-sentence "questions" as replies may be "worked over"
>with the same technique to show you the foolishness. You will not
>like the result. Neither will your employer.

Mark won't care one way or the other, Len. He cares about how well I run the
Lab, how well the Lab handles RFI, Product testing and the various FCC
engineering studies we are asked to do.

His interest in rec.radio.amateur.policy is zero.

Your attempt at misdirection is a feeble one.

>>No, I think we kept right on subject.

>Then we can all take it that you are spinning as an ARRL-apologist.

You are free to take it any way you want, Len. Think everyone is buying it?

>>You are correct, but how do those statements explain your belief that ARRL
>>is trying to control you?

>Incorrect. I stated that the ARRL is exercising CONTROL through labeling
>itself as THE representative of US amateur radio to the FCC and from an
>88-year tenure under such a claim. That is CONTROL over ALL amateurs.

And for 95% of the FCC regulatory matters that affect Amateur Radio, ARRL is
the only amateur organization that files. Of course, you will conveniently
ignore the fact that ARRL encourages amateurs and organizations to file on all
matters that affect ham radio. So much for "control," eh?

>>>Why do you deny that the ARRL has had a strong influence
>>>on the government regarding amateur radio regulations?

>>I do not deny that Len. I would not put the amount of energy I put into the
>>FCC regulatory filings I particiate in if I felt that such work would not
>have
>>influence. Why would I *want* to say that?

>Who is Ed Hare's employer?

Exactly, so why would I deny that ARRL has a strong influence at the FCC. Now, the last time we went through this, you were arguing that ARRL had little influence over the FCC. I guess you change your argument to suit your agenda du jour.

>>>Are you saying that First Amendment rights "do not apply" when
>>>it comes to amateur radio regulations?

>>Yup, it is another one of those "what he said, what he heard" sort of
>things.

>You did not answer the question.

I agree with ARRL that amateurs and organizations should file their comments with the FCC on matters that affect Amateur Radio.

>You wish to use the single-sentence question as a "reply" on most
>of your postings. That is a perfect example of the "what he said, what
>he heard" sayings.

>Why is that method exclusive and unidirectional for yourself, yet
>"not allowed" for others?

Are you trying to control what I post now? :-)

>>I don't believe that misdirection is needed here, Len, and we are still on
>>topic. If you feel ridiculed, it was not due to misdirection.

>Please do not engage in any more mind-fornication techniques. Those
>are tiresome and transparent.

Yup, you are trying to control what I post. Misdirecting this by calling my tough question "mind fornication" does not help you make your point.

>Your employer may not be pleased. The ARRL still hasn't membership
>of even a quarter of licensed US radio amateurs. You are not making
>things better.

If I admit you are right, will you become an ARRL member?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1009. Subject: Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 18:59:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310135933.08770.00000664@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 37001

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>You have chosen to "reply" by an entire quote without adding
>any comment whatsoever.

>I will have to take that as either capitulation or frustration at not
>being able to add any spin to a reply.

I am sure you will. Of course, the fact that I accidentally hit the SEND
button will not matter one whit to your conclusion.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1010. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 19:00:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8BAD3F.67E6190C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 36950

Bill Sohl wrote:
> One could ponder the thought that Adam and Eve probably didn't.

Do you think God believes in evolution?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1011. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 19:02:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8BADB2.BFFBB41D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37002

W1RFI wrote:
> I don't believe that 1/3 of all hams could accurately handle formal traffic
> under ideal band conditions.

So your estimate is even more pessimistic than mine.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1012. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 19:02:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310140235.08822.00000590@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 37003

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>Why are you "having fun" with this sort of nonsense?

And now you are trying to control my fun!

>Is this what grown-up ARRL employees do to tout the glories
>of ARRL membership and "representation?"

Of course my fun isn't intended to promote ARRL membership, Len. Do you see everything through that filter?

>One of the Directors of the ARRL is named "Fried Heyn" isn't
>he?

>Are you really sure you want to go this way on names?

Why, whatever are you talking about?

ARRL does not have a Director named Fried Heyn. He is a past director, and I bet he has heard them all.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1013. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 19:04:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310140413.08822.00000591@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 37004

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>>Now, now, Len, a few posts back, you were trying to help me wiht my English
>>comprehension. Or so you said... hmmm...

>Let me add TYPING ABILITY.

Well, if you are going after my occasional fumble finger, you are really
scraping the bottom of the barrel.

Have fun.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1014. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 19:06:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8BAEBD.B3DAF80@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37005

W1RFI wrote:
> I cannot see why a 5 kHz wide
> digital voice signal is okay on 14.250 MHz but not a 5-kHz wide digital data
> signal.

I foresee a common digital mode for both voice and data.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1015. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 19:09:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8BAF5C.16C2FE92@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37006

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >I certainly will try to make it and buy you that lobster dinner I owe you.
>
> And seeing as it is in Arizona, I would gladly settle for a nice steak. You
> wouldn't believe how obscenely expensive lobster is there! Honor WILL be served
> with a steak, as far as I am concerned.

Ed, if I don't spend it on lobster, my greedy kids will just get it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1016. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 19:17:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8BB153.8911B32F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37007

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> Bill Sohl wrote
>
> >BUNK... No one is cheating because of public
> >availability of the question pools. The FCC tests
> >have a similar set of publicly published Q&As.
>
> I don't think you read my message! I said that
> in an ACADEMIC SETTING the publishing of the
> questions and answers, in advance, is cheating.

Why don't you try the newsgroup alt.academia.cheating? :-)
You reminded me that this is not a pilot's newsgroup. I will
remind you that this is not an academic newsgroup.

> Just because it's "legal" doesn't change its
> actual NATURE in this regard.

Of course it does, Val. If the Q&A are freely published, then
it's not cheating to look at them. My SKS is illegal in CA
but legal in TX. The laws/rules have everything to do
with the nature of things being legal or illegal.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1017. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 19:22:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8BB277.6B83F462@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37008

Valentine Germann wrote:
> All they want to do is "learn" how to get a
> hand-held radio and get on the repeater, with as little trouble
> as possible. What 's so strange about this? That is, I see
> generations "X", "Y" and "Z" in action all the time, and this is
> the way it IS.

You are certainly free to petition the FCC to get the situation
changed. Let us know what their reaction is.

> For whatever reason, the idea of the INTRINSIC value of
> hard work to get something is simply in the dumper.

Mother Nature programmed animals, including Homo sapiens, to
expend as little energy as possible to accomplish a task.
Nowhere in Part 97 does it mention hard work.

> In an academic setting that is RIDICULOUS, that request,
> but today Ham Radio simply GIVES that material away!

Exactly! When are you going to accept that fact and get
on with your life?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1018. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 19:26:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8BB376.ECB61A14@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37009

Joshua Houk wrote:
>
> In article <a6fmg4nsf1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>,
> billsohl@mindspring.com says...
>
> > I passed the Extra over two years ago...and have promptly
> > forgotten 2/3 of the stuff that was on the test. Why you may
> > ask?
>
> Because you don't have the knowledge required to be an Extra class
> amateur?

He met the requirements for the Extra class license set by the
sovereign government of the United States of America. Shirley,
that is enough.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1019. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 20:47:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310154728.03114.00000079@mb-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 37011

In article <a6fpi7$7s4$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020310001020.20892.00000071@mb-mr.aol.com...
>> In article <3c8a2e47_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20020308225729.12293.00000082@mb-cs.aol.com...
>> >> In article <3c893425_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> >> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >> >news:20020308121030.22805.00000026@mb-cb.aol.com...
>> >> >> In article <3c87f203_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> >> >> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>> >> For as long as the fuel holds out. One of the problems in
>> >> the ice storms of 1997 was fuel supplies running low.
>> >
>> >Planning and preparation ... nothing more.
>>
>> The best laid plans of mice and men...
>
>What's your alternative then?

He has stated none. "CW gets through when nothing else will" so
alternatives aren't needed.

>> >I have a PD-220 "SuperStationmaster" on 2m ... used to use
>> >them in in commercial installations on mountaintops ... seen
>> >them take 6" of iceload and 100mph wind and not come down.
>>
>> If the house underneath stays up...
>
>If my house goes, I'd be far more intent on taking care
>of my family than worrying about anyone else's.

Bill, you have to realize the common Urban Myths are still
in force in popular ham mythology.

"When real emergencies happen the cell phones 'always' go
down" and "amateurs will immediately jump in and save the
community with their skills and equipment." This is part of
amateur "history" from you-know-who's publishing. :-)

"CW gets through when nothing else will," presumably even if
all primary electrical power fails.

>> >With my location on the exact top of the highest hill in the area,
>> >I can BE the repeater
>>
>> You have standby duplexers, I presume.
>
>I'll let Carl answer that. The other question to
>you is just how much redundancy does YOUR
>emergency set-up have? Redundant transciever? Power?
>Microphones? Morse Key?

As a "renowned amateur historian" he is prepared with
redundant jingo systems. :-)

>> >But you ALWAYS make sure to emphasize that "CW skills MUST
>> >be there" ...
>>
>> Where have I EVER said that? Produce the post.
>
>Is it then your opinion that a person with NO morse skills
>can, in fact, be a good operator...or, as Carl is trying to
>ferret out, must the person have morse skills
>for you to consider the person an expert operator?

It's fairly clear to anyone who has read the outpourings in
this chat room that N2EY is constantly pushing for the
supremacy of the morsemen in amateur radio under any
and all conditions.

>> And if porcine aviation intervenes,
>
>Did I miss something? I have no clue what "porcine aviation" is
>in reference to?

:-) "If pigs could fly..." :-)

...just more of necro-equine flaggelation by a renowned morseman.

>> After years of reading your diatribes against the mode and its users,
>> Carl, I'm just a wee bit skeptical.
>
>Why, you won't find anything from Carl that supports any notion that
>Carl, myself or NCI wants to eliminate morse USE.

Bill, you have to understand that morsemen are morsemen to the
very bitter end. Anything, however trivial, not positive towards
morsemethods shall always be construed as outrageous insutling
personal comments and dealt with harshly.

A non-positive attitude against retention of morse testing is ALWAYS
taken as evil, vile very-personal insults against the superior radio
skill in morsemanship proven by actual federal, merit-badged testing.

"The few, the proud, the US Morsemen."

>> Y'know, you sure do preach to the choir about preparation. Seems to me
>> that part of preparation would be getting the license with the most
>> privileges, even if you didn't agree with all the requirements.
>
>Why?
>In a real emergency, even a nocode Tech can operate HF
>(i.e. the license privileges don't prohibit operating on
>ham band segments that the license itself wouldn't otherwise
>permit.)

Never mind trying to state some silly little federal regulations, Bill,
those don't apply in the Virtual Morseradio World where the dreams
all revolve around a core of morsemanship once again saving the
Titanic survivors of 1912 or alien invasion, whichever comes first.
Intense dreaming seems to be all the preparation needed by the
morsemen. They are always ready to jump into action to save the
day and the nation through their federally certified morsemanship.
They have dreamed such and deserve all the respect and honors
and glory they feel is theirs. QED.

1020. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 20:47:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310154729.03114.00000080@mb-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 37012

In article <u8n15vh9rq15e4@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>W1RFI wrote:
>
>>So you believe "many" people want to become amateur
>>operators so they won't learn anything?
>
>In a word: YES! All they want to do is "learn" how to get a
>hand-held radio and get on the repeater, with as little trouble
>as possible. What 's so strange about this? That is, I see
>generations "X", "Y" and "Z" in action all the time, and this is
>the way it IS. Classwork, study and "achievement" are just
>part of a "game" for far too many, and there is no intrinsic
>value seen in hard work or getting something because of it.
>No, the work needed to gain true farmiliarity with a subjectl is
>seen as an "unfair burden" that should be lifted as soon as
>possible, by cheating if necessary, sometimes.

Several fallacies in the above.

1. An amateur radio license test is NOT an academic
achievement test, never was.

2. There is misplaced "work ethic" applied to an AVOCATION.

3. Self-professed telepathy is not a guarantor of "knowing"
what "all" want to do.

4. According to some prevailing Urban Myths, one CANNOT
ever talk about amateur radio without first being a bona fide
federally-certified, merit-badged amateur radio licensee. :-)

>The "deal" today for many, many young people is: "Get it any
>way you can, and DON'T feel bad about it." It's this last that
>has changed over the last ten years or so especially. That is,
>students at least used to feel bad when they took the low road.
>Now they mostly don't. It's quite a disturbing trend, I think.

Heh heh heh...this mantra has been chanted in every single
generation since recorded history (including translations on
the walls of the preserved ruins of Pompeii). This seems to
arise as a side-effect of imbibing too many sour grapes when
there is a realization that few others follow self-professed
ethical standards and "excellence" in a hobby.

>For whatever reason, the idea of the INTRINSIC value of
>hard work to get something is simply in the dumper. It's the
>LEARNING how to WORK that is simply not valued.

Since amateur radio is defined as a radio activity "without
pecuniary interest" (the reason that the word "amateur" replaces
"commercial" or "professional"), it can be broadly categorized
as an avocation or HOBBY.

The "LEARNING how to WORK" only applies to trades, crafthalls,
guilds, and professionals.

>Most
>students today can't even understand the concept. I have
>students who pay hundreds of dollars for my class and then
>cheat because they have a visceral revulsion to actual hard
>intellectual work. That is, the degree today is a hoop, part
>of a game, and not anything valuable in and of itself. What
>counts is GETTING it, by whatever means possible. When
>you have your ticket punched, you done.

The alt.flame.teachers-against-students newsgroup is down
far in the next hallway next to alt.kill-those-that-do-not-follow-me
non-discussion group.

Amateur radio is defined as a HOBBY..

>Get with the modern world, guy. Today, unfortunately, MOST
>students only want to know ONE THING -- WHAT'S going to
>BE on the TEST! And many times they just flast ASK THAT,
>and expect to get it, down to every jot and tittle.

On academic policies you are free to discuss this matter with
school administrators. A reminder: Amateur radio is a HOBBY,
not a trade, crafthall, guild, union, or professional group.

>In an academic setting that is RIDICULOUS, that request,
>but today Ham Radio simply GIVES that material away!
>
>It may be LEGAL, but it ain't, er, a TEST, in my view anyway.

Feel free to write your elected federal officials from Missouri and
tell them about this odious condition in an uncaring world. They
will then consider the matter and inform the FCC if you are
reluctant to pursuie the matter directly with the FCC.

If neither group considers your views favorably, you are then free
to resume this diatribe of your generation so superior to the
obviously-inferior younger generation. After all, they must be
infected by the same lack of work ethic and ignorance you ascribe
to obviously-inferior others. :-)

Above all, remember that the First Amendment is not supposed
to apply to citizens unlicensed-in-the-amateur-radio-service!

1021. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 21:10:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310161052.19293.00000122@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 37013

In article <a6fpi7$7s4$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020310001020.20892.00000071@mb-mr.aol.com...
>> In article <3c8a2e47_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20020308225729.12293.00000082@mb-cs.aol.com...
>> >> In article <3c893425_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> >> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >> >news:20020308121030.22805.00000026@mb-cb.aol.com...
>> >> >> In article <3c87f203_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> >> >> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >"If the frequencies are available at the stations involved" ...
>this
>> >> >> >sounds like a matter of proper preparation and planning to me.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Sure - but how much preparation is "proper"? Is two bands enough, or
>> >maybe
>> >> >> three or four, or what? How much power?
>> >> >
>> >> >Whatever it takes ...
>>
>> >> > I don't have (and don't envision needing)
>> >> >an amplifier ...
>> >>
>> >> There may be times when an amplifier is needed.
>> >
>> >Not from my experience ... I've never found it essential
>> >to have more than 100W to be able to make a contact
>> >outside of the area, or anywhere inside the surrounding
>> >area (for example the area my ARES/RACES group would
>> >cover or respond into to support adjacent units).
>>
>> In all of the places I've lived as a radio amateur, I've never experienced
>a
>> power outage that lasted longer than a few hours. Does that mean I need
>only
>> provide

>> enough backup energy for a few hours and I'll be adequately prepared?
>
>You prepare for whatever duration you want. There is NO hard and
>fast rule. Emergency preparation decisions are driven by expectations
>based on past experience, planning for that rare "worst case"
>situation and, in the end, personal ability to support preparedness
>in terms of equipment, power, storage capability, and finances.

I agree 100%, Bill.

My question stems from Carl's insistence that any problems which
arise in an emergency could have been prevented by "proper planning
and preparation".
>
>I could easily have an emergency generator with 100 gallons of
>gasolene available...BUT, who wants to have 100 gallons of
>gasolene stored at their home.

Exactly my point. There's the space problem, the transportation problem
and the fire hazard. Plus storage of such quantities of gasoline may be
a fire safety violation in many places.

> I can, however, have a full tank
>of gas in my car, my car has a 12 volt alternator, I can (and do) have
>several 12 volt sealed batteries to power my rig. IF the batteries
>needed recharging, I could easily connect them to my car and float
>them while still running my rig directly off the vehicles 12 volts
>for an hour.

Same here. But you have to be careful, because often sealed batteries cannot
be charged above a certain rate.

> Off hand, I'd probably be able to run for several
>days without ever leaving my property to get gas.
>
Hopefully. All depends on the vehicle.

>Other possibilities include augmenting via solar panels. You
>can certainly get sufficient power from a relatively small panel
>to operate in recieve and still be slightly charging the battery.

Yup - as long as the sun shines. In many parts of the US the average daily
winter sunshine equals about 1-2 hours of full power from a panel.

>If your primary purpose was to assist, rather than be the
>emergency control operator/hub/node, that may be all you
>need. Especially if communications can be maintained using
>low power...which is far more the case than any need for
>even 100w.

Sure. All depends on the situation.

>> >> >> Many emergencies wipe out commercial power
>> >> >

>> >> >I don't need commercial power ... all of my gear can be run
>> >> >from 12VDC ... I have large, deep-cycle batteries and the
>> >> >means to charge them without commercial power (it's called
>> >> >vehicles, and gas to run them) This is part of being properly
>> >> >and adequately prepared.
>> >>
>> >> For as long as the fuel holds out. One of the problems in
>> >> the ice storms of 1997 was fuel supplies running low.
>> >
>> >Planning and preparation ... nothing more.
>>
>> The best laid plans of mice and men...
>
>What's your alternative then?

As many tools in the toolbox as practical. That includes things like technical
knowledge and the skill to use various modes.
>
>> >> All depends on the situation. How usable will a makeshift wire
>> >> antenna be on VHF/UHF if the repeaters in your area fail?
>> >
>> >I have a PD-220 "SuperStationmaster" on 2m ... used to use
>> >them in in commercial installations on mountaintops ... seen
>> >them take 6" of iceload and 100mph wind and not come down.
>>
>> If the house underneath stays up...
>
>If my house goes, I'd be far more intent on taking care
>of my family than worrying about anyone else's.

BINGO!!
>
>> >With my location on the exact top of the highest hill in the area,
>> >I can BE the repeater
>>
>> You have standby duplexers, I presume.
>
>I'll let Carl answer that. The other question to
>you is just how much redundancy does YOUR
>emergency set-up have? Redundant transciever? Power?
>Microphones? Morse Key?

Yes to all.
>
>> >> >> > if it's not available, fine ... that's where operator
>> >> >> >knowledge and experience come in ...
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Agreed! That's one of the skills on my list.
>> >> >
>> >> >You equate operator skill and experience with CW proficiency.
>> >>

>> >> CW proficiency is actually a whole set of skills, not one skill. But I
>do
>> >> not equate operator skill and experience solely with CW skills.
>> >>
>> >> IOW, CW skills are a subset of operator skill and experience.
>> >
>> >But you ALWAYS make sure to emphasize that "CW skills MUST
>> >be there" ...
>>
>> Where have I EVER said that? Produce the post.
>
>Is it then your opinion that a person with NO morse skills
>can, in fact, be a good operator...

Sure! Did you see my list, posted in this thread a few days ago?
Did anyone notice that none of the listed skills are exclusively Morse
skills?

>or, as Carl is trying to
>ferret out, must the person have morse skills
>for you to consider the person an expert operator?
>
To consider someone an "expert" amateur radio operator, I would
have to include Morse skills, simply because the mode is so
popular with hams. Earning the title "expert amateur radio operator"
requires a LOT of skills. I do not consider someone with little or no
Morse skills to be an expert amateur radio operator. But I also do
not think that amateur radio or emergencies are the sole province of'
experts.

I don't presume to call myself an expert amateur radio operator, either.
Still way too much out there for me to learn and get good at.

><snip>
>
>> It suddenly occurs to me that you might think I was arguing for code
>testing
>> based on emergency use. That's not my point at all. I'm simply
>> pointing out that Morse/CW is useful in emergencies, and is in fact used
>> by hams in emergencies. And not just because of operator preference.
>
>I have NO problem with that mindset/approach. You then make morse
>skill no different than many other optional skills (additional language
>capability,
>first aid knowledge, etc.) Each of those are not skills or abilities that
>a ham must have, but can be useful and/or simply avialable as one of
>the tools in that ham's bag of tricks.

As it applies to emergencies, ya got it 100%, Bill.
>
>> The test is a whole other issue. It's a dead issue for over 2 years now.
>> FCC gutted what was left of code testing so that all we have is a bare

>> minimum 5 wpm test, propped up by S25.5. It's clear from the R&O
>> to 98-143 that FCC will drop all code testing as soon as the treaty
>allows.
>
>Agree.

I don't see how the FCC could have made its position any more clear than
they did in the R&O for 98-143.
>
>> And if porcine aviation intervenes,
>
>Did I miss something? I have no clue what "porcine aviation" is
>in reference to?

it's a reference to "when pigs fly"...
>
>> ... and S25.5 somehow survives
>> WRC 2003 (bear with me, Carl, miracles do happen), all the
>> FCC will do is retain that bare minimum.
>
>Agree.

Like I said - dead issue.
>
>> >> However, it seems to me that you are taking great pains to keep Morse
>out
>> >> of the toolbox.
>> >
>> >Not exactly ... I'm like Cecil ... live and let live ... freemarket of
>> >modes.
>>
>> Which means what? No mode tests or no mode subbands?
>
>We have, except for morse, "no mode tests" now. And, in actuality,
>MOST emergency coms are on VHF/UHF which can and does
>involve hams that don't require any morse mode test (i.e. Techs).

I'm just trying to clarify what the phrase means. "Free market of modes"
to some means no mode-specific subbands.

Note that even without the code test we do not have a free market of modes
in the written testing. Some modes are much more likely to be on the test than
others.
>
>As to mode subbands, I don't see how that is evident
>in what Carl has said above.

>> >If you want to spend the time becoming really good at Morse, be my
>> >guest ... I'm not the least bit interested and would not, therefore,
>waste
>> >my time doing so ... does that mean I want to stop you? No! Does
>> >that mean that I want to "take something away from you"? No!

>>
>> After years of reading your diatribes against the mode and its users,
>> Carl, I'm just a wee bit skeptical.
>
>Why, you won't find anything from Carl that supports any notion that
>Carl, myself or NCI wants to eliminate morse USE.

Not in your stuff, Bill, but I've been reading Carl's stuff since '97 and
I'm skeptical.

>> Y'know, you sure do preach to the choir about preparation. Seems to me
>> that part of preparation would be getting the license with the most
>privileges,
>> even if you didn't agree with all the requirements.
>
>Why?

Preparation and planning!

>In a real emergency, even a nocode Tech can operate HF
>(i.e. the license privileges don't prohibit operating on
>ham band segments that the license itself wouldn't otherwise
>permit.)

If it's a genuine life-and-death emergency, yes - in fact, anyone can operate
any radio under those circumstances.

However, how many people will obtain and set up rigs they are not licensed to
use, just in case of life-and-death emergency? How many will know how to use
a rig/band/mode they've never used before because they lack the license?
Preparation includes stuff like having the license and the skills.

I can repost the list if you want...

73 de Jim, N2EY

1022. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 21:30:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C8BD06D.80D41C94@earthlink.net>
Source record: 37014

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >No, you used my correction of your error (and elevated yourself to
> >victim status by tying your error to a spinal chord injury) to hurl
> >another insult.
>
> The word is "cord."

Ed, I don't type so well since that awful volleyball accident.

Dave K8MN

1023. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 22:02:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310170238.06778.00000091@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 37015

In article <20020310140413.08822.00000591@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>Well, if you are going after my occasional fumble finger, you are really
>scraping the bottom of the barrel.
>
>Have fun.

"THREE
The Amateur is Progressive...He keeps his station abreast of
science. It is well built and efficient. His operating practice is
above reproach."

...consider yourself reproached. :-)

1024. Re: Subject: Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 22:02:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310170238.06778.00000092@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 37017

In article <20020310135933.08770.00000664@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>You have chosen to "reply" by an entire quote without adding
>>any comment whatsoever.
>
>>I will have to take that as either capitulation or frustration at not
>>being able to add any spin to a reply.
>
>I am sure you will. Of course, the fact that I accidentally hit the SEND
>button will not matter one whit to your conclusion.

Irrelevant. As you well know, ANY mistake, however minor, is taken as an immediate declaration of incompetence, a terrible sin, and something that cannot be cured with an underarm deoderant (B. O., or bad operating).

1025. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 22:02:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310170241.06778.00000094@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 37016

In article <20020310140235.08822.00000590@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>Why are you "having fun" with this sort of nonsense?
>
>And now you are trying to control my fun!

The ARRL has been attempting to CONTROL the fun of a hobby activity for decades.

If some paid League staff employee gets his horn honked once in a while, he should keep the car doors shut rather than complain about the noise.

1026. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 22:02:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310170241.06778.00000093@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 37018

In article <20020310135746.08770.00000663@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>>>Since very recently. The ARRL has been in existance since 1914.
>
>>>Okay, but if you have to go back to 1914. . . :-)
>
>>Follow the context of a reply. ALL THE WORDS.
>
>>Selective quoting is a very poor technique in debate although it is
>>extensively used in Internet squabling. You are engaging in mere
>>squabling.
>
>It was a joke, Len. That is why I added the smiley. I then did indeed go on
>to quote the rest of.

If you wish to try out for stand-up comedy, I can put you in touch
with some who might arrange it for you.

>Relax; you will live longer.

No a problem. I've existed since 1932 and both sides of my
family have long livers (at least 3 feet or so).

>>Your own one-sentence "questions" as replies may be "worked over"
>>with the same technique to show you the foolishness. You will not
>>like the result. Neither will your employer.
>
>Mark won't care one way or the other, Len. He cares about how well I run the
>Lab, how well the Lab handles RFI, Product testing and the various FCC
>engineering studies we are asked to do.

Hmmm...no remarks about the "impact" of the only ARRL staffer
who is a "regular" in this chat room?

Jim Haynie thought it reasonable that no ARRL Hq person should
give opinions in here. Of course, that was in private mail that
ensued after he popped in here shortly after his election.

>His interest in rec.radio.amateur.policy is zero.
>
>Your attempt at misdirection is a feeble one.

Not really. Many access this chat room to see what is
being shouted back and forth. That exact number is

unknown. Should there be an official ARRL poll on that
or are we to conclude that "his interest is zero" applies
to everything concerning the ARRL's appearance to the
outside world?

>>>No, I think we kept right on subject.
>
>>Then we can all take it that you are spinning as an ARRL-apologist.
>
>You are free to take it any way you want, Len. Think everyone is buying it?

Many have "already bought it" long before I came into this chat
room.

>>Incorrect. I stated that the ARRL is exercising CONTROL through labeling
>>itself as THE representative of US amateur radio to the FCC and from an
>>88-year tenure under such a claim. That is CONTROL over ALL amateurs.
>
>And for 95% of the FCC regulatory matters that affect Amateur Radio, ARRL is
>the only amateur organization that files. Of course, you will conveniently
>ignore the fact that ARRL encourages amateurs and organizations to file on
>all matters that affect ham radio. So much for "control," eh?

That CONTROL was virtually absolute prior to the FCC's accepting
citizen input through the Internet. Not just through a legal firm in
DC but through amateur news, opinions, and technology of radio
filtered through Newington.

How many individuals or local clubs could afford the legal fees to
contact the FCC in a formal way in the before-Internet days? How
many non-legal amateurs knew of the proper format of legal filing
in order to gain recognition and consideration before the
Commission? I'd say only a very, very small percentage of all
licensees.

>>Who is Ed Hare's employer?
>
>Exactly, so why would I deny that ARRL has a strong influence at the FCC.
>Now, the last time we went through this, you were arguing that ARRL had little
>influence over the FCC. I guess you change your argument to suit your agenda
>du jour.

The "last time we went through this" I said about the same as I had
on previous times...that the ARRL is now LOSING some of the
exclusivity in representation when the FCC has made it much
easier for everyone to comment to them directly.

Before Internet, the ARRL had almost a monopolistic influence power
over FCC amateur regulation decisions. It had a large demographic
base to "represent" (although still a decided minority through its
existance) and an established legal firm to do the communicating
with the government.

>>>Yup, it is another one of those "what he said, what he heard" sort of
>>things.
>
>>You did not answer the question.
>
>I agree with ARRL that amateurs and organizations should file their comments
>with the FCC on matters that affect Amateur Radio.

Yup, it is another one of those "spin" answers.

>Are you trying to control what I post now? :-)

I'm trying to get exact answers. I don't get those. What I get are
standard boilerplate "the ARRL can do no wrong" misdirections
into other areas.

>>>I don't believe that misdirection is needed here, Len, and we are still on
>>>topic. If you feel ridiculed, it was not due to misdirection.
>
>>Please do not engage in any more mind-fornication techniques. Those
>>are tiresome and transparent.
>
>Yup, you are trying to control what I post. Misdirecting this by calling my
>tough question "mind fornication" does not help you make your point.

Oh, my, SPIN is "not" mind fornication?

Spin is a constant ploy in the political arena. Influence by SIGs
(the ARRL is a SIG) on government regulations is a political thing.

Whether it is called "mind control" or "brainwashing" or
"psychological warfare," spin is still spin. It is common practice.

As you are trying to do here is to avoid a direct answer by bringing
up indirect references to some word useage as "not nice." That is
irrelevant. My original statement was that the ARRL has exerted an
unduly-strong influence over US amateur radio regulations for nearly
all of its history yet has always been "representing" a minority of
those licensees. What followed was a number of different examples
within the same subject area. "Answers" to all of those were met
with spin to avoid a (probable) uncomfortable direct statement on
the subject.

>If I admit you are right, will you become an ARRL member?

That is also irrelevant. Discussion on subjects in a newsgroup
does not require a direct participation activity.

ARRL bylaws specifically state that VOTING members MUST have
an accredited amateur radio license. While "others" (not-licensed-
in-the-amateur-radio-service) MAY be "members," such have NO
influence on any polls or other "voting" originated and controlled by
the ARRL.

Yet, the ARRL insists on controlling the amateur radio regulations of getting INTO amateur radio, based on "representation" of a minority who are ALREADY in amateur radio. To many, that is simply an elitist minority group trying to exercise control over a majority. That isn't working well. The membership of the ARRL is still less than a quarter of all licensed US amateurs.

1027. Re: the pheasants will rise up again, osama

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 22:27:10 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a6gnim$4ua$7@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 37019
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

Osama Bin Laden supporter "Stagger 'TexASS TURD' Lee"
<SLee@houston-hunks.com> rimjobbed in message
news:3C8B679C.F0E98C18@houston-hunks.com...
> Boris Prisonbitch whined:
> >
> > AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote:
> > > "GenderBender" <alterego@msnn.com> wrote in message
> > > news:WIri8.11046$hO6.1077097@bin4.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com...
> > > > What does all this have to do with the topic of this group?
> > >
> > > They want to show how stupid they are since postini doesn't offer that
type
> > > of ping.
> >
> > ole martian

Translation: Anybody who has a brain in their head, unlike Llllardasssss
Boris Lllllloyd Davies is a "martian hed<sic>." But Lllardasssss
Lllllloyd's oblong, watermelon shaped cranium reflect his shallow end of
the gene pool origins.

>
> A\ /

Faggot Lee posts the following slobber, not realising his own whining and
netKKKoping past in <3C8BA6A5.19219DD3@houston-hunks.com>:
"You don't like it? I suggest that you use your OE news filters, or simply
skip the thread. No one is forcing you to read it, and you sure as hell
aren't going to get any of the participants to stop."

You ass-kissing syncophant.
--
Anonymous coward and all-around fuckwit
"Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
revealed what a hypocrite he is and ironically admits he has no credibility
in message
<3C36FDCC.76EC185D@houston-hunks.com> :

"Therefore, I find your story difficult to believe. Your own anonymous
status makes the story even less credible."

1028. Re: Anon COWARD's rimjobbing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 22:29:24 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a6gniu$4ua$a@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 37020
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.lloyd-davies

Kiddie raper "Stagger 'TexASS TURD' Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in
message news:3C8BA6A5.19219DD3@houston-hunks.com...
> GenderBender wrote:
> >
> > Stagger, it is better to be a top poster than a "Top" such as yourself.
> > Read my post again and you will see the 3 newsgroups that were in
question,
> > do your homework before replying with a stupid answer as which group is
this
> > group. The thread appeared in more than 3 NG until I trimmed the fat
and
> > the question remains what does this have to do with amateur radio? Don't
be
> > a smacked ass all your life.
> >
> > "Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
> > news:genderbender.go.away@houston-hunks.com...
> > >
> > > On Sat, 09 Mar 2002 17:34:46 GMT, GenderBender <alterego@msnn.com>
wrote:
> > > : What does all this have to do with the topic of this group?
> > >
> > > Well, top poster, which group is "this group?" The thread appeared in
> > > three news groups until you trimmed your post.
> > >
> > > And if you have to ask the question, chances are that you haven't been
> > > around the ham news groups for very long anyway.
> > >
> > > Do your homework before posting the next time.
> > >
>
> Clearly, you haven't been reading r.r.a.m. or the other news groups to
> which the thread was cross posted.
>
> The thread is about a low life ham who has been posting crap for years
> in several news groups.

Translation: 'Whaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaahhhhhhhh, mean old AB8MQ has made me
look foolish and his mean, nasty words hurt my fragile little ego."

> Since the thread is about a ham and his Usenet
> harassment and filth, plus his on the air jamming, it is unfortunately
> about ham radio.

But Faggot Lee forgets to talk about his on the air jamming and how he cheated other hams out of money, and by his own criteria, that is about ham radio also.

From: Rev Turd Fredericks <turdfred@catholic.org>
Message-ID: <PM000391D524FF3746@dhcppc1.home.com>

"Stagger Lee is anti-free speech because he originally came in here demanding that Steve Geilda, a regular in this group, cancel Roger Wiseman's account on his server because he didn't like what Roger was saying. That is anti-free speech."

"Since free speech is one of the foundations of the American constitution and America it's self, if you are ant-free speech, you are by defintion anti-American."

Stagger Lee here should be reported to the boys at Homeland security...apparently he is anti-American and a Osama Bin Laden supporter.

> You don't like it? I suggest that you use your OE news filters, or
> simply skip the thread. No one is forcing you to read it, and you sure
> as hell aren't going to get any of the participants to stop.

Archived, fuckhead.

> P.S. Don't be a smacked ass all your life.

PKB, fuckhead.

--
Faggot Lee posts the following slobber, not realising his own whining and netKKKoping past in <3C8BA6A5.19219DD3@houston-hunks.com>:
"You don't like it? I suggest that you use your OE news filters, or simply skip the thread. No one is forcing you to read it, and you sure as hell aren't going to get any of the participants to stop."

1029. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 23:12:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310181204.09202.00000729@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 37021

>Subject: Re: Question Pools and Such!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/10/02 15:47 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020310154729.03114.00000080@mb-bj.aol.com>

>Amateur radio is defined as a HOBBY..

Not according to the federal agency that regulates it.

Steve

1030. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 23:14:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310181400.09202.00000730@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 37022

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>Date: 03/09/02 22:46 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <2GAi8.1475$792.237204518@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>

>I must be oblivious to them.

No problem. We're not.

Steve

1031. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-10 23:26:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310182604.23412.00000070@mb-de.aol.com>
Source record: 37023

In article <3C8BD06D.80D41C94@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>W1RFI wrote:
>>
>> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>>
>> >No, you used my correction of your error (and elevated yourself to
>> >victim status by tying your error to a spinal chord injury) to hurl
>> >another insult.
>>
>> The word is "cord."
>
>Ed, I don't type so well since that awful volleyball accident.

Oh, my! It does seem to affected your personality as well!

No doubt that "awful volleyball accident" left a permanent
swelling of the ego. Tsk, tsk.

Tell us about this "accident." Did that happen while on secret
air force duty in a commie squadron?

Did that happen while defending the free world with morse as
the only ham in all of Guinea-Bissau?

Were you injured by angry natives of Tanzania while unloading
a relief-supply truck carrying volleyball sets?

Please, tell all, your curriculum vitae on morsemanship is vital so
that doubting Diogeneses out here another light to guide them.
Tell all, beep those notes, strike that chord, be a lieder of men!

1032. AB8MQ@OVIS.NET: The turd which won't flush.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 00:01:04 UTC
From: Stagger Lee <SLee@houston-hunks.com>
Message-ID: <3C8BF3C0.DEB137E5@houston-hunks.com>
Source record: 37024
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

AB8MQ@OVIS.NET wrote:
>
> Kiddie raper "Stagger 'TexASS TURD' Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in
> message news:3C8BA6A5.19219DD3@houston-hunks.com...
> > GenderBender wrote:
> > >
> > > Stagger, it is better to be a top poster than a "Top" such as yourself.
> > > Read my post again and you will see the 3 newsgroups that were in
> question,
> > > do your homework before replying with a stupid answer as which group is
> this
> > > group. The thread appeared in more than 3 NG until I trimmed the fat
> and
> > > the question remains what does this have to do with amateur radio? Don't
> be
> > > a smacked ass all your life.
> > >
> > > "Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
> > > news:genderbender.go.away@houston-hunks.com...
> > > >
> > > > On Sat, 09 Mar 2002 17:34:46 GMT, GenderBender <alterego@msnn.com>
> wrote:
> > > > : What does all this have to do with the topic of this group?
> > > >
> > > > Well, top poster, which group is "this group?" The thread appeared in
> > > > three news groups until you trimmed your post.
> > > >
> > > > And if you have to ask the question, chances are that you haven't been
> > > > around the ham news groups for very long anyway.
> > > >
> > > > Do your homework before posting the next time.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Clearly, you haven't been reading r.r.a.m. or the other news groups to
> > > which the thread was cross posted.
> > >
> > > The thread is about a low life ham who has been posting crap for years
> > > in several news groups.
>
> Translation: 'Whaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaahhhhhhhh, mean old AB8MQ has made me
> look foolish and his mean, nasty words hurt my fragile little ego."

Roger laughs at a parent who lost his daughter. That goes way beyond
"words" and is deserving of legal action. It proves what a low life
Roger is:

In message <a4rsdh$4p6$5@dosa.alt.net>, KC8JBO attempted to justify
taunting a parent about his daughter's death by saying "Cruelty deserves
cruelty. An eye for an eye. I laugh at the pain I give them. It warms
my heart. Their pathetic insults don't hurt me at all. It's funny what I
do to make them dance. I OWN their sorry asses. And always will."

> > Since the thread is about a ham and his Usenet
> > harassment and filth, plus his on the air jamming, it is unfortunately
> > about ham radio.
>
> But Faggot Lee forgets to talk about his on the air jamming and how he
> cheated other hams out of money, and by his own criteria, that is about ham
> radio also.

Just remember, "two test", I didn't receive warning letters from the
FCC, nor did I have to take another exam just to retain my license.

> From: Rev Turd Fredericks <turdfred@catholic.org>
> Message-ID: <PM000391D524FF3746@dhcppc1.home.com>
>
> "Stagger Lee is anti-free speech because he originally came in here
> demanding that Steve Geilda, a regular in this group, cancel Roger
> Wiseman's account on his server because he didn't like what Roger was
> saying. That is anti-free speech."

Turd Fredericks (as the name might hint) is a spankard. His hypocrisy
was proven long ago by John Kimball, after which Mr. Fredericks ran away
to hide. Your harrassment, defamation, and slander go entirely beyond
the limitations placed upon free speech. You are a disgrace, and in
fact YOU do damage to the concept of free speech.

Because you have almost no imagination, you post things like the
following (which can be found as message <3ab97a3a_4@corp.newsfeeds.com>
on Google):

==
"I'm sorry that you are a lonely, fat girl living in the mid west and
only have corn husks to play with, if you know what I mean. Try and pick
yourself up a life or some clue or something.

Understand what you speak of before you open your hotdog laden puss up
and start yapping. Really. You seemed like a nice little twat, at first,
but all this talk of libel makes you sound pretty damn obsessed. I guess
you were stalked or libeled or something earlier in life, and it sounds
like YOUR problem."
==

In summary, Wiseman: Bite me.

1033. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 01:18:52 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6h0pe$5me$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37025

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020310161052.19293.00000122@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <a6fpi7$7s4$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Is it then your opinion that a person with NO morse skills
> >can, in fact, be a good operator...
>
> Sure! Did you see my list, posted in this thread a few days ago?
> Did anyone notice that none of the listed skills are exclusively Morse
> skills?

You say that here...but skip down a few lines and...

> >or, as Carl is trying to
> >ferret out, must the person have morse skills
> >for you to consider the person an expert operator?
> >
> To consider someone an "expert" amateur radio operator, I would
> have to include Morse skills, simply because the mode is so
> popular with hams. Earning the title "expert amateur radio operator"
> requires a LOT of skills. I do not consider someone with little or no
> Morse skills to be an expert amateur radio operator.

Then you have a very archaic view of expertise.

> But I also do
> not think that amateur radio or emergencies are the sole province of'
> experts.

Nor have I said so either.

> I don't presume to call myself an expert amateur radio operator, either.
> Still way too much out there for me to learn and get good at.

After all these years, you don't consider yourself
an expert?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1034. Re: Stagger Lee: The TexASS turd which won't flush or quit raping little boys

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 01:24:05 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a6h20k$3ha$1@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 37027
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.douglas-gerry

"Stagger 'TexASS TURD' Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
news:3C8BF3C0.DEB137E5@houston-hunks.com...
> AB8MQ@alt.net wrote:
> >
> > Kiddie raper "Stagger 'TexASS TURD' Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote
in
> > message news:3C8BA6A5.19219DD3@houston-hunks.com...
> > > GenderBender wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Stagger, it is better to be a top poster than a "Top" such as
yourself.
> > > > Read my post again and you will see the 3 newsgroups that were in
> > question,
> > > > do your homework before replying with a stupid answer as which group
is
> > this
> > > > group. The thread appeared in more than 3 NG until I trimmed the
fat
> > and
> > > > the question remains what does this have to do with amateur radio?
Don't
> > be
> > > > a smacked ass all your life.
> > > >
> > > "Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
> > > news:genderbender.go.away@houston-hunks.com...
> > > > >
> > > > > On Sat, 09 Mar 2002 17:34:46 GMT, GenderBender <alterego@msnn.com>
> > wrote:
> > > > > : What does all this have to do with the topic of this group?
> > > > >
> > > > > Well, top poster, which group is "this group?" The thread
appeared in
> > > > > three news groups until you trimmed your post.
> > > > >
> > > > > And if you have to ask the question, chances are that you haven't
been
> > > > > around the ham news groups for very long anyway.
> > > > >
> > > > > Do your homework before posting the next time.
> > > > >
> > >
> > > Clearly, you haven't been reading r.r.a.m. or the other news groups to

> > > which the thread was cross posted.
> > >
> > > The thread is about a low life ham who has been posting crap for years
> > > in several news groups.
> >
> > Translation: 'Whaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaahhhhhhhh, mean old AB8MQ has made
me
> > look foolish and his mean, nasty words hurt my fragile little ego."
>
>Translation: "Whaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaah!!!!!!!!!!!!

> > > Since the thread is about a ham and his Usenet
> > > harassment and filth, plus his on the air jamming, it is unfortunately
> > > about ham radio.
> >
> > But Faggot Lee forgets to talk about his on the air jamming and how he
> > cheated other hams out of money, and by his own criteria, that is about
ham
> > radio also.
>
> Just \ /

Faggot Lee posts the following slobber, not realising his own whining and
netKKKoping past in <3C8BA6A5.19219DD3@houston-hunks.com>:
"You don't like it? I suggest that you use your OE news filters, or simply
skip the thread. No one is forcing you to read it, and you sure as hell
aren't going to get any of the participants to stop."

Just remember, you're too chickenshit to give your callsign, or are you just
ashamed to be too stupid to even get a ham ticket in the first place.

> > From: Rev Turd Fredericks <turdfred@catholic.org>
> > Message-ID: <PM000391D524FF3746@dhcppc1.home.com>
> >
> > "Stagger Lee is anti-free speech because he originally came in here
> > demanding that Steve Geilda, a regular in this group, cancel Roger
> > Wiseman's account on his server because he didn't like what Roger was
> > saying. That is anti-free speech."
>
> Turd \ Lots of sniveling and whining/

Turd Fredericks and the rest of the alt.2600 regulars slapped your
maggot-infested fat ass around until you were SPANKEDout of posting there.

Faggot Lee posts the following slobber, not realising his own whining and
netKKKoping past in <3C8BA6A5.19219DD3@houston-hunks.com>:
"You don't like it? I suggest that you use your OE news filters, or simply
skip the thread. No one is forcing you to read it, and you sure as hell
aren't going to get any of the participants to stop."

Now, fuck off, Faggot Lee and quit beating up your wife, scumbag.

1035. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 01:27:53 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310202753.21366.00000884@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 37026

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>Jim Haynie thought it reasonable that no ARRL Hq person should
>give opinions in here. Of course, that was in private mail that
>ensued after he popped in here shortly after his election.

Interesting. Jim knows that I hang out on rrap and he hasn't had a problem with that. He didn't have a problem when I didn't post here for 6 months, either.

>Should there be an official ARRL poll on that
>or are we to conclude that "his interest is zero" applies
>to everything concerning the ARRL's appearance to the
>outside world?

That would be a ridiculous conclusion. If that is the best you can do, you have lost this one.

>Many have "already bought it" long before I came into this chat
>room.

My goodness, you mean that all those people who are not ARRL members read rrap and think I am an ARRL apologist?

Another ridiculous conclusion. You lose.

>How many individuals or local clubs could afford the legal fees to
>contact the FCC in a formal way in the before-Internet days?

All it ever took was a letter. Another ridiculous conclusion. You lose.

>How
>many non-legal amateurs knew of the proper format of legal filing
>in order to gain recognition and consideration before the
>Commission?

ARRL put that information in its FCC Rule Book and would gladly tell someone how to file comments. You lose that point, too.

>The "last time we went through this" I said about the same as I had
>on previous times...that the ARRL is now LOSING some of the
>exclusivity in representation when the FCC has made it much
>easier for everyone to comment to them directly.

And a good thing that is. That is why ARRL asks hams to make their views known in FCC filings.

>Yup, it is another one of those "spin" answers.

Yeah, there is "spin" going on, Len, but it is all yours. You will say anything, no matter how distorted or ridiculous, to try to defame ARRL.

>I'm trying to get exact answers. I don't get those. What I get are
>standard boilerplate "the ARRL can do no wrong" misdirections
>into other areas.

ARRL can do wrong. And calling opinion different from yours "misdirection" is a pretty feeble debating tactic. You lose again.

>Whether it is called "mind control" or "brainwashing" or
>"psychological warfare," spin is still spin. It is common practice.

If you wish to believe that I am controlling your mind, that is your choice.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1036. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 02:12:56 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <IoUi8.1327$8y2.275102860@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 37028

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020310181400.09202.00000730@mb-cs.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> >From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
> >Date: 03/09/02 22:46 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <2GAi8.1475$792.237204518@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
>
> >I must be oblivious to them.
>
> No problem. We're not.
>
That much is certain. Chip away.

1037. Re: ARS Licensing in the USA Since WW2

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 02:16:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310211603.10589.00000117@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 37030

A Brief History of Amateur Radio Licensing In The USA Since WW2 (1946-2002)

by N2EY - Part 3 of 4
The VHF/UHF Revolution (1970 - 1976)

Most of the VHF/UHF mobile services (police, fire, railroads, taxicabs, etc.) were using channelized FM equipment as early as the late 1940s. Amateurs continued to use AM well into the 1960s, and lacked any formal standardization of frequencies in the VHF-UHF bands. An informal "standard" existed based on frequencies that happened to be multiples of commonly available WW2 surplus crystals, but hams resisted true channelization.

In the '60s, however,some of the land mobile equipment from commercial services became obsolete for its original purpose and was offered to hams at low prices.

At first the idea of channelized FM operation did not get much of a response, but
by 1970 the idea was rapidly catching on all over the country. The deciding factor was the practicality of FM repeaters for extending the range of mobiles, portables and simple home stations.

In the AM days the range of VHF/UHF mobiles was unpredictable at best. Mobile to mobile contacts were particularly undependable. FM repeaters greatly increased the dependable range of most stations, because one only had to be able
to make solid radio contact with a repeater to enjoy the advantages of its location, high power, and gain antennas. Repeaters also changed the way hams operated on VHF, because no longer could one make long transmissions, or monopolize a frequency. Repeaters made channelized operation a necessity. Once the potential of the mode became apparent to most hams, FM quickly displaced AM as the VHF/UHF mode of choice.

Most early FM amateur stations, both repeater and individual, were a combination of homebrewing and conversion of surplus commercial equipment originally used by other services. New equipment meant for other services was usually too expensive, and ham gear capable of VHF/UHF FM did not appear for a few years. This went against the trend toward manufactured gear. Getting a repeater on the air was usually a group effort, and required many different skills and resources. Many clubs organized around repeaters.

The existing FCC rules did not make it easy for repeater operation. Logging was required of all stations. All transmissions through a repeater were considered third party traffic, which meant that all transmissions through the repeater had to be recorded. Repeaters had special "WR" callsigns, such as WR3ABZ, and a complex process more rigorous than used in other services was used to process repeater license applications. Autopatch and crosslinking were

prohibited, power and antenna restrictions were in effect, and a control operator had to be "on duty" at all times. Many changes in a repeater required a modified license. Even with these hurdles, however, repeater popularity grew rapidly.

From 1972 to 1977, these rules were eased considerably, after experience showed that hams could manage their own problems with the "new" mode. Crossbanding, linking, automatic operation, and autopatch became legal. Logging and application requirements were reduced to no more than any other type of station.

In 1974, logging requirements were eased. The only information still required was the calls of stations worked, the starting and ending dates, and any third-party traffic. Many hams still kept detailed logs, but it was no longer required by law. Requirements for portable and mobile operation were eased during this time period, as well. No longer would it be necessary to notify the FCC when operating portable or mobile for extended periods.

In this time period the license fees were increased to $9 for new and renewed licenses and exams, and $25 for vanity calls, then reduced to their former $4 and $20 levels.

For many years, hams had conducted "phone patches" - often for the families of military personnel. Strictly speaking, this was illegal, because the phone company prohibited the connection of non-phone-company equipment to their lines. (This was the era of "Ma Bell" having an almost complete monopoly). In 1970 the rules were changed to permit legal interconnection, if your equipment met the technical requirements.

Solid state equipment continued to displace tube gear, but there was still plenty of "hollow state" equipment being made. Japanese gear had a strong foothold in the amateur market. Many older American companies began to reduce their product lines or go out of the amateur radio business entirely.

In 1972, the FCC widened the HF phone bands. In effect, this reduced much of the impact of incentive licensing. The amateur allocations in 1972 looked like this: (Frequencies in MHz:)

1.8-2 CW/Phone (Subject to geographic and power limitations)
3.5-4 CW 3.775-4 Phone Novices 3.7-3.75 CW
7-7.3 CW 7.15-7.3 Phone Novices 7.1-7.15 CW
14-14350 CW 14.2-14.35 Phone
21-21.45 CW 21.25-21.45 Phone Novices 21.1-21.25 CW
28-29.7 CW 28.5-29.7 Phone Novices 28.1-28.2 CW
(Technicians had all privileges above 30 MHz except 144-145)
50-54 CW 50.1-54 CW/Phone
144-148 CW 144.1-148 Phone
220-225 CW/Phone
420-450 CW/Phone
1215-1300 CW/Phone
2300-2450 CW/Phone
3300-3500 CW/Phone

5650-5925 CW/Phone
10000-10500 CW/Phone
21000-22000 CW/Phone
All above 40000 CW/Phone

Extra Class Only:

3.5-3.525 CW 3.775-3.8 Phone 7-7.025 CW 14-14.025 CW 21-21.025 CW
21.25-21.27 Phone

Extra and Advanced Classes Only:

3.8-3.9 Phone 7.15-7.225 Phone 14.2-14.275 Phone 21.27-21.35 Phone

Also in 1972 the EIA (Electronic Industry Association, a manufacturer's group) petitioned the FCC to create a new "Class E" CB service by reallocating 224-225 MHz. The proposed new service would use channelized FM, and would not have many of the problems of 27 MHz CB. This proposal took several years to defeat, but was ultimately abandoned when 27 MHz CB was expanded to 40 channels.

In late 1974 the FCC proposed yet another license restructuring. This proposal was based on 35 rule-making petitions submitted to the FCC by various individuals
and small groups in the wake of the 1967-1969 "incentive licensing" changes. The
changes proposed would have resulted in a very complex US license and exam structure.

The proposal was for a "two ladder" license system, which would require 7 license classes. The "HF ladder", also called "Series A", would consist of the existing Novice/General/Advanced/Extra sequence, while the "VHF/UHF" ladder, ("Series B") would consist of a new sequence, Communicator/Technician/Experimenter/Extra. The dividing line between "HF" and "VHF/UHF" was set at 29 MHZ, however. Non-Extras would have to hold one license in each ladder/series if they wanted privileges both above and below 29 MHz. Many hams with existing licenses would find themselves holding two licenses if the proposed restructuring, because none of the license classes except Extra would convey privileges both above and below 29 MHz.

Tests would consist of the then-existing 3 code tests (5, 13 and 20 wpm) and a total of six new written tests, one for each of the non-Extra license classes.
Some of the testing would be taken over from the FCC by teams of two volunteer examiners.

The Communicator was to be a sort of "VHF Novice" with no code test and FM-voice-only privileges in the bands above 144 MHz. This was the first FCC proposal of
a no code test license for hams. The Experimenter would be the VHF/UHF equivalent of the Advanced, but would only require 5 wpm code.

New power levels were proposed: 2000 watts peak output for Extra, Advanced and Experimenter, 500 watts peak output for Technicians and Generals, and

250 watts input for Novices and Communicators. Generals and Technicians would lose mode privileges - they would only be allowed to use CW, AM, SSB or FM.

Advanceds would have gotten access to the Extra-only voice subbands of the time,
and Extras would get "for life" operator licenses.

The ARRL conducted a detail survey of all of its US members, and developed a counterproposal that was much simpler and consisted of a single "ladder", adding a "Basic" license that would be easier to get than the Novice. Neither proposal was very popular, and ultimately only minor changes were made to the license structure.

There were other rules changes that appeared minor at the time, but had long term consequences. Many of these changes, and others that would follow in the 1980s, had their roots in the 1974 restructuring proposal.

The waiting period for an Extra class license was reduced to
a year in 1973 and eliminated in 1976. Also in 1976, Technicians got Novice privileges, all hams were limited to 250 watts in the Novice subbands, and a Novice no longer had to wait a year to retake the test if he/she did not upgrade. The vanity call program was expanded, and the regulations on digital modes were eased. New types of amateur calls began to appear - calls beginning with N and A were added, as were "2X1" and "2X2" calls. The requirement to change callsigns when moving to a different district was removed in the early 1970s. No longer would it be possible to determine a US ham's location based solely on the callsign.

This period also saw the appearance of "Bash books". Although the written exams were secret, a fellow named Dick Bash published "study guides" containing the exact questions and answers on the tests. He gathered this information by paying people who had taken a written test to recall as much of it as possible. possible. He then collected all of the reported questions and answers and published them in book form.

The number of hams grew slowly until about 1975, then began to increase rapidly. By 1977 there were 327,000 US hams

Deregulation and WARC-79 (1977 - 1989)

In 1977 there were more changes to amateur radio regulations. Portable and mobile identification requirements were eliminated, "instant upgrades" became available, and license fees were abolished. The code sending test was waived and repeater rules were simplified even more. 1978 saw the Novice license term extended to 5 years and made renewable, the Conditional class license abolished (existing Conditionals became Generals), and secondary station licenses were abolished. ASCII and other standard data codes were authorized for amateur use. The first use of spread spectrum radio by amateurs was authorized in 1981 Technicians got all privileges above 50 MHz at this time.

Many of these changes were driven by the need for the FCC to reduce its workload. There were not only more hams, but many other new services were

appearing, and the FCC did not automatically get more funds to administrate the new services. In this time period it became common for the FCC to conduct testing sessions at hamfests and other gatherings. All that was needed was advance notice to the FCC and an estimate of the number of people to be tested, and the FCC would send an examiner if one was available. This reduced the number of offices and examination points needed.

In 1978 the FCC banned the manufacture and sale of amplifiers that could be used in the 24-35 MHz region. This ban was driven by the widespread use of amplifiers in the CB service, but the way the rules were written affected amateurs as well. Manufactured amplifiers could no longer cover 10 meters - but a licensed amateur could still homebrew an amplifier, or modify a manufactured one to cover 10 meters. Hams were limited to one amplifier per year, however. This action was significant because it was the first time ham gear had come under any kind of type acceptance rules.

In this period RFI became a major concern. Every day it seemed that new electronic gadgets were coming on the market - and intererence problems were no longer limited to TV and radio. The FCC eventually issued rules governing interference susceptibility - but the took the form of Part 15 warning labels, not technical requirements.

In late 1979 there was a World Administrative Radio Conference (WARC-79) to review international radio allocations. The result of this conference was three new amateur radio HF bands - 30, 17, and 12 meters. These were the first new ham bands in 32 years (15 meters was the result of the 1947 conference). It would take several years for hams to gain access to these bands, however.

By the early 1980s Japanese made amateur equipment became the most common, while most American manufacturers of ham radio gear had closed up or reduced their product lines to a few items. Also in this time period, personal computers began to appear in large numbers, and many of them were in ham shacks.

Two new digital data modes, AMTOR (error correcting RTTY) and packet, first appeared in the early '80s. Both became popular - AMTOR on HF and packet on VHF. AMTOR eventually gave way to PACTOR and other digital modes.

In 1983 the FCC announced a fundamental change to the licensing process. The FCC would no longer conduct examinations - instead, teams of volunteer examiners (VEs) would conduct all amateur radio exams. But this was a minor change compared to the fact that the test questions would no longer be secret - instead, the question pools would be maintained by volunteer examiner coordinators (VECs) overseen by the FCC. The "Bash books" of the '70s became official and legal. In addition, "instant upgrading" was authorized. Hams who upgraded would no longer have to wait for the actual license to arrive before using their new privileges.

Also in 1983, the FCC again proposed a codeless VHF/UHF amateur license. This was
opposed by a majority of hams, as it had been in the 1974 proposed restructuring.

1983 also saw a change in the power limit. The old "1000 watts input" rule was replaced by a new "1500 watt peak output" rule. This meant that hams could run more power in most modes, but a few modes, like AM, actually lost power.

The term of all classes of amateur license went from 5 to 10 years in 1984. The mandatory 30 day waiting period for retesting was eliminated in 1985.

1987 brought a restructuring called "Novice Enhancement" which gave Novices access to 10 meter phone and some limited VHF/UHF bands. Also in 1987, the Technician written test was made different than the General by splitting the General test into two parts.

The amateur allocations in 1987 looked like this: (Frequencies in MHz:)

1.8-2 CW/Phone (Subject to geographic and power limitations)
3.5-4 CW 3.775-4 Phone Novice/Techs 3.7-3.75 CW
7-7.3 CW 7.15-7.3 Phone Novice/Techs 7.1-7.15 CW
10.1-10.15 CW
14-14.35 CW 14.15-14.35 Phone
21-21.45 CW 21.2-21.45 Phone Novice/Techs 21.1-21.2 CW
24.890-24.990 CW 24.93-24.99 Phone
28-29.7 CW 28.3-29.7 Phone Novice/Techs 28.1-28.5 CW 28.3-28.5 Phone
(Technicians had all privileges above 30 mHz)
50-54 CW 50.1-54 CW/Phone
144-148 CW 144.1-148 Phone
220-225 CW/Phone Novices 222.1-223.91 CW/Phone
420-450 CW/Phone
902-928 CW/Phone
1240-1300 CW/Phone Novices 1270-1295 CW/Phone
2300-2310 CW/Phone
2390-2450 CW/Phone
3300-3500 CW/Phone
5650-5925 CW/Phone
10000-10500 CW/Phone
24000-24250 CW/Phone
47000-47200 CW/Phone
75500-81000 CW/Phone
119980-120020 CW/Phone
142000-149000 CW/Phone
241000-250000 CW/Phone
All above 300000 CW/Phone

Extra Class Only: (all frequencies in kHz):

3.5-3.525 CW 3.75-3.775 Phone 7-7.025 CW 14-14.025 CW 14.15-14.175 Phone
21-21.025 CW
21.2-21.225 Phone

Extra and Advanced Classes Only:

3.75-3.85 Phone 7.15-7.225 Phone 14.175-14.225 Phone 21.225-21.3 Phone

The rapid growth in the number of hams continued in this period. By 1989 there were over 500,000 US hams.

No-Code Licensing (1989 - 1997)

In 1989 the FCC once again raised the question of a nocode amateur license for VHF/UHF. This time the response of hams was divided about equally pro and con, and the ARRL, which had opposed all nocode licenses in the past, endorsed the idea of a "Communicator" type license. The FCC did not want another class of license, so in 1991 the Technician lost its code requirement. Since existing Techs had Novice HF privileges and "new" Techs would have only VHF/UHF, another license class, Technician Plus, was created. Existing Technicians, and those who passed the 5 wpm code test, became Technician Plus class.

In 1991 the FCC also created a program to accomodate those with disabilities that made it difficult or impossible for them to pass the 13 and 20 wpm code tests. The code waiver program, as it is called, requires a doctor's certification. Since 5 wpm code is a treaty requirement, no waiver for that speed could exist. This program came about at the request of the late King Hussein of Jordan, JY1, to the White House, not because of any request on the part of people with disabilites.

The number of hams continued to increase during this time. There were almost 680,000 hams by 1996 - but this total is inflated by the fact that the change to 10 year licenses meant that from 1989 to 1994 there were no license expirations at all.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1038. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 02:16:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310211604.10589.00000118@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 37029

In article <3C8BAD3F.67E6190C@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Bill Sohl wrote:
>> One could ponder the thought that Adam and Eve probably didn't.

Sistine Chapel ceiling says otherwise, I think.

>Do you think God believes in evolution?

Why not? Sentient beings usually believe in their own inventions.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1039. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 02:27:28 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C8C1619.FC5100CC@adelphia.net>
Source record: 37031

Oh yes, Ed! I was having trouble keeping up with the new paradigm of "lifetime learning". So I found if I were to become a ham, I wouldn't have to learn anything, any more! Just kidding, but the post made me laugh. 8^)

- Mike -

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
> >Some people, perhaps "many" people, will do almost
> >ANYTHING rather than truly learn the material.
>
> So you believe "many" people want to become amateur operators so they won't
> learn anything?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare,W1RFI

1040. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 03:06:02 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020310220602.06498.00000324@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 37032

In article <3C8AE518.477C129@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>> If an engineer passes the ham radio tests
>> on the basis that he already knows electronics, and a near-illiterateCBer
>passes the
>> same test on the basis that he wasn't required to learn anything, both get
>the same
>> license. Now tell me nothing is dumbed down.
>
>OK Dick, I give up. Which one of those new hams was dumbed down by the exams?
>Was the engineer dumber after he took the test or was the CBer dumber after
>he took the tests? Were you dumber after you took your tests?

Cecil:

I, for one, was a heck of a lot "dumber" after passing all of my amateur
radio tests -- mainly because I was intelligent enough to realize that I
still had a lot more to learn, and had, in fact, only scratched the surface
of the total knowledge available to me. Over the years as a ham, I have
attempted to access some of that greater knowledge, and have enjoyed
learning about several operating modes, methods, and techniques that
are generally not tried by hams who do not advance beyond entry-level
testing requirements.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1041. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 03:31:28 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8o87o527h604d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37033

W1RFI wrote

>Ah, one of those "kids today" sort of things. If someone
>wants to do nothing, there are better ways than Amateur
>Radio to do it.

I didn't say they wanted to "do nothing!" Oh, yeah, they
want to DO something . . .

>The idea that someone wants to rote memorize 1000
>questions without understanding so they can do nothing
>is ridiculous on its face.

I guess I truly am talking to the wall here. If you don't get
what I'm talking about, well, wow . . .

>And if they do want to take the easy way out, it is easier
>to learn the underlying material than to do all that memorizing.

You are SO confused. Having the actual TEST QUESTIONS
in front of you, cold, changes the entire idea of "testing." It's
not about "memorization" per se, and never has been. If you
have the QUESTIONS and ANSWERS ahead of time, going
in, well, THAT in ITSELF is the problem, from my perspective.
It cuts the AMOUNT of WORK you have to do by at least one
order of magnitude, no matter HOW you do it.

Sheesh.

If it wasn't that way . . . why would the whole Bash system have
come into existence and, er, FORCED, to some degree, the
FCC to go to this pool system?

Riddle me THAT, eh?

Val Germann
Columbia, Missouri

1042. ARNewsline 1282 - March 8 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 04:09:03 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020310230903.24765.00001091@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 37036

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1282 – March 8, 2002

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1282 with a release date of
Friday, March 8th, 2002 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T.

The Dayton Hamvention announces the EMMY AND OSCARS of Amateur Radio. We have the winners on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1282 coming your war right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

HAMVENTION 2002: AWARD WINNERS NAMED

The Dayton Hamvention has named Radio Amateur Information Network founder Alanson “Hap” Holly, KC9RP, as its 2002 Radio Amateur of the Year. Holly received the news of his selection on Thursday evening February 28th in a phone call from Cathi Hoskins, N8ZCQ, who chairs the Hamvention Awards and Banquet Committee. KC9RP tells Amateur Radio Newsline that he was completely taken by surprise:

--
Holly KC9RP: “I was absolutely stunned! In fact, all I could say was me? I mean seriously, I was just absolutely floored.”
--

Holly, lives in Des Plaines Illinois has been licensed since 1965. He began his ham radio informational programming career in 1984 on a local Chicago Area repeater. This eventually lead him to become founder, moderator and guiding light of a weekly amateur radio audio feature magazine known as the RAIN Report.

--
Sample audio from Rain Report.
--

RAIN programming is distributed to hundreds of repeaters across the country via a telephone dial-up line, the rainreport.com website, by a subscription tape service and broadcast over W-A-Zero-R-C-R's weekly 160 meter informational net.

But that’s is only a small part of the Hap Holly story. Originally licensed in Escondido California at age 14, Holly who has been blind since age 7 served as a phone-patch station and net control for the famed WESTCARS traffic net until 1970. He then headed off to Principia College in Illinois and from 1970 to graduation in 1974, ran phone patches and kept radio schedules for many of

his fellow students.

Holly graduated Principia with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Sociology, and soon found himself in the Chicago area. There, he sought out world-class jazz accordionist Leon Sash, to pursue further training in music. As a professional keyboard player, Holly's diverse repertoire of American music of the past six decades has made him a popular choice in the Chicago area.

Hap met his wife-to-be while he was teaching a class in non-visual perception to high school students at a summer camp in Buena Vista, Colorado. The two were married in August of 1976. Stephanie, who is sighted, received her ham ticket and KA9WKD callsign in 1986.

Over the years, Hap Holly has written articles for the Spec-Com Journal, Radio Scan Magazine and occasionally reports for us here on the Amateur Radio Newsline. Holly is also a common sight at the Dayton Hamvention, taping forums which are then incorporated throughout the year into his RAIN Reports. And since 1975 KC9RP has been an honored member of the Des Plaines Lions Club. He has also been a member of the Des Plaines Toastmasters since 1976. He and Stephanie are also active with Des Plaines Illinois Emergency Medical Alert system.

Named as this years Hamvention Technical Excellence award winner is Alan Waller, K3TKJ, of Laurel, Delaware. Waller was chosen for his work that lead to the interfacing the Internet to Amateur Radio.

First licensed in 1961, Waller combined his decades-long love for Amateur Radio and a burgeoning interest in the then-new Internet to design and manage the www.qsl.net and www.qth.net web sites. That was back in 1993. Since that time, Alan Waller's web sites have come to serve the needs of tens of thousands of ham radio operators worldwide by providing a vast technical reference platform, an electronic mail service, web page hosting services, and links to thousands of other ham radio related sites. And in the true spirit of the Amateur Radio, Waller's initial work utilized leading edge experimentation to see what could be done with the technology then available. This has developed into a mature, reliable service to the world wide ham radio community.

Rounding out this seasons winners are a pair of pair of space exploring hams who have been named as co-recipients of the 2002 Hamvention Special Achievement Award. Former astronauts Owen Garriott, W5LFL, and Tony England, W0ORE, are being honored for paving the way for manned ham radio operations from the space shuttles that has made ham radio a permanent part of mans exploration of space.

Owen Gariott, W5LFL was first. On November 28, 1983, Garriott, was launched into space aboard the space ship Columbia for the STS-9 mission. It was the Spacelab 1 mission and Garriott brought along the first Amateur Radio station on a crew-tended space vehicle. It was a simple Motorola hand held transceiver connected to a special antenna designed to fit in the Space Shuttle's window.

Three days later, W5LFL came on the air and hams across the United States and around the world were witness to a historic radio transmission:

--
Owen Garriott W5LFL: “This is W5LFL in Columbia. W5LFL in Columbia orbiting the Earth at an altitude of 135 nautical miles passing over the U.S. West Coast and calling CQ.”
--

Among those who heard Owen Garriott's Amateur Radio transmissions from space was Lance Collister, WA1JXN of Frenchtown Montana. Collister, who is now W7GJ, is credited with being the first amateur to work an astronaut in orbit. Take a listen:

--
Lance Collister WA1JXN/W7GJ: “W5LFL on Columbia, WA1JXN, W-A-1-Japan - Xray-Norway, WA1JXN Frenchtown Montana standing by.”

Owen Garriott, W5LFL: “Hello W1JXN, WA1JXN, WA1-Juliet-Xray-November. This is W5LFL. You’re our first contact from orbit. WA1JXN, how do you read? Over?”
--

The success of Garriott’s mission lead to the development of SAREX -- The Shuttle Amateur Radio Experiment. And, over the years, SAREX permitted youngsters in classrooms around the world to speak directly with astronauts in space. But for this to happen, the technology of manned ham radio operations from space had to be enhanced. This aspect of the then new SAREX program fell to the next ham radio operator orbited: Tony England, W0ORE.

W0ORE flew into space on the shuttle Challenger in 1985. It was Mission 51F, Spscelab 2. In addition to the 2 meter FM voice gear, Tony England also had with him the first ever ham television station to go into space. Slow Scan yes, but capable of sending back high resolution images which hams on the ground equipped with SSTV gear could view live or record on a simple audio cassette for later viewing and historical archiving. From space, Tony England described the station he was using:

--
Tony England, W0ORE: “Essentially we’ve got a commercial TV camera that anyone could go out to their local radio store ant buy. We feed this into a scan converter built by a commercial outfit and modified by NASA Amateur Radio clubs and this takes a snapshot of the scene and digitizes it and put it in a memory.

Then its sent to a handie-talkie like this. From there we will send it over a wire up to the upper window upstairs and to this antenna when I get it up there in the window. Then it will be transmitted to the ground.

When we get going, we will be able to send color TV images of what we are doing on board as a series of snapshots updated every 10 or 20 seconds. Amateurs anywhere on the ground will be able to receive them, and ones with scan converters will see the pictures.”
--

That flight also marked another first. The first ever two way television -- ham radio television -- to and from space.

Tony England went on to flight prove both the improved FM voice and then new SSTV systems. The SSTV was so successful that NASA gave very serious consideration to a permanent installation on all shuttles for back up communications. More important, the early on-orbit operations by Own Garriott W5LFL and Tony England W0ORE made possible the thousands of educational contacts between children in school classrooms and the crews flying in space. First, on board the shuttles, and now as a permanent part of the International Space Station.

Hap Holly KC9RP, Alan Waller K3TKJ, Owen Garriott W5LFL and Tony England W0ORE will receive their honors at the Hamvention Awards Banquet slated for Saturday evening, May 18th at the Nutter Center in Dayton Ohio. Amateur Radio Newsline will be there to bring you this story and all the news about Hamvention 2002. (ARNewsline™ from Dayton Hamvention® news release. Some audio from “Amateur Radio’s Newest Frontier” and “SAREX - The Shuttle Amateur Radio Experiment” video presentations)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the Indiana Hamfest Association net serving Indianapolis Indiana.

(5 sec pause here)

**

RADIO RULES: FCC RESUMES VANITY PROCESSING

Vanity license processing is getting back on tract. According to a Legaue bulletin the FCC now has all outstanding vanity applications filed last October in hand and is ready to resume routine vanity processing. Until recently a single missing vanity application had been holding up a backlog of more than 2000 vanity applications. The FCC credits the ARRL in part with helping to locate applicants and resolving the problem. (ARRL, FCC)

**

RESCUE RADIO: AMATEUR RADIO EMERGENCY COMMS SUMMIT

The first ever Amateur Radio Emergency Communications summit was held in Indianapolis last week. Amateur News Weekly’s Jack Parker, W8ISH, reports on the success of this first meeting.

--
They came from the Red Cross, Salvation Army, ARES, RACES and even CB-radio’s REACT team. Two dozen representatives of different Amateur Radio emergency communications groups met in a Federal Building training room to find ways of helping local and state emergency management organizations. The summit was organized by Marion County ARES director Mike Palmer, N9FEB. Palmer cited a need to develop better communications and cooperation between the different groups.

Many amateurs wear two or three different hats when it comes to providing public service. Palmer wants to identify those who are willing to help and to better utilize the voice and data communications available in the Marion County Amateur Radio Community. Many of the summit participants agreed this type of effort is long overdue.

Members of Army-Navy and Air Force Mars, as well as the Indiana Wing of the Civil Air Patrol offered their services during times of disaster. Everyone agreed this was a good start and look forward to future efforts to better train and organize Amateur Radio Emergency Communications in Marion County and Central Indiana.

Reporting from Indianapolis for Amateur News Weekly, this is Jack Parker W8ISH.

--

According to Jack, everyone came away from the meeting knowing that cooperation between groups is a key element in providing better service to the public. (ANW)

**

RADIO RULES: FCC ADOPTS AMBER EAS EVENT CODE FOR CHILD ABDUCTION CASES
The Federal Communications Commission has announced the adoption of a Report and Order amending the Emergency Alert System rules. Included are several new EAS event and location codes, which broadcast stations and cable systems may use to alert the public in the event of state and local emergencies. Of these, a new Child Abduction Emergency event code may be the most interesting to hams involved in Search and Rescue and who have E-A-S decoders installed in their repeaters.

The plan is described as a voluntary partnership between law enforcement agencies and the media that will be used to alert the public of serious child abduction cases where police believe that the child is in danger of bodily harm or death. Under the plan, radio and television stations will be permitted but not required to interrupt programming to disseminate information concerning serious child abductions when the new Child Abduction Emergency code is received. It could also be used by hams as an automated call to action to help find a missing child if used to activate an E-A-S equipped Amateur Service repeater.

Police departments say that every minute counts in dealing with an abducted child situation. In adding the Child Abduction Emergency code the FCC says that its responding to public concerns. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC COMPLETES GEORGIA ARRL VEC EXAM SESSION AUDIT

The FCC has wrapped up an investigation into apparent irregularities at five ARRL VEC-sponsored Amateur Radio examination sessions in Georgia during 2000 and 2001. As a result of the probe, FCC Special Counsel Riley Hollingsworth says that several examinees will be called back for partial retesting:

--
Riley Hollingsworth: “We determined reviewing all of the information that was brought to our by the League that eight examinees will have to be retested on the code element. The ARRL has also relieved ten VE’s of their duties as volunteer examiners.”
--

According to the ARRL Letter, all V-E’s who might have been involved were suspended after the FCC investigation began last year. (FCC, RAIN)

**

ENFORCEMENT: A REPEATER OUTSIDE OF THE BAND

The FCC is also looking at the operation of repeater in the Metro New York City area. Again, the FCC’s Riley Hollingsworth:

--
Riley Hollingsworth: “We opened an inquiry into allegations that an uncoordinated repeater operated by Thomas Batista, KC2DDD, and Gerardo Arias, N2IFU, in Corona and Staten Island New York. Now that repeater is not only causing interference to a coordinted repeater, but the input is apparently on a frequency not even allocated to the Amateur band. So, needless to say we are real interested in reviewing that response when it comes in.
--

What Hollingsworth will be looking for is an answer to why the machine is using 143.020 MHz as an input frequency as well as why its on the air without coordination. 143.020 MHz is a full 800 Kilohertz below the bottom edge of the 2 meter Amateur band. (FCC, RAIN)

**

CONVENTIONS: SOUTH EAST VHF SOCIETY CONFERENCE

On a far lighter note, the Sixth Annual Southeastern VHF Society Conference will take place April 26th through the 27th in Oak Ridge, Tennessee. And they too are putting out a call for papers. If you are interested in participating, please contact KG4QDZ by e-mail to kg4qdz@arrl.net. (VHF Reflector)

**

CONVENTIONS: CHARLESTON HAMFEST MARCH 16

And the 18th Annual Charleston Area Hamfest and Computer Show will be held Saturday, March 16, 2002 from 9 AM to 3 PM at the Coonskin Armory in Charleston, West Virginia. Talk-in is on the 145.35 MHz repeater. Admission is $5 and there will be free parking. More information is available by e-mail to n8tmw@arrl.net. (N8TMW)

**

BREAK 2

Here when you need us 52 weeks a year. We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org.

(5 sec pause here)

**

HAM RADIO POLITICS: NCI LEADER CALLS FOR ELECTIONS

Bruce Perens, K6BP, the founder and an incumbent director of No Code International says that its time for new directions for the group and has called for elections. Amateur Radio Newsline's Norm Seeley, KI7UP, has more:

--
According to Bruce Perins, K6BP, when he started NCI in 1997, he never dreamed that it's goals would be achieved so quickly. But says Perins; "we are most of the way there."

Perins notes that last year the International Amateur Radio Union voted to ask for the removal of the international treaty provision requiring Morse Code testing for Radio Amateurs. Now Perins observes that even ARRL has voted in favor of removing code requirements from the international Radio Regulations.

With what he terms as -- no remaining credible opposition to NCI's cause left on the international level -- Perins says that it is time to turn NCI's focus to domestic policy. He says that for NCI to take an appropriate role in the end-game of the no-code battle means cooperation with national societies like the American Radio Relay League. And to do this, Perrins believes may take some new people.

So Perins has asked that an election for new directors be held no later than April 30th of this year. He also says that any person who was an NCI member on December 31, 2001 can be a candidate for director, and is eligible to vote in the election.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Norm Seeley, KI7UP.

--

More information about No Code International is on the web at www.nocode.org. (ARNewsline with information from K6BP)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: AO-40 GPS TEST RESULTS PUBLISHED

The February issue of GPS World included an article titled Formation Flying in Space. Authored in-part by AMSAT North America's Frank Bauer, KA3HDO, the essay shows G-P-S results from the receivers that NASA' Goddard Space Flight Center provided for flight on the AMSAT OSCAR 40 bird. According to Tom Clark, W3IWI, the data shown in the article was downloaded using AO-40's RUDAK system by WD0E and KB0G. (ANS)

**

WRTC-2002: ORGANIZING COMMITTEE ANNOUNCES THE COMPLETE LIST OF OFFICIAL ON-SITE REFEREES

The WRTC 2002 Organizing Committee has named a full list of on-site referees for the upcoming games. The committee says that it received more than 100 highly qualified applications and those chosen were from that group. A full list of referees and other information is available on the web at www.wrtc2002.org (WRTC2002)

**

DX

In D-X, word that Dave Cree, G3TBK, has returned to work in the Caribbean. Throughout March Dave will be active as J88DR from St. Vincent. For the first two weeks of April look for him J3 slash G3TBK from Grenada. Operations will be on all bands, but concentrating on the WARC bands, mostly on C-W, but with some SSB. QSL to Dave's home call either direct or via the RSGB bureau. (RSGB)

The New Zealand Amateur Transmitters Society is warning hams world wide of what they say is a pirate operation. According the NZART News, a maritime mobile station using the callsign ZL2TO and the name Tony has been heard recently operating on nets on 15 Meters. This station currently gives his location as the Cape Verde Islands. Only one problem. The ZL2TO call sign is allocated the Waitara Amateur Radio Club. (NZART)

And the South Africa Radio League news service says that anyone who has held a QSO's with 7Q8 slash ZS6GH or C9 slash ZS6GH should write them off . SARL says that these have been declared null and void because license or authorization to operate was issued by the telecommunications regulators in Malawi or Mozambique. (SARL)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: NOMINATIONS SOUGHT FOR THE YOUNG HAM OF THE YEAR AWARD

And finally, we started this weeks newscast with a story about awards. Lets end it on a similar note as we here a Amateur Radio Newsline officially open the 2002 nominating season for our own Young Ham of the Year Award.

The Young Ham of the Year award was created in 1986 by amateur Radio Newsline producer Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, to fill what he viewed as a void where younger members of ham radio society were often overlooked:

--
Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF: “When I was a young ham in the 50’s and 60’s the good deeds of young hams were often overlooked and ignored. When I grew up I was fortunate enough to be in a position to remedy this and thats how the Young Ham of the Year Award program came about. Thats how it came into being”
--

The award as originally envisioned as very low budget. One idea was for a certificate that would be mailed to a ham, age 18 or younger who had shown some exceptional ability or performed some heroic deed that set him or her apart from the crowd. When Bill mentioned the idea to Chip Margelli K7JA, of Vertex Standard back in the company’s days as Yaesu USA, the idea quickly expanded. Margelli offered company support on the spot:

--
Chip Margelli, K7JA: “When Bill Pasternak gave me a call and dsescribed the project to me in the tiniest bit of detail it was obvious that this was a no-brainer and something that we as a company at Yaesu wanted to encourage. So, I jumped at the opportunity to be a major contributor and it has been a great project ever since.”
--

The award now had substance, but it lacked a permanent home. One was found in 1993 when it was invited to the Huntsville Hamfest:

--
Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF: “The way we got to Huntsville? Simple. We advertised. We put a notice into the newscast that we were searching for a permanent home. The answer came in a note from Scotty Neustadter, now W4WW, who is the Huntsville Hamfest Chairman. Scotty basically said bring it to Huntsville. And we did.”
--

While the presentation ceremony did go to Seaside Oregon in 1994, it returned to Huntsville in 1995 where it has been ever since. And in 1996 a second major corporate underwriter came on board. C-Q Magazine. Rich Moseson W2VU, is editor:

--
Rich Moseson, W2VU: “We at CQ have always thought that it is very important to promote Amateur Radio to young people and we saw that co-sponsorship of the award was the way to help do that.
--

What CQ did was to add to the Young Ham of the Year awards chest something very special. A week of fun and excitement at Spacecamp. Today, with corporate sponsorship from Vertex-Standard USA and CQ Magazine, and support from countless others including the ARRL, Dave Bell Associates and Rosewood Communications the Young Ham of the Year Award continues to honor the Amateur Radio related achievements of those hams age 18 or younger. And now its time to find a fitting recipient for 2002.

Full details, rules and a nominating form are available right now on our website at www.arnewsline.org. Just scroll down to the Young Ham of the Year Award area and click to download. Or you can send a self addressed stamped envelope to the 2002 Newsline Young Ham of the Year Award, 28197 Robin Avenue, Santa Clarita California 91350 and we will mail back the materials.

The Amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year Award is a one of a kind. It honors the youth of ham radio and in doing so, we hope it helps to insure a bright future for the hobby and the radio service that all of us love. (ARNewsline™)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline@arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

Before we go, another reminder that the nominating period for the 2002 amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year is now open. Nominees must be 18 or younger. Full rules and an application is on our website at www.arnewsline.org.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Roy Neal, K6DUE, thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2002. All rights reserved.

1043. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 04:23:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8C313E.A9FF9CCC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37037

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I, for one, was a heck of a lot "dumber" after passing all of my amateur
> radio tests -- mainly because I was intelligent enough to realize that I
> still had a lot more to learn, and had, in fact, only scratched the surface
> of the total knowledge available to me.

Actually, the knowledge that you had a lot to learn smartened you up,
not dumbed you down. I just do not see how taking and passing a ham
radio exam can dumb a person down.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1044. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 04:28:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8C3283.F4F3AE46@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37038

Valentine Germann wrote:
> You are SO confused. Having the actual TEST QUESTIONS
> in front of you, cold, changes the entire idea of "testing." It's
> not about "memorization" per se, and never has been. If you
> have the QUESTIONS and ANSWERS ahead of time, going
> in, well, THAT in ITSELF is the problem, from my perspective.
> It cuts the AMOUNT of WORK you have to do by at least one
> order of magnitude, no matter HOW you do it.

If that is true, it's the way the FCC wants it to be. I had
open book exams in college. They were sometimes more difficult
than the closed book exams. Have you memorized those 1000
Russian words and definitions yet?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1045. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 05:02:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C844AFE.D584F135@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37039

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
> >Some people, perhaps "many" people, will do almost
> >ANYTHING rather than truly learn the material.
>
> So you believe "many" people want to become amateur operators so they won't
> learn anything?

You might ask W5TIT what she thinks, or better yet, reread what she has
already said
about ham radio testing.

1046. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 05:02:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C845685.B58B46E5@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37040

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > >I know many hams who passed their
> > > original code exam and promptly forgot everything they knew about Morse code. Those
> > > are the people I am grouping in the 1/3 who are non fluent in CW. They couldn't carry
> > > on a decent CW QSO if their lives depended on it.
> >
> > How do you know? Maybe they could, indeed, if their lives actually DID depend on it,
maybe they could
> > remember it well enough to bail themselves out, after all!
>
> We are talking about hams functioning well under emergency conditions, not merely
> bailing themselves out. I'm talking about CW emergency nets.

Oh, so you don't believe it would be important that a ham might be able to minimally use Morse code, he isn't allowed to use it to bail himself or a group out unless he can handle a formal traffic net. We see. So much for saving the day, right?

>
>
> > > Your error is in thinking that CW is like the Southern Baptist Religion. "Once saved,
> > > always saved", does not spill over to, "Once Morsed, always Morsed".
> >
> > That's the error in YOUR thinking, for levels of 13wpm at least. It's not something one
> > completely forgets, sort of like how to ride a bicycle. That assumes the individual
actually
> > did learn it, and didn't scam the system.
>
> You really think someone can effectively use CW after not using it for half a
> century?

Well you seem to think its just fine for him to be able to not use CW at all. So why the fuss because I think it might be better to be able to use it even crudely than not at all?

> It is my belief that he would simply be in the way in a CW emergency
> net.
>

Only if he needed to pass important traffic and was unable to do so. Why should it matter if he is not highly skilled when he was the only means of getting the traffic handled?

1047. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 05:02:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8456F9.A0C1E87@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37041

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > If an engineer passes the ham radio tests
> > on the basis that he already knows electronics, and a near-illiterateCBer passes the
> > same test on the basis that he wasn't required to learn anything, both get the same
> > license. Now tell me nothing is dumbed down.
>
> OK Dick, I give up. Which one of those new hams was dumbed down by the exams?
> Was the engineer dumber after he took the test or was the CBer dumber after
> he took the tests? Were you dumber after you took your tests?

You can't understand the difference beteen a dumbed down test, and what results, and the act of making someone dumber. And still you claim to be a genius.

1048. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 05:02:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C84D6D6.4FDE9CB0@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37042

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C840467.2BBFF8E5@worldnet.att.net...
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > > "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> > > news:u8k8h9t9f8t5d1@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > Hello, all!
> > > >
> > > > What you say is all well and good. HOWEVER, an "A"
> > > > from Central Missouri State University is NOT the same
> > > > thing as an "A" from Harvard, though both are quite
> > > > "authoritative" in their own way. Taking tests over
> > > > complicated material, "blind," in what amounts to a
> > > > true academic setting, is VASTLY more difficult than
> > > > what is going on today vis-a-vis the Ham Tests.
> > >
> > > Who cares, so what? Does that have any relavence
> > > to ham licensing tests?
> >
> > Who cares if the ham radio tests actually test for knowledge?
> > Obviously not you.
>
> And you Dick, clearly still don't understand that a ham
> license is NOT a degree in anything. The license is a
> gateway to allow the license holder to be on the air.

Ah, gee Bill. The light is going on. So no one is supposed to learn
anything meaningful without it resulting in a degree.

So, are you having memory problems also? If you'll bother to look back
into the archives you'll see where I said -several times- that no one
expects or ever did expect the entry class licensees to know very much.
But the Extra class was intended to be different. Now it no longer is,
evidenced by your following paragraph......

>
> What hams have done in the past and still do now is to
> follow one or more paths after becoming a ham which
> focuses their "advancement, knowledge, skills" into
> specific areas.

Why have more than a single license if no one needs to do anything but
get a 'gateway to get on the air'? What's the point?

>
>
> I passed the Extra over two years ago...and have promptly
> forgotten 2/3 of the stuff that was on the test. Why you may
> ask? Simple...I have NO need or desire to retain the
> amount of time I have to notify the FCC before I conduct
> amateur space operations....or the details of VE rules
> and regs (and yes, I am a VE...but I help when I can,
> I don't run VE sessions myself).
>

I think you have just gone on to prove my point. If that's what you
took
from studying for an Extra class test, and much of the test was of that
nature
then its mostly pointless anyway, just a matter of going through the
motions.

There should be a supplemental test for becoming a VE, that should be
taken by any licensee who wishes to be a VE, regardless of his license
class.
It is wrong to waste the much more limited number of questions on VE
subjects
instead of questions related to technical or operational subjects when
the total number of questions has been seriously reduced already.

>
> > > > This is REGARDLESS of the fact that an Extra-class
> > > > test passed today is just as "authoritative" as one
> > > > passed years ago. That is, both may be equal before
> > > > the rulebook but HARDLY EQUAL as social facts.
> > >
> > > Again, who cares, so what?
> > >
> > > > Surely, this is too obvious to require further elucidation?
> > >
> > > Ditto my above.
> >
> > Well, thanks for clearing that up. You don't know and you don't
> > care.
>
> So tell us Dick? Who but YOU and several others in
> this newsgroup have any concern or care that:
>

A lot of people who have already left the hobby, to be sure. Evidently
no one at the League is very concerned, not that they could do anything
about it anyway. FCC is pretty well disengaged, just waiting for the
time to take away
spectrum because "we didn't modernize". Meanwhile they were the biggest
cause of that lack with the restructuring and reduction in testing
standards.

What this is leading up to. *IMO* is a single class license in the ARS that will be about as simple and easy to get as the old Class D CB license where you read the rules sheet, fill out a form and mail it in. In fact that might just be a good suggestion to make when their next NPRM comes around. Why keep up the charade?

1049. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 05:02:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C855471.A96E0F64@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37043

Bill Sohl wrote:

>
> In a real emergency, even a nocode Tech can operate HF
> (i.e. the license privileges don't prohibit operating on
> ham band segments that the license itself wouldn't otherwise
> permit.)

Yep, FCC rules say that in a emergency where life or property are at risk anyone is authorized to use any communications means at their disposal to effect the needed traffic handling. A nocode tech could even use Morse code if he needed to. Not that he would be able to.

1050. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 05:02:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8554D7.F4B1173A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37044

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >The point was that FCC nor the government in general will be in any way
> >inclined to turn ham radio loose to do anything anyone might way to do
> >with ham radio re Carl's bright ideas for an idealistic digital nirvana in
> >ham radio. It would set us up to become an underground illicit means of
> >international communication that could easily harbor hidden
> >terrorist communications which might escape detection, at least until too
> >late to be effective Carl thinks he has all this figured out. He needs a new
> abacus.
>
> Whew, that is a bit far out even for you, Dick. :-)
>

So you disagree? If so, please explain for us YOUR interpretation of the rule prohibiting codes and ciphers on ham radio.

1051. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 05:02:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C85552F.72AA2B56@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37045

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > If a full 1/3 of hams are fluent in the use of CW
> >the chances are excellent there will always be a CW operator on hand. Got a
> >problem with that?
>
> I do not believe that 1/3 of hams are proficient enough in CW to be able to
> accurately handle traffic under failing band conditions. I don't belive that
> in 1963, 1/3 of all hams were proficient enough to accurately handle traffic in
> failing band conditions.
>
> I don't believe that 1/3 of all hams could accurately handle formal traffic
> under ideal band conditions.
>

I see you have your navel, too. :-) I DO believe everything above that you don't.
So I have mine, too.

1052. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 05:02:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8558B9.6DAE456A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37046

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>
> >> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> >The point was that FCC nor the government in general will be in any way
> >> >inclined to turn ham radio loose to do anything anyone might way to do
> >> >with ham radio re Carl's bright ideas for an idealistic digital nirvana
> >> >in ham radio. It would set us up to become an underground illicit means of
> >> >international communication that could easily harbor hidden
> >> >terrorist communications which might escape detection, at least until too
> >> >late to be effective Carl thinks he has all this figured out. He needs a
> >> >new abacus.
>
> >> Whew, that is a bit far out even for you, Dick. :-)
>
> >Yup, I can hear them black helicopters comin'
> >in for Dick now.... whup, whup, whup :-)
>
> The idea that "they" are monitoring the thousands of amateur QSOs that take
> place daily is ridiculous on its face.

And again, you attribute statements to me that I *did not* make. You really have learned your trolling lessons from Cecil quite well.

I'll say it one more time... the government is not about to allow hams carte blanche to
use whatever codings they wish to do whatever they wish with ham radio. If FCC should happen to stumble and make the mistake of trying to authorize that I have no doubt whatever the move would be very quickly cancelled by higher authority. FCC *isn't* the final authority. They do the bidding of congress.

1053. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 05:10:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020311001033.08046.00000163@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 37047

In article <a6h0pe$5me$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020310161052.19293.00000122@mb-fm.aol.com...
>> In article <a6fpi7$7s4$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >Is it then your opinion that a person with NO morse skills
>> >can, in fact, be a good operator...
>>
>> Sure! Did you see my list, posted in this thread a few days ago?
>> Did anyone notice that none of the listed skills are exclusively Morse
>> skills?
>
>You say that here...but skip down a few lines and...
>
>> >or, as Carl is trying to
>> >ferret out, must the person have morse skills
>> >for you to consider the person an expert operator?
>> >
>> To consider someone an "expert" amateur radio operator, I would
>> have to include Morse skills, simply because the mode is so
>> popular with hams. Earning the title "expert amateur radio operator"
>> requires a LOT of skills. I do not consider someone with little or no
>> Morse skills to be an expert amateur radio operator.
>
>Then you have a very archaic view of expertise.

How so? Isn't Morse widely used by hams? Doesn't "expert" mean that someone
is very skilled and knowledgeable in ALL aspects of something? I don't see
how someone could claim to be an "expert" amateur radio operator and yet
have no Morse/CW skills. It would be like saying a driver who could not drive
a manual transmission vehicle was an expert driver.

>> But I also do
>> not think that amateur radio or emergencies are the sole province of'
>> experts.
>
>Nor have I said so either.

Then we agree. "Good operator" and "expert operator" are completely
different things.
>
>> I don't presume to call myself an expert amateur radio operator, either.

>> Still way too much out there for me to learn and get good at.
>
>After all these years, you don't consider yourself
>an expert?

Nope. Never claimed to be, either. I know too many ops who are way better
than me.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1054. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 06:16:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020311011638.14037.00000689@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 37048

>Subject: Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/10/02 17:02 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020310170241.06778.00000093@mb-bh.aol.com>

>Yet, the ARRL insists on controlling the amateur radio regulations
>of getting INTO amateur radio, based on "representation" of a
>minority who are ALREADY in amateur radio. To many, that is
>simply an elitist minority group trying to exercise control over a
>majority. That isn't working well. The membership of the ARRL is
>still less than a quarter of all licensed US amateurs.

And...?!?!

There are two predominant political parties in the United States, and a
handful of other "also rans".

None of which hold a majority of any part of the population.

Ergo, WHY should the ARRL be any different?

Your current "excuse de jour" draws analogies between the ARRL and an
airplane modellers organization. I am willing to be the AMA does not
"represent" a majority of those involved in THAT past time, either.

Come to think of it, I wonder how many ex-radio technicians there are out
there and what percentage of them YOU represent..?!?!

Hmmmmm.......

SR

1055. Thanks, AC6V

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 07:11:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020311021110.14587.00000687@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 37049

I just wanted to express my gratitude and appreciation to AC6V for what has got to be THE finest "one-stop-shopping" web site for Amateur and other radio hobbyists.

I started going thru QST for some sites to do some comaparitive shopping when a friend of mine reminded me about this site.

All I can say is....WOW!

Thank-you, Mr. Dinkins!

73

Steve, K4YZ

1056. Twistedhed The Punch Clown

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 07:44:45 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0203102344.70b9dc8b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 37050
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.shortwave

Subject: More Twistedhed's Blathering
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Author: twistedhed@webtv.net (Twistedhed)
Date: 2001-03-26 17:20:06 PST

in 3741-3A87F5A4-23@storefull-122.iap.bryant.webtv.net
twistedhed@webtv.net wrote:
>nice forgery Dougie but the headers don't lie.
>Undoubtedly you don't understand how the Usenet
>works so I will explain it to you, my anonymous
>acolyte
>what do you know of my life? The jockstrap you sent
>in the mail is a trophy of your docile worship of
>me and it hangs proudly above my mantle
>I will never cease pirate CB activity as long as it irks
>you or someone like you. However, as a consolation
>and to ease your suffering, I will stay within the
>confines of the freeband for now. The saucer men tell
>me I have a good signal in the pile

1057. Re: SLee@alt.net: The turd which won't flush.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 11:25:51 UTC
From: AB8MQ <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a6i6qc$6ur$2@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 37109
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.douglas-gerry

"Stagger "TexASS TURD' Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
news:3C8BF3C0.DEB137E5@houston-hunks.com...
>
> In summary, Wiseman: Bite me.

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA.......Poor Faggot Lee, having a temper tantrum. He'd rather whine about things in the newsgroups, which like Gielda said is his perferred option.

--
Faggot Lee posts the following slobber, not realising his own whining and netKKKoping past in <3C8BA6A5.19219DD3@houston-hunks.com>:
"You don't like it? I suggest that you use your OE news filters, or simply skip the thread. No one is forcing you to read it, and you sure as hell aren't going to get any of the participants to stop."

1058. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 11:26:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020311062613.06075.00000763@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 37101

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> The idea that "they" are monitoring the thousands of amateur QSOs that take
>> place daily is ridiculous on its face.
>
>

> And again, you attribute statements to me that I *did not* make. You really
>have
>learned your trolling lessons from Cecil quite well.

Ah, yes, a "troll," which in your parlance means that I said something that disagrees with what you said.

Dick, if the government were to make a decision not to permit carte-blanche encoding, the only reasonable reason to make that decision would be that they wanted to monitor Amateur communications for covert transmissions.

> I'll say it one more time... the government is not about to allow hams carte
>blanche to
>use whatever codings they wish to do whatever they wish with ham radio.

And I will say it one time, too, Dick; you are wrong. Amateurs can use whatever encoding they wish within Amateur Radio, with the requirements that the modulation type be legal for use on the frequency being used (ie, no phase-shift keying on 50.05 MHz) and that the encoding method be publically documented. In correspondence with ARRL, they have clarified that posting the encoding method on a public web site is sufficient public documentation.

This in no way would stop the evildoers you apparently see poised to take over ham radio from very quietly posting their secret code on a web site and sending a message via ham radio.

> If FCC
>should happen to stumble and make the mistake of trying to authorize that I
>have
>no doubt whatever the move would be very quickly cancelled by higher
>authority.

> If FCC
>should happen to stumble and make the mistake of trying to authorize that I
>have
>no doubt whatever the move would be very quickly cancelled by higher
>authority.

The "authorities" haven't overturned the decade-old FCC rule on unspecified digital codes yet, Dick. Another "any day now" sort of thing?

>FCC *isn't* the final authority. They do the bidding of congress.

Then write to your Congressman and tell him that the rules that permit the use of unspecified digital codes are a risk to national security.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1059. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 11:28:46 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020311062846.06075.00000764@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 37102

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> I don't believe that 1/3 of all hams could accurately handle formal traffic
>> under ideal band conditions.

> I see you have your navel, too. :-) I DO believe everything above that you
>don't.
>So I have mine, too.

Dick, you can't be serious. I doubt that 1/3 of hams know the formal NTS procedures. Nowhere near 1/3 of hams have participated in formal traffic handling. Are you really suggesting that people could just jump right in and handle formal traffic with absolutely no practice or skill?

I disagree.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1060. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 11:31:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020311063148.06075.00000766@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 37103

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> >The point was that FCC nor the government in general will be in any way
>> >inclined to turn ham radio loose to do anything anyone might way to do
>> >with ham radio re Carl's bright ideas for an idealistic digital nirvana in
>> >ham radio. It would set us up to become an underground illicit means of
>> >international communication that could easily harbor hidden
>> >terrorist communications which might escape detection, at least until too
>> >late to be effective Carl thinks he has all this figured out. He needs a
>new
>> abacus.

>> Whew, that is a bit far out even for you, Dick. :-)

> So you disagree? If so, please explain for us YOUR interpretation of the
>rule
>prohibiting codes and ciphers on ham radio.

My conclusion that your statement was pretty far out was related to the thought
that spies and terrorists will develop new digital encoding methods and use ham
radio to communicate covert messages if the FCC allows hams to develop new
digital encoding methods ans use ham radio for its intended purpose.

Fortunately, you are wrong, because the rules do permit hams to develop and use
new encoding methods.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

1061. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 11:33:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020311063340.06075.00000767@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 37104

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> And you Dick, clearly still don't understand that a ham
>> license is NOT a degree in anything. The license is a
>> gateway to allow the license holder to be on the air.

>Ah, gee Bill. The light is going on. So no one is supposed to learn
>anything meaningful without it resulting in a degree.

> So, are you having memory problems also? If you'll bother to look back
>into the archives you'll see where I said -several times- that no one
>expects or ever did expect the entry class licensees to know very much.
>But the Extra class was intended to be different. Now it no longer is,
>evidenced by your following paragraph......

The Extra Class license was never even close to being the equivalent of a
degree in electronics, Dick. I bet you walked 5 miles to school, too.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

1062. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 11:36:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020311063658.06075.00000768@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 37105

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>Why keep up the charade?

Because most hams see ham radio and the tests as a learning opportunity, Dick.
The tests of today are less of a "charade" than the General I took in 1964.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1063. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 11:43:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020311064318.06075.00000769@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 37106

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> So you believe "many" people want to become amateur operators so they won't
>> learn anything?
>
> You might ask W5TIT what she thinks, or better yet, reread what she has
>already said
>about ham radio testing.

Okay, that's one. Now, seeing what other newcomers have posted here, think
20:1 is about right?

Let's ask Kim a question. Kim, have you learned anything about radio technology
and operating since you became a ham?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1064. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 11:55:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020311065538.20892.00000115@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 37107

Just found this - not sure I replied

In article <3c83b4e6_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020304081022.17584.00000356@mb-ct.aol.com...
>> In article <3c82ecd0_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20020303211411.20827.00000337@mb-mj.aol.com...
>> >> wa6vse-shack@fast.net writes:
>> >>
>> >> >It's as Ed and
>> >> >others have observed ... they seem to remember the "tests
>> >> >that they took" as being much more rigorous than they
>> >> >actually were, view any changes as "dumbing down," and
>> >> >resent that newcomers are not subject to the same set of
>> >> >limitations and restrictions that they faced as newcomers.
>> >>
>> >> Since we don't actually have the old tests, it's impossible to
>tell
>> >> how tough they really were.
>> >
>> >I took the full general 25 years ago at the FCC field office
>> >in Long Beach, CA ...
>>
>> But you didn't pass it. The "full general" included the 13 wpm code
>test.
>
>You know PERFECTLY well that I was talking about
>the written tests ...

No, I did not. And my statement is true: You did not pass the "full general" in
1975.

In 1975, the "full general" meant 13 wpm code receiving and sending, plus the
then-current General/Technician written test, taken in one session inthat order
in front of an FCC examiner.

Somebody who did not know the whole history might get the wrong idea from what
you wrote.

Why not say: "I took and passed the General/Technician written test in 1975"?
No possibility of misunderstanding when it's said that way.

>
>> > the writtens up through general today
>> >are, IMHO (as an RF engineer and long-time holder of a
>> >commerical license) not any easier than the "old" test.
>>
>> It's the method. If a person knows the stuff, they're not much
>different.
>>
>> I took the full Advanced in the summer of 1968 and passed first try
>- - code
>> and written. That was when I was 14. The old pre-restructuring Extra
>has been
>> passed by at least one third-grader.
>> >
>> >> The issue of "dumbing down" is not about what it takes for
>newcomers
>> >to
>> >> get started, but what it takes for more/full privileges. The
>> >requirements for
>> >> full privileges used to be more rigorous than they are now - and
>I'm
>> >not just
>> >> talking about the code tests.
>> >
>> >Other than the "pig without wings" idea of "time in grade"
>> >requirements (which the FCC abandoned years ago),
>> >there are lots of people who disagree ... people who took
>> >the old tests.
>>
>> So? It's just an idea - a talking point.
>>
>> Carl, you sure do seem to get agitated over new ideas that don't
>agree
>> with your version of How It Ought To Be.
>
>I get "agitated" over ideas that I believe to be TRULY
>bad for the future of ham radio ...

How that agitation is expressed is YOUR responsibility.
>
>> >> >I'm NOT saying that rank beginners should have FULL
>> >> >privileges ... just that they should have enough, with
>> >> >sensible, justifiable limits based on their demonstrated
>> >> >level of technical knowledge, that the ARS is, in fact,
>> >> >interesting and they don't feel like they are being treated
>> >> >as 2nd class citizens who are reviled and looked down on
>> >> >by "their superiors."
>> >>
>> >> Sure. But what constitutes adequate knowledge for full
>privileges?

>> >> How is it demonstrated?
>> >
>> >By passing the tests prescribed by the FCC ... NOT by
>> >"proving one's self" to "one's superiors" by "paying one's
>> >dues" with stupid, arbitrary "time in grade" requirements.
>>
>> The FCC didn't think they were "stupid" or "arbitrary" for a very
>> long time.
>> >
>> >> >Nobody is trying to "ban Morse useage" ... I think you know
>> >> >that.
>> >>
>> >> From what I have read on this NG the past several years, I am
>> >convinced
>> >> that some folks want Morse/CW use to end. Not just the test - the
>> >mode
>> >> itself.
>> >
>> >Like who??? Name some names ... call 'em out ...
>>
>> Remember Mark Morgan, KB9RQZ? He comes to mind.
>
>One person who I don't recall having seen here in some
>time ... do you think Mark has the influence to eliminate
>amateur's ability to use Morse?

You said "nobody is trying to ban Morse usage". I disproved that statement.
Mark Morgan is not alone. Sure, such folks are a tiny minority, but they
still disprove the blanket statement "Nobody is...."

>> > exactly WHO wants
>> >to "end Morse/CW use???" And even if there were
>> >one or two, or even a dozen, that fanatical about it,
>> >do you REALLY believe they could muster enough
>> >influence with the FCC to pull it off???
>>
>> There was a time when folks who opposed the code TEST would have
>been
>> dismissed with exactly those words.
>>
>> Fact is, some folks DO want Morse/CW to disappear from the ham
>bands.
>
>Maybe a very few individuals, but I don't see ANY evidence
>of any sort of organized effort in that direction ... plus, do
>you REALLY think the FCC would ban Morse (after all, there's
>no good reason to do so ...)??? I certainly don't believe they
>would even consider it.

The same was said about the code TEST in the past.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1065. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 11:55:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020311065538.20892.00000116@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 37108

In article <3C878056.4151F11A@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>>
>> W1RFI wrote:
>> > In most cases, it is a much better choice to change frequencies than to
>change
>> > modes. Perhaps that is what we should be teaching new hams.
>>
>> I don't really agree with that statement. If propagation on 40 mtrs drops
>out, we
>> should then
>> plan on automatically changing bands to 75? That opens up a whole set of
>problems.
>
>That's the way Intel had their emergency communications organized, Dick.

Did they ever have to deal with an actual emergency? Say, one where some of
their equipment didn't work?

>Changing
>frequencies is a lot easier than changing modes,

Not in all cases. You state it as if it were a universal fact.

> especially if all the operators
>are not practiced and prepared for their brand of CW traffic. For instance,
>Intel
>didn't have a straight key and, at the time, I couldn't handle the paddles.

That was simply a lack of proper planning and preparation. Or somebody with an
anti-CW/Morse agenda.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1066. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 13:54:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203110554.6ce8793b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 37110

I put this back in the "Radio Policy" thread because that's where it started.

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message news:<3c8a2861_1@news7.fast.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020308225725.12293.00000079@mb-cs.aol.com...
> > Submitted for your approval....
> >
> > Here's a list of desireable radio operator skills for hams.
>
> Sorry, Jim ... while I *agree* that most of these are
> useful attributes for an operator, I think that MOST of
> them can't be tested ... nor would a "time in grade"
> experience requirement for advancement provide
> any assurance that the "skill" had been acquired.

Who is talking about testing any of these skills? Not me!

I'm simply saying that these are desirable operating skills for amateur radio operators. It was alleged that I and others only value Morse/CW skill, so I re-posted this list to demonstrate that I value many different radio skills. Not a word about testing.

The FCC obviously doesn't care about testing skills, so any such test is pretty much a moot point.

> Additionally, I don't think you can have an exhaustive
> "one size fits all" list without unnecessarily discriminating
> against people who don't fit your "cookie cutter" image
> of "the perfect operator" ... for example, people with
> disabilities.

A desirable skill is still desirable even if everyone can't achieve it, or hasn't yet achieved it.
>
> Since ham radio is, in part, about "self-education,"
> I still think it best to keep the license qualifications
> limited to rules/regs/practices and the necessary,
> basic technical knowledge necessary to meet the
> government's legitimate regulatory interests (which
> include electrical and RF safety for the operator and
> others and recognizing/avoiding/mitigating interference
> problems).

Which means you would support drastic reduction/changes in written testing,
because most of what's in the writtens doesn't meet your definition given
above.
>
> Most of the stuff you list below is/can be learned by
> doing ... the license allows one to do ... get it?

Sorry if it wasn't clear that this list was about desirable skills to
have, not to be tested for.
>
> > Operator Skills
> >
> > 1) The skill to speak clearly, concisely and distinctly, at a steady rate,
> > level and tone.
>
> This would discrminate against people with speech problems ... who
> could be perfectly good CW/Digital operators without anyone even
> knowing that they had a speech problem.

Sure. That's why it's not proposed as a test.
>
> > 2) The skill to listen carefully and understand a transmission under both
> good
> > and poor conditions.
>
> This would discrminate against people with hearing problems ... who
> could be perfectly good Digital operators without anyone even
> knowing that they had a hearing problem.

Sure. That's why it's not proposed as a test.
>
> > 3) The skill to judge radio conditions on a given frequency and how they
> are
> > changing.
>
> Useful ... but how do you test it?

Test?
>
> > 4) The skill to determine the mode of a received signal by ear or other
> means.
>
> Useful ... again, how do you test it (other than the "by ear" part,
> using tapes ... probably impractical at a VE session and leaves
> out the "other means" which are just as valid IMO.

See below.
>
> > 5) The skill to properly tune in a signal for best reception.
>
> Clearly useful, but how do you test it practically at a VE session?

See below.
>
> > 6) The skill to tune up and operate transmitters so as to maximize
> > effectiveness and minimize interference.
>
> Clearly useful, but how do you test it practically at a VE session?

Test?
>
> > 7) The skill to correctly judge the radio conditions over a given path and
> > adjust transmissions for best results.
>
> Clearly useful, but how do you test it practically at a VE session?

See below.
>
> > 8) The skill to correctly judge the skills of other operators and adjust
> > transmissions for best results.
>
> Clearly useful, but how do you test it practically at a VE session?

See below.
>
> > 9) The skill to communicate effectively in less than optimum settings
> (heat,
> > cold, lack of sleep, etc.)
>
> This is starting to sound like a "How do we make the qualifications so
> absurd that nobody will want to bother?" item ... I think that most hams,
> in an emergency situation will "Do what needs doing." To suggest that
> this is even measurable, let alone testable, is a BIG stretch ... what
> would you do? Torture people to see how much heat, cold, sleep
> deprivation, etc. they could/would tolerate before saying "Uncle!" ?
> At what level of torture tolerance would YOU deem an applicant "worthy"
> of being granted an amateur license?

Of course it's not to be tested. Just a skill to be developed.

Though it WOULD be interesting to put a bunch of hams in a "Survivor" type
situation and see who could get a rig built and call for help first...;-)

The point of the above is simply that the ability to function under less-
than-optimum conditions is a developed skill, and is part of "planning and
preparation".
>
> > 10) The skill to communicate effectively under less than optimum radio
> > conditions.
>
> Clearly useful, but how do you test it practically at a VE session?

See below.
>
> > 11) The skill to communicate effectively with less than optimum equipment.

>
> Useful, but again, with proper planning and preparation, good, working
> equipment, antennas, etc. should be available and there should be no
> need to rely on "minimalist radio" techniques.

"Should be available"? What if they're not?
>
> > 12) The skill to use the standard phonetic alphabet smoothly and
> effectively,
> > and judge when its use is needed.
>
> Clearly useful, but how do you test it practically at a VE session?

See below.
>
> > 13) The skill to use appropriate abbreviations and prosigns, and judge
> when
> > they are needed.
>
> This seems more oriented towards Morse operation than a general
> requirement that needs to be applied to all.

Nope, it applies to voice as well.
>
> > 14) The skill to write down received transmissions legibly and neatly so
> that
> > others can easily read them.
>
> What about typing?

That's covered by another skill.

> What about those with handicaps ... would you deny
> them licenses on the basis of not being able to write "legibly and neatly"?
> Who's the judge of what's "legible and neat"? You? My 1st grade teacher
> (rest her soul)? Some elite corps of "handwriting police"?

Test?
>
> > 15) The skill to write clear, coherent formal messages in standard form.
>
> What about typing? What about those with handicaps ... would you deny
> them licenses on the basis of not being able to write "legibly and neatly"?
> Who's the judge of what's "legible and neat"? You? My 1st grade teacher
> (rest her soul)? Some elite corps of "handwriting police"?
>
> The emphasis of this item on "formal message" seems to indicate
> the "radiogram" format ... something that's hardly ever used in REAL
> emergency communications ... for H&W traffic, e-mail formats would
> be more efficient and more commonly recognized ... in fact, once
> the message gets out of the disaster area, in many cases e-mail
> delivery would be the most efficient means of delivery. (Yes, I know,

> to some using anything but "pure ham radio" is sacreligious, but all
> I care about is what works best when it comes to emergency comms.)

The ability to use a standard format is important.
>
> > 16) The skill to type, error free, at a rate that makes best use of the
> > transmission mode.
>
> A usefull skill no doubt ... but really a stretch if you're about to
> suggest that it should be a license requirement.

Where do you see that?
>
> > 17) The skill to deal with hostile and/or illegally operated stations.
>
> A useful skill no doubt ... but really a stretch if you're about to
> suggest that it should be a license requirement. How would you
> test this in a VE session? Who would decide what was pass
> and what was fail?

Test?
>
> > 18) The skill to do several things at once while on the air.
>
> A useful skill no doubt ... but really a stretch if you're about to
> suggest that it should be a license requirement. How would you
> test this in a VE session? Who would decide what was pass
> and what was fail?

Test?
>
> > 19) The skill to have situational awareness in all operating situations.
>
> This sounds like it boils down to "Watch your back." ... for example,
> "Make sure the brush fire doesn't surround you.", or "Don't set up
> your station in/near a building that's likely to collapse in an aftershock."
>
> How would you test this?
>
> Are you trying to put the "Darwin Awards" out of business? :-)

Just a skill.
>
> > 20) The skill to project a welcoming, friendly and helpful attitude on the
> air.
>
> A useful attribute not doubt. How would you test this in a VE session?
> Who would decide what was pass and what was fail?

Here's an idea how SOME of the above could be tested, even though my list was
not meant to advocate any sort of testing.

An "operating skills test" could be conducted by having the would-be ham operate a simulated station to send and receive simple but useful messages - using any of a choice of modes. The simulated station could be as simple as a laptop with special software, hooked to another, out-of-sight-and-sound laptop operated by a VE.

The would-be ham is given a message and instructed "Go to one of the following frequencies and send the message to (call of station to be contacted)". The would-be ham gets to choose the band and mode, and even change band/mode if conditions require. Scoring is by exception, looking at various skills, like the use of standard phonetics.

Of course since the FCC is simply not interested in skill testing, this is all simply a moot point.

Let me reiterate that the list was simply to illustrate some desirable operating skills, and not any sort of testing for them.
>
> Also, how would you propose to purge all of the existing ops who
> couldn't "cut the mustard" according your "cookie-cutter" standards,
> assuming that you could develop a means to practically test all of
> this (and were made the "standards police" so that you could enforce
> it) ???

Who said anything about purging or testing anyone? Not me.

> Or would old timers be 'inherently OK' even if they did not
> meet all of these standards?

What test?

Think about the skills in terms of desirable goals, not tests to be passed.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1067. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 15:40:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C85A468.4A618D22@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37111

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020310104405.07180.00000883@mb-cr.aol.com...
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > >The point was that FCC nor the government in general will be in any way
> > >inclined to turn ham radio loose to do anything anyone might way to do
> > >with ham radio re Carl's bright ideas for an idealistic digital nirvana
> in
> > >ham radio. It would set us up to become an underground illicit means of
> > >international communication that could easily harbor hidden
> > >terrorist communications which might escape detection, at least until too
> > >late to be effective Carl thinks he has all this figured out. He needs a
> new
> > abacus.
> >
> > Whew, that is a bit far out even for you, Dick. :-)
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Yup, I can hear them black helicopters comin'
> in for Dick now.... whup, whup, whup :-)
>
> Funny thing is that you don't even need radio
> to pass encrypted messages anymore.

"Anymore"???" And when has that *not* been true?

> POTS (plain
> old telephone service) gives you all anyone needs.
> POTS plus a modem, a PC and an encryption program
> will do it all...text or voice.
>

So you believe your new-found discovery will cause the FCC to drop the
amateur
radio regulation prohibiting codes and ciphers? Yeah, right!

Why do you think that regulation was formed in the first place?

1068. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 15:50:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C863AD2.BA0E6F5E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37112

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> And you Dick, clearly still don't understand that a ham
> >> license is NOT a degree in anything. The license is a
> >> gateway to allow the license holder to be on the air.
>
> >Ah, gee Bill. The light is going on. So no one is supposed to learn
> >anything meaningful without it resulting in a degree.
>
> > So, are you having memory problems also? If you'll bother to look back
> >into the archives you'll see where I said -several times- that no one
> >expects or ever did expect the entry class licensees to know very much.
> >But the Extra class was intended to be different. Now it no longer is,
> >evidenced by your following paragraph......
>
> The Extra Class license was never even close to being the equivalent of a
> degree in electronics, Dick. I bet you walked 5 miles to school, too.

There he goes again. Did I say that it was "close to being the equivalent
of a degree"?
No I did not. But I know from past experience that before your time an Extra
class license test
was condsidered, (this I was told by an FCC district engineer) to be at least
as difficult as
a First Class Radiotelephone License, which was required to be chief engineer
of a
commercial radio or TV station. So your assertion that nothing has changed
comes up
VERY lame.
I'm sure that were that FCC district engineer still alive today he would
hold quite
different beliefs.

1069. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 16:06:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C863EA6.47F95B5E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37113

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> The idea that "they" are monitoring the thousands of amateur QSOs that take
> >> place daily is ridiculous on its face.
> >
> >
>
> > And again, you attribute statements to me that I *did not* make. You really
> >have
> >learned your trolling lessons from Cecil quite well.
>
> Ah, yes, a "troll," which in your parlance means that I said something that
> disagrees with what you said.
>
> Dick, if the government were to make a decision not to permit carte-blanche
> encoding, the only reasonable reason to make that decision would be that they
> wanted to monitor Amateur communications for covert transmissions.
>

Really? Have you had your coffee yet, Ed? You seem to be still asleep.
The reason for that rule is so that they will be able to monitor any amateur
transmission,
not that they plan to. Is that so strange?

>
> > I'll say it one more time... the government is not about to allow hams carte
> >blanche to
> >use whatever codings they wish to do whatever they wish with ham radio.
>
> And I will say it one time, too, Dick; you are wrong. Amateurs can use whatever
> encoding they wish within Amateur Radio, with the requirements that the
> modulation type be legal for use on the frequency being used (ie, no
> phase-shift keying on 50.05 MHz) and that the encoding method be publically
> documented. In correspondence with ARRL, they have clarified that posting the
> encoding method on a public web site is sufficient public documentation.
>

That is NOT the argument, of course. The "publication" rule handles it all quite
well.

>
> This in no way would stop the evildoers you apparently see poised to take over
> ham radio from very quietly posting their secret code on a web site and sending
> a message via ham radio.

>

Does anything ever stop evildoers from breaking the law? Not that I ever could
determine.
Did banning ham radio operators from operating stop spies in WW2? Not likely, but
it
sure helped monitors sort out what was present on the ham bands. Just as asserting
some
control over what hams do still would.

>
> > If FCC
> >should happen to stumble and make the mistake of trying to authorize that I
> >have
> >no doubt whatever the move would be very quickly cancelled by higher
> >authority.
>
>
> The "authorities" haven't overturned the decade-old FCC rule on unspecified
> digital codes yet, Dick. Another "any day now" sort of thing?
>

That doesn't give hams carte blanche to do anything they want digitally on ham
radio.
If it does, what was Dennis Ferguson's complaint?

>
> >FCC *isn't* the final authority. They do the bidding of congress.
>
> Then write to your Congressman and tell him that the rules that permit the use
> of unspecified digital codes are a risk to national security.
>

That might be a good idea.

1070. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 16:11:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C863FBA.336F5B8F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37114

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> I don't believe that 1/3 of all hams could accurately handle formal traffic
> >> under ideal band conditions.
>
> > I see you have your navel, too. :-) I DO believe everything above that you
> >don't.
> >So I have mine, too.
>
> Dick, you can't be serious. I doubt that 1/3 of hams know the formal NTS
> procedures.

So what? Do you really think that a formal NTS net would refuse to work a ham on
CW
who called in with emergency traffic just because he didn't follow procedures?
Are you that unfamiliar with ham nets?

> Nowhere near 1/3 of hams have participated in formal traffic
> handling. Are you really suggesting that people could just jump right in and
> handle formal traffic with absolutely no practice or skill?

I'm saying that hams won't require a station calling in with emergency traffic to
hold those
skills. They'll work with him to handle his emergency. Sorry to find so many here
who
evidently wouldn't.

1071. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 16:52:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020311115208.24480.00000737@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 37115

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>But I know from past experience that before your time an Extra
>class license test
>was condsidered, (this I was told by an FCC district engineer) to be at least
>as difficult as
>a First Class Radiotelephone License, which was required to be chief engineer
>of a
>commercial radio or TV station.

It was probably just about the same level of difficulty. And it is not before my time; I have passed both exams.

>So your assertion that nothing has changed comes up VERY lame.

Plenty has changed since I was first licensed, Dick. For me to obtain all amateur privileges, I passed the General exam. I did so after studying a 16-page study guide. The Extra, though harder than the Extra of today, I believe, was a "vanity" license only, conveying no substantive additional priveleges over the General.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1072. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 16:54:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020311115417.24480.00000738@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 37116

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>
>That doesn't give hams carte blanche to do anything they want digitally on
>ham
>radio.
>If it does, what was Dennis Ferguson's complaint?
>

The limiting factor is not in the encoding methods, Dick; we have sufficient flexibility there already. The limits are in content, where digital voice is allowed in the voice/image bands, but the same bandwidth could not be used to send data.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1073. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 17:42:08 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C8CEC70.C8752ED@psu.edu>
Source record: 37118

Hey, Cecil

I can vouch that unless Dick has been deviously plotting an alternative identity for some time now, Valentine is indeed who he says he is.

something struck me as familiar about the name - there just aren't that many people running around with nams like that. I remembered Valentine from astronomy, one of my other hobbies. Lo and behold, I looked up some messages from the old astro-officers list I used to belong to, and there he was.

You are now a real person, Valentine!! (big grin)

- Mike -

CAM wrote:
>
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > P.S. In general, when someone makes unwarranted
> > accusations of the type "CAM" has made about
> > Mr. Carroll (setting up a second, hidden, identity) it's
> > usually because they have done so themselves or
> > are thinking about doing it.
>
> Only a sneaky underhanded yellow bellied scoundrel would do such.
> With me, what you see is what you get, warts and all.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1074. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 17:46:22 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <O36j8.5395$Ex5.556782@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37117

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020311001033.08046.00000163@mb-mj.aol.com...
> In article <a6h0pe$5me$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Then you have a very archaic view of expertise.
>
> How so? Isn't Morse widely used by hams? Doesn't "expert" mean that
someone
> is very skilled and knowledgeable in ALL aspects of something? I don't
see
> how someone could claim to be an "expert" amateur radio operator and yet
> have no Morse/CW skills. It would be like saying a driver who could not
drive
> a manual transmission vehicle was an expert driver.
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Jimbo, Jimbo join the program. You have been pronounced 'archaic' or
'legacy' even which should be your signal by the Theologian and Telephone
Sanitizers Union Code to slink into the netherworld. Your unworthy body
has been pronounced upon, now go somewhere and die.

You are dealing with people who will become instant weather critics and
take credit for the rain but don't look to them to help you caulk an ark,
or for that matter actually DO a damned thing.

When we tolerate shoddy philosophy because philosophy is an exalted
profession,
and scorn good plumbing because plumbing is a humble calling,
we will soon find that neither our theories nor our pipes hold water.

With thanks to the late John Gardner.

Dick NBK

1075. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 18:13:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C8CF3BB.8A6DFC77@earthlink.net>
Source record: 37119

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20020310140235.08822.00000590@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >
> >>Why are you "having fun" with this sort of nonsense?
> >
> >And now you are trying to control my fun!
>
> The ARRL has been attempting to CONTROL the fun of a
> hobby activity for decades.

It is true because a non-ham has CAPITALIZED IT.

> If some paid League staff employee gets his horn honked
> once in a while, he should keep the car doors shut rather
> than complain about the noise.

Yeah, Ed. Clam up and let the non-amateur amateurs tell you how things
are.

Dave K8MN

1076. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 18:17:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C8CF4B1.5CA5B950@earthlink.net>
Source record: 37120

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Oh, my, SPIN is "not" mind fornication?

I think you inserted one too many commas, Len. Did you mean,
"Oh, my SPIN is "not" mind fornication?"

Dave K8MN

1077. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 18:22:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C8CF5F9.20222656@earthlink.net>
Source record: 37121

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3C8BD06D.80D41C94@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >W1RFI wrote:
> >>
> >> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >>
> >> >No, you used my correction of your error (and elevated yourself to
> >> >victim status by tying your error to a spinal chord injury) to hurl
> >> >another insult.
> >>
> >> The word is "cord."
> >>
> >Ed, I don't type so well since that awful volleyball accident.
>
> Oh, my! It does seem to affected your personality as well!
>
> No doubt that "awful volleyball accident" left a permanent
> swelling of the ego. Tsk, tsk.

Do you refer to my pride in being a radio amateur, Len. Pass a radio amateur licensing exam--any of 'em--and you can swell with pride too, Leonardo.

> Tell us about this "accident." Did that happen while on secret
> air force duty in a commie squadron?

What does your statement mean, Len?

> Did that happen while defending the free world with morse as
> the only ham in all of Guinea-Bissau?

What does this one mean, Len?

> Were you injured by angry natives of Tanzania while unloading
> a relief-supply truck carrying volleyball sets?

What does this mean, Len?

> Please, tell all, your curriculum vitae on morsemanship is vital so
> that doubting Diogeneses out here another light to guide them.
> Tell all, beep those notes, strike that chord, be a lieder of men!

Gee, from your tone I'd have to guess that you're still smarting at having to limit your "amateur radio" activities to your postings here.

You can comfort yourself by obtaining full voting membership in one of the SWL organizations.

Dave K8MN

1078. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 19:35:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8D070A.A83BD7C0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37122

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > The idea that "they" are monitoring the thousands of amateur QSOs that take
> > place daily is ridiculous on its face.
>
> And again, you attribute statements to me that I *did not* make. You really have
> learned your trolling lessons from Cecil quite well.

Dick, has it ever occurred to you that the way you compose your statements just
might be the problem? According to you, you rarely say what you meant to say.
A small amount of care in composing your posts will alleviate the problem.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1079. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 19:40:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8D081D.F1D76E6B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37123

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > OK Dick, I give up. Which one of those new hams was dumbed down by the exams?
> > Was the engineer dumber after he took the test or was the CBer dumber after
> > he took the tests? Were you dumber after you took your tests?
>
> You can't understand the difference beteen a dumbed down test, and what results, and
> the act of making someone dumber. And still you claim to be a genius.

Since the tests obviously haven't been dumbed down, you must therefore be talking
about the test takers.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1080. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 19:49:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8D0A5B.8DC094F8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37124

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >That's the way Intel had their emergency communications organized, Dick.
>
> Did they ever have to deal with an actual emergency? Say, one where some of
> their equipment didn't work?

We didn't have an actual emergency while iEARS was in operation and I was
at Intel. We had backup equipment including generators and solar power.

> >That's the way Intel had their emergency communications organized, Dick.
> >Changing frequencies (at Intel) is a lot easier than changing modes,
>
> Not in all cases. You state it as if it were a universal fact.

I'm obviously talking about Intel iEARS. It was certainly easier for me to
change frequencies than try to learn to use a paddle during an emergency.
I have added the context back in which you trimmed out of my statement.

> >Intel
> >didn't have a straight key and, at the time, I couldn't handle the paddles.
>
> That was simply a lack of proper planning and preparation. Or somebody with an
> anti-CW/Morse agenda.

Actually it was a pro-code Extra who specified the use of a paddle only and
prohibited the use of a straight key. He said , "Real hams don't use straight keys!"
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1081. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 19:55:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8D0BB9.E1024C12@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37125

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > We are talking about hams functioning well under emergency conditions, not merely
> > bailing themselves out. I'm talking about CW emergency nets.
>
> Oh, so you don't believe it would be important that a ham might be able to minimally
> use Morse code, he isn't allowed to use it to bail himself or a group out unless he can
> handle a formal traffic net.

What I am saying is that a ham with minimal use of Morse code should not be trying to participate in a formal CW traffic net. What is it about, "I'm talking about CW emergency nets." that you don't comprehend. Ed thinks that less than 1/3 of hams are capable of successfully participating in a formal CW emergency net.

> > You really think someone can effectively use CW after not using it for half a
> > century?
>
> Well you seem to think its just fine for him to be able to not use CW at all.

I am not making a moral judgment. I am making a rational value judgment. I wish that all hams were skillful at CW, but I know in reality that they are not.

> > It is my belief that he would simply be in the way in a CW emergency
> > net.
>
> Only if he needed to pass important traffic and was unable to do so. Why should it matter
> if he is not highly skilled when he was the only means of getting the traffic handled?

Do you really think a formal CW emergency net is going to put up with a ham who sends/receives Morse code at 8wpm? Dream on.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1082. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 19:59:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8D0C92.62EDA4B0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37126

Dick Carroll wrote:
> So what? Do you really think that a formal NTS net would refuse to work a ham on
> CW who called in with emergency traffic just because he didn't follow procedures?
> Are you that unfamiliar with ham nets?

I suggest that you run your own experiment, Dick. Check into a CW traffic
net at 5wpm and see what happens. I have found that they won't even slow
down to 13wpm and don't seem to know the meaning of 'QRS'.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1083. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 20:07:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8D0E94.89B62530@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37127

N2EY wrote:
> Isn't Morse widely used by hams? Doesn't "expert" mean that someone
> is very skilled and knowledgeable in ALL aspects of something? I don't see
> how someone could claim to be an "expert" amateur radio operator and yet
> have no Morse/CW skills. It would be like saying a driver who could not drive
> a manual transmission vehicle was an expert driver.

There's absolutely nothing prohibiting a driver from being an expert in
driving automatic transmission cars. He may have attended the bodyguard
driving class without performing those driving miracles using a stick shift.
I possess engineering expertise without knowing much about civil engineering.
A field of expertise can be extremely narrow. A person can be an expert amateur
radio operator without ever having used SSB, for instance. A field of operational
expertise can be extremely narrow.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1084. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 20:09:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020311150914.06051.00000900@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 37128

From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu

>something struck me as familiar about the name - there just aren't that
>many people running around with nams like that. I remembered Valentine
>from astronomy, one of my other hobbies. Lo and behold, I looked up some
>messages from the old astro-officers list I used to belong to, and there
>he was.

And no one can possibly learn anything about astronomy by taking it up as a
hobby because there are no tests for that one at all! :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1085. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 20:12:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8D0F96.64FDBB1E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37129

mike coslo wrote:
> I can vouch that unless Dick has been deviously plotting an alternative
> identity for some time now, Valentine is indeed who he says he is.

Yep, but that doesn't keep him and Dick from being bosom buddies. IMO,
no two strangers could compose postings so similar in style and content.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1086. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 20:21:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8D11B1.6A4A7E12@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37130

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > And you Dick, clearly still don't understand that a ham
> > license is NOT a degree in anything. The license is a
> > gateway to allow the license holder to be on the air.
>
> Ah, gee Bill. The light is going on. So no one is supposed to learn
> anything meaningful without it resulting in a degree.

One is supposed to meet the requirements, Dick, and that's all. Actual
cheating is illegal. Any other procedure for meeting the requirements
is acceptable to the sovereign government of the United States of America.
If it is acceptable to the FCC, why is it unacceptable to you?

> But the Extra class was intended to be different.

You correctly used past tense, Dick. When are you going to accept that
it was past tense and stop trying to live in the past?

> Why have more than a single license if no one needs to do anything but
> get a 'gateway to get on the air'? What's the point?

Good point. Let's hear it for a single license.

> A lot of people who have already left the hobby, to be sure. Evidently
> no one at the League is very concerned, not that they could do anything
> about it anyway.

Do you know a way to do something about SK's?
>
> What this is leading up to. *IMO* is a single class license in the ARS
> that will be about as simple and easy to get as the old Class D CB
> license where you read the rules sheet, fill out a form and mail it in.

Are you willing to bet $1000 that will happen by 2005? 2010? 2020?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1087. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 20:24:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8D126E.F887027@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37131

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >But the Extra class was intended to be different. Now it no longer is,
> >evidenced by your following paragraph......
>
> The Extra Class license was never even close to being the equivalent of a
> degree in electronics, Dick. I bet you walked 5 miles to school, too.

Uphill both ways in the subzero snow, naked, on his hands and knees, with
hungry wolves nipping at his heels.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1088. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 20:28:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8D1380.7A50B8C4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37132

Dick Carroll wrote:
> But I know from past experience that before your time an Extra
> class license test
> was condsidered, (this I was told by an FCC district engineer) to be at least
> as difficult as
> a First Class Radiotelephone License, which was required to be chief engineer
> of a commercial radio or TV station. So your assertion that nothing has changed
> comes up VERY lame.
> I'm sure that were that FCC district engineer still alive today he would
> hold quite different beliefs.

Consider that commercial radio or TV stations no longer require a First Class
Radiotelephone Licensee and the commercial radio license Q&A are published
for all to see. You wish things wouldn't have changed, Dick, but they have.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1089. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 20:57:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020311155700.08328.00000108@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 37133

In article <3C8554D7.F4B1173A@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

> So you disagree? If so, please explain for us YOUR interpretation of the rule
>prohibiting codes and ciphers on ham radio.

"Codes and ciphers?!?" :-)

What "rule" is that?

FCC regulations clearly permit International Morse Code mode
on all amateur bands except for a small portion of the 1.25m band.

No US radio amateur may transmit anything "intended to obscure
the meaning" of a communication.

"Codes and ciphers?" I don't think so. Isn't there a CODE test
for two of the three US amateur licenses?

1090. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 20:57:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020311155702.08328.00000109@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 37134

In article <20020310202753.21366.00000884@mb-cv.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>Jim Haynie thought it reasonable that no ARRL Hq person should
>>give opinions in here. Of course, that was in private mail that
>>ensued after he popped in here shortly after his election.
>
>Interesting. Jim knows that I hang out on rrap and he hasn't had a problem
>with that. He didn't have a problem when I didn't post here for 6 months,
either.

...then Haynie changed his mind over several years.

It is obviously good to have as many propaganda outlets as possible.

>>Should there be an official ARRL poll on that
>>or are we to conclude that "his interest is zero" applies
>>to everything concerning the ARRL's appearance to the
>>outside world?
>
>That would be a ridiculous conclusion. If that is the best you can do, you
>have lost this one.
>
>>Many have "already bought it" long before I came into this chat
>>room.
>
>My goodness, you mean that all those people who are not ARRL members read
>rrap and think I am an ARRL apologist?

Some DO think that. Try to live with it. Everyone else must.

>>How many individuals or local clubs could afford the legal fees to
>>contact the FCC in a formal way in the before-Internet days?
>
>All it ever took was a letter. Another ridiculous conclusion. You lose.

No "loss." All it takes to confirm that is a trip to the FCC Reading Room and do a letter count and letter origin tally on previous FCC requests for Comment on past amateur-radio-related issues.

Is it a "ridiculous conclusion" based on over 2600 individual Comments exclusive of the ARRL's on 98-143?

>>How
>>many non-legal amateurs knew of the proper format of legal filing

>>in order to gain recognition and consideration before the
>>Commission?
>
>ARRL put that information in its FCC Rule Book and would gladly tell someone
>how to file comments. You lose that point, too.

Again, no "loss." If "all it took was a letter," why does the ARRL
have a legal firm representing them in DC?

Why does the ARRL insist on being a "middleman" in "how to file
comments?" The FCC explains the procedures directly on its
website.

>>The "last time we went through this" I said about the same as I had
>>on previous times...that the ARRL is now LOSING some of the
>>exclusivity in representation when the FCC has made it much
>>easier for everyone to comment to them directly.
>
>And a good thing that is. That is why ARRL asks hams to make their views
>known in FCC filings.

Question repeat #1: Why does the ARRL keep a legal firm in DC
if "all it takes is a letter?" Can't the ARRL Hq staff compose a
"letter?"

Question repeat #2: Why does the ARRL have it OWN "FCC rule
book" when the FCC has its own rule book available free for
download and explains the procedure and format for Comments?

>Yeah, there is "spin" going on, Len, but it is all yours. You will say
>anything, no matter how distorted or ridiculous, to try to defame ARRL.

Tsk, tsk. I'm just asking questions.

>>I'm trying to get exact answers. I don't get those. What I get are
>>standard boilerplate "the ARRL can do no wrong" misdirections
>>into other areas.
>
>ARRL can do wrong. And calling opinion different from yours "misdirection"
>is a pretty feeble debating tactic. You lose again.

"Misdirection?" I've asked direct questions. I get so few answers
but am bombarded with misdirection that I've come to the
conclusion that direct answers on specifics are only answerable
by attempts to promote ancilliary subjects. In other words, "spin."

>If you wish to believe that I am controlling your mind, that is your choice.

Not possible. :-)

See the misdirection above? I've made a direct statement that the
ARRL has controlled the opinions of its members and others since
it was first formed. I've shown a few examples of such control and
influence. I've had vociferous denials of same from believers and

the usual misdirection into personal attacks.

What is almost always overlooked is that a large organization MUST try to influence others that it is the "best" organization. That is not "bad," just survival. Spin and opinion-influence techniques are not "bad," just standard practice in politics and in advertising. Those are all-pervasive in our society.

What many consider "bad" are the holier-than-thou pronouncements that an organization survivor that an activity could only succeed and continue on the basis of that organization's "leadership" and "representation." That includes self-defining phraseology that it deems itself "important" to all of amateur radio...because it pronounces itself to be so. The ARRL does not readily accept negative criticism as a group, a common failing in entrenched organizations having survived a long competitive history of various amateur organizations. That is a common failing due to its very human officials...they can do little wrong...just ask them.

After all these years (88) the ARRL still only "represents" less than a quarter of all licensed US radio amateurs. The ARRL is almost the oldest organization in radio and is certainly the largest devoted to amateur radio. It would seem logical that its membership should be higher than it is. The old spin tactics don't seem to have been that good. Maybe its time for some truth for a change...

1091. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 21:26:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020311162629.08328.00000110@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 37135

In article <3C8CF5F9.20222656@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3C8BD06D.80D41C94@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >W1RFI wrote:
>> >>
>> >> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>> >>
>> >> >No, you used my correction of your error (and elevated yourself to
>> >> >victim status by tying your error to a spinal chord injury) to hurl
>> >> >another insult.
>> >>
>> >> The word is "cord."
>> >
>> >Ed, I don't type so well since that awful volleyball accident.
>>
>> Oh, my! It does seem to affected your personality as well!
>>
>> No doubt that "awful volleyball accident" left a permanent
>> swelling of the ego. Tsk, tsk.
>
>Do you refer to my pride in being a radio amateur, Len. Pass a radio
>amateur licensing exam--any of 'em--and you can swell with pride too,
>Leonardo.

There are very few who can swell as much as lil Davie. :-)

>> Tell us about this "accident." Did that happen while on secret
>> air force duty in a commie squadron?
>
>What does your statement mean, Len?

Why does lil Davie "answer" a question with another question?

Let me rephrase it since "commie squadron" is an old military
nickname for "communications squadron."

Did that "accident" happen while on duty in the air force in a
communications squadron?

Perhaps it was "while doing work for NASA?"

>> Did that happen while defending the free world with morse as
>> the only ham in all of Guinea-Bissau?
>
>What does this one mean, Len?

Oh, my, lil Davie is all a-twitter again.

What does lil Davie's question mean?

>> Were you injured by angry natives of Tanzania while unloading
>> a relief-supply truck carrying volleyball sets?
>
>What does this mean, Len?

What does lil Davie's question mean? :-)

>Gee, from your tone I'd have to guess that you're still smarting at
>having to limit your "amateur radio" activities to your postings here.

Tsk, tsk, bad setting of lil Davie's tone control. :-)

Actually, there are no such "limits," but lil Davie is not content to
remain at anchor like the old blimp gas bags...he has to ignite
himself and flame all over whenever someone brings a needle
into his vicinity. Tsk, tsk, so sensitive! The Hindenburg II...

>You can comfort yourself by obtaining full voting membership in one of
>the SWL organizations.

Now why should one have to do that?

I have full voting privileges in the IEEE. I'm a professional in radio.

I thought it might be fun to have an amateur radio license as
well as a commercial license, but that "fun" concept seems to
have disappeared after certain others stepped in, swelled to a
straining point with their mighty DX accomplishments, dictating
their new regulations on "fun."

The "fun" seems to be a strict obediance to the new obersturm-
bandsfuhrers swaggering about with sticks at the ready, snarling
orders on what others should "enjoy." They are superior for they
have told everyone they are. All must believe them.

Gruss gott...

1092. Re: ARS Licensing in the USA Since WW2

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 22:00:23 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8q96ra36n7bf6@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37136

N2EY wrote :

A Brief History of Amateur Radio Licensing In The USA Since WW2 (1946-2002)

Thanks MUCH for putting this on!

Val Germann
Columbia, Missouri

1093. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 22:07:19 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0203111407.38c74090@posting.google.com>
Source record: 37137

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<O36j8.5395$Ex5.556782@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020311001033.08046.00000163@mb-mj.aol.com...
> > In article <a6h0pe$5me$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> > <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >
> > >Then you have a very archaic view of expertise.
> >
> > How so? Isn't Morse widely used by hams? Doesn't "expert" mean that
> someone
> > is very skilled and knowledgeable in ALL aspects of something? I don't
> see
> > how someone could claim to be an "expert" amateur radio operator and yet
> > have no Morse/CW skills. It would be like saying a driver who could not
> drive
> > a manual transmission vehicle was an expert driver.
> >
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
> Jimbo, Jimbo join the program. You have been pronounced 'archaic' or
> 'legacy' even which should be your signal by the Theologian and Telephone
> Sanitizers Union Code to slink into the netherworld. Your unworthy body
> has been pronounced upon, now go somewhere and die.

Not me! I'm younger and probably healthier than most of those who would
pronounce upon me. And I know where my towel is.

> You are dealing with people who will become instant weather critics and
> take credit for the rain but don't look to them to help you caulk an ark,
> or for that matter actually DO a damned thing.

"bell the cat", in other words.
>
> When we tolerate shoddy philosophy because philosophy is an exalted
> profession,
> and scorn good plumbing because plumbing is a humble calling,
> we will soon find that neither our theories nor our pipes hold water.
>
> With thanks to the late John Gardner.

Yeah verily.

Also:

"The more complicated they make the plumbing, the easier it is to stop up the drain" - Montogomery Scott

73 de Jim, N2EY

1094. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 22:15:15 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0203111415.683195ac@posting.google.com>
Source record: 37138

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C8D0C92.62EDA4B0@IEEE.org>...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > So what? Do you really think that a formal NTS net would refuse to work a ham on
> > CW who called in with emergency traffic just because he didn't follow procedures?
> > Are you that unfamiliar with ham nets?
>
> I suggest that you run your own experiment, Dick. Check into a CW traffic
> net at 5wpm and see what happens. I have found that they won't even slow
> down to 13wpm and don't seem to know the meaning of 'QRS'.

I have found the opposite - IF you check into a slow/training net. We have had one here in EPA (PTTN) for longer than I've been a ham. It precedes the regular section net. I learned traffic handling on PTTN and refined my skills on EPA. Was regular 3RN rep for a while. Even went to EAN a couple times.

And did lots of it with a straight key and homebrew rigs.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1095. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 22:22:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8D2E36.31FD5958@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37139

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > I suggest that you run your own experiment, Dick. Check into a CW traffic
> > net at 5wpm and see what happens. I have found that they won't even slow
> > down to 13wpm and don't seem to know the meaning of 'QRS'.
>
> I have found the opposite - IF you check into a slow/training net.

We are not talking about slow/training nets, Jim. The point is that
a bona fide emergency CW traffic net will not tolerate a 5wpm operator
anymore than a bona fide US emergency SSB traffic net will tolerate
an operator who speaks broken English.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1096. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 22:23:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020311172340.21386.00000813@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 37140

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>>Interesting. Jim knows that I hang out on rrap and he hasn't had a problem
>>with that. He didn't have a problem when I didn't post here for 6 months,
>either.

>...then Haynie changed his mind over several years.

Not at all. He does not believe that ARRL should have a presence on rrap. Our internet outlet is the ARRL web page. He does not have the right to tell me where I spend my personal time, nor would he want to.

>It is obviously good to have as many propaganda outlets as possible.

Yeah, but if I were the ARRL propaganda outlet, I wouldn't have time to work on RFI.

>>My goodness, you mean that all those people who are not ARRL members read
>>rrap and think I am an ARRL apologist?

>Some DO think that. Try to live with it. Everyone else must.

Whew, only "some" now. You had me worried for a bit. "Some" think that ARRL has Ed Hare be their secret propaganda outlet on rec.radio.amateur.policy, too. I can live with it just fine, thanks.

>Is it a "ridiculous conclusion" based on over 2600 individual Comments
>exclusive of the ARRL's on 98-143?

That is great, Len. I am glad that each and every ham with a view sent that view to the FCC. QST and every other ARRL outlet asked hams to do just that.

>Again, no "loss." If "all it took was a letter," why does the ARRL
>have a legal firm representing them in DC?

To write the letter, Len. Duh!

>Why does the ARRL insist on being a "middleman" in "how to file
>comments?" The FCC explains the procedures directly on its
>website.

Um, the same website that ARRL links to in the part of ITS website that tells hams how to file comments? You are seeing the Devil behind every bush!

>Question repeat #1: Why does the ARRL keep a legal firm in DC
>if "all it takes is a letter?" Can't the ARRL Hq staff compose a
>"letter?"

Sure, I compose them all the time, but not for FCC filings. Chris composes them better and he knows the law. We have a deal; he doesn't tell hams how to fix RFI problems and I don't tell him how to represent ARRL with the FCC.

>Question repeat #2: Why does the ARRL have it OWN "FCC rule
>book" when the FCC has its own rule book available free for
>download and explains the procedure and format for Comments?

Because hams want to buy it. Those that do apparently prefer the plain language explanations to the rules.

>Tsk, tsk. I'm just asking questions.

Well, there you go. You did, after all, chastize me for asking questions, now, di'n't'cha?

>>If you wish to believe that I am controlling your mind, that is your choice.

>Not possible. :-)

>See the misdirection above? I've made a direct statement that the
>ARRL has controlled the opinions of its members and others since
>it was first formed.

I think that most members would feel that it is "not possible" that ARRL exerts some sort of mind control over them, Len.

>What is almost always overlooked is that a large organization MUST
>try to influence others that it is the "best" organization.

Big difference between "opinion" and "influence" and "control," Len. Talk about misdirection!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1097. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 22:24:50 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020311172450.21386.00000814@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 37141

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Uphill both ways in the subzero snow, naked, on his hands and knees, with
>hungry wolves nipping at his heels.

Forgot the barbed wire on those bare feet for traction! :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1098. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 22:26:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C8D2EF3.C397D836@earthlink.net>
Source record: 37142

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3C8CF5F9.20222656@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3C8BD06D.80D41C94@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >W1RFI wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >> >>
> >> >> >No, you used my correction of your error (and elevated yourself to
> >> >> >victim status by tying your error to a spinal chord injury) to hurl
> >> >> >another insult.
> >> >>
> >> >> The word is "cord."
> >> >
> >> >Ed, I don't type so well since that awful volleyball accident.
> >>
> >> Oh, my! It does seem to affected your personality as well!
> >>
> >> No doubt that "awful volleyball accident" left a permanent
> >> swelling of the ego. Tsk, tsk.
> >
> >Do you refer to my pride in being a radio amateur, Len. Pass a radio
> >amateur licensing exam--any of 'em--and you can swell with pride too,
> >Leonardo.
>
> There are very few who can swell as much as lil Davie. :-)

Anyone who has attained an amatreur radio license is entitled to pride
in that achievement. Perhaps you can share in that pride at some point.

> >> Tell us about this "accident." Did that happen while on secret
> >> air force duty in a commie squadron?
> >
> >What does your statement mean, Len?
>
> Why does lil Davie "answer" a question with another question?

Well, Leondardo, most of the time when someone answers a question with a question, he doesn't understand what the questioner meant.

> Let me rephrase it since "commie squadron" is an old military
> nickname for "communications squadron."

I was attached to the 46th Communications Squadron for two years. During that period, I never heard anyone refer to it as a "commie squadron". Either your quaint name for such an organization is a) archaic useage, b) used in the Army and not the Air Force or c) is BS.

> Did that "accident" happen while on duty in the air force in a
> communications squadron?

You writing a book?

> Perhaps it was "while doing work for NASA?"

...leave this chapter out and make it a mystery.

> >> Did that happen while defending the free world with morse as
> >> the only ham in all of Guinea-Bissau?
> >
> >What does this one mean, Len?
>
> Oh, my, lil Davie is all a-twitter again.

> What does lil Davie's question mean?

It indicates that I don't know what you mean by your question.

> >> Were you injured by angry natives of Tanzania while unloading
> >> a relief-supply truck carrying volleyball sets?
> >
> >What does this mean, Len?
>
> What does lil Davie's question mean? :-)

Who is lil Davy?

> >Gee, from your tone I'd have to guess that you're still smarting at
> >having to limit your "amateur radio" activities to your postings here.
>
> Tsk, tsk, bad setting of lil Davie's tone control. :-)

I didn't use the tone. You did. Who is lil Davy?

> Actually, there are no such "limits," but lil Davie is not content to
> remain at anchor like the old blimp gas bags...he has to ignite
> himself and flame all over whenever someone brings a needle
> into his vicinity. Tsk, tsk, so sensitive! The Hindenburg II...

Sure there are limits, Len. What do you have to do with amateur radio other than posting your lengthy diatribes in this venue? Who is lil Davy?

> >You can comfort yourself by obtaining full voting membership in one of
> >the SWL organizations.
>
> Now why should one have to do that?

So you wouldn't feel obliged to take pot shots at the ARRL. You don't seem to care for the fact that as a non-licensed person, you would not be permitted full voting privileges as an Associate Member of the League.

> I have full voting privileges in the IEEE. I'm a professional in radio.

I know it has been pointed out to you before: This isn't a "professional" radio newsgroup. This is an amateur radio newsgroup. Why not go blow smoke in the rec.radio.ieee or alt.ima.professional.radio.guy newsgroups?

> I thought it might be fun to have an amateur radio license as
> well as a commercial license, but that "fun" concept seems to
> have disappeared after certain others stepped in, swelled to a
> straining point with their mighty DX accomplishments, dictating
> their new regulations on "fun."

So what'd the fun go out of, ham radio licenses or commercial licenses? It wasn't clear from your comment. If it is ham radio which is a disappointment to you, let me wish you luck in finding a suitable new hobby--one where others will appreciate having a newcomer walk on their traditions, find constant fault with long time participants and with their largest and oldest membership organizations and having you, as a beginner, tell them how things should be. I'm sure that there are any number of endeavors where a guy like you would be welcomed with a hearty handshake.

> The "fun" seems to be a strict obediance to the new obersturm-
> bandsfuhrers swaggering about with sticks at the ready, snarling
> orders on what others should "enjoy." They are superior for they
> have told everyone they are. All must believe them.
>
> Gruss gott...

...maybe rose gardening would be to your liking. "Good Old Mr. Wilson!" Is this the part where you claim to be a "happy old man"?

Dave K8MN

1099. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 23:03:00 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8qcs3lr2nnf23@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37143

W1RFI wrote:

>And no one can possibly learn anything about astronomy by
>taking it up as a hobby because there are no tests for that
>one at all! :-)
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

This is worth a thread all by itself. That is, testing is hardly necessary for amateur astronomy because one cannot harm or interfere with anyone else simply by observing astronomical objects with a telescope. And one is not using the publicly owned airwaves, divvied up by law, in so observing. "Learning" in Ham Practice has a PUBLIC dimension that totally separates it from other avocations, in my view. And the deliberate "dumbing down" of the tests risks unfortunate effects in the public realm having to do with the ultimate usefullness and even survival of Ham Radio itself, or significant parts of it. Yes, this comparison is worth a thread all to its lonesome.

I wonder what one- or two-line response Mr. Hare will have to this post? I'm beginning to get interested in his strange economy where important issues are concerned.

Val Germann
Columbia, Missouri

**

1100. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-11 23:07:26 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8qd4naq25lh76@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37144

W1RFI wrote:

>Let's ask Kim a question. Kim, have you learned anything
>about radio technology and operating since you became a ham?
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Now, you see, this is an entirely different question than the one revolving around the tests. Sure, anyone passing the tech test and buying a radio, and then using it, is going to learn SOMETHING, if only how to push a PTT switch. However, the quality of that learning, and its ultimate level, will in large part be determined by the quality of the people the original vetting procedure allows into Ham Radio. I think that is patently obvious and gets at the root of the problem.

Val Germann
Columbia, Missouri

**

1101. CRe: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 00:26:56 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <kXbj8.5934$Ex5.605481@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37145

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u8qd4naq25lh76@corp.supernews.com...
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> >Let's ask Kim a question. Kim, have you learned anything
> >about radio technology and operating since you became a ham?
> >
> >73,
> >Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Now, you see, this is an entirely different question than the
> one revolving around the tests. Sure, anyone passing the
> tech test and buying a radio, and then using it, is going to
> learn SOMETHING, if only how to push a PTT switch.
> However, the quality of that learning, and its ultimate level,
> will in large part be determined by the quality of the people
> the original vetting procedure allows into Ham Radio. I think
> that is patently obvious and gets at the root of the problem.
>
> Val Germann
> Columbia, Missouri
>

While I tend to agree with most of your input, I think you are expecting too much of the testing process. Kim is a juvenile airhead to be sure but I have been licensed as many here have since I WAS a juvenile and probably something of a geek at that. So vetting is too strong a term and concept to unload on a testing process. And of course the upright citizen may in the course of time become a depressive, alcoholic, meth-freak, or even an uncontrolled diabetic (yes, I have seen exactly that) so the test lacks the power to vet anyone on a permanent basis.

And even among the anti-social types having them in the tent pissing out has something to be said for it as opposed to (see 27 MHz) having them outside the tent pissing in.

The reduction in the code to 5wpm did not really seem to lower the barrier it presented. I have contended that it, like embarassment and boredom, is something one does to himself. So if you are of a mindset that being a good poseur equals (or betters - see Enron) actually doing anything it is a hell of a barrier to mewl, moan, whine, and agitate against and marshall all of your pseudo-learning to attack. And in fact we have seen just that: you will soon join the Group W bench with all the mother-rapers, father-rapers, and litterers -- you just haven't been around long enough.

You will also see Lifer Tech Syndrome. There are those that in preference to actually doing something that admittedly makes not a lot of regulatory sense (but few exams do) will over-compensate to the point of the absurd. These are guys who will join everything including applying for a medical waiver to QCWA, make annual pilgrimages to Dayton and HP Maxim's grave, and become instant geniuses on things like the regs, 160 grayline propagation, and (wait for it) digital techniques. Anything to achieve 'equality' but a blessed code test.

In a previous life, I played tournament bridge -- an easy game to play but a difficult one to play well. The secret to success is count, count, count and play with people better than you both to learn something and because they can be trusted not to do something stupid and insert a random event into things. But card games, to whatever extent they are still played, have been deteriorating for over two centuries. Bridge is a mixture of two other games, one of which was Whist (over which the sandwich was invented by the Earl of Sandwich) which one learns to play by now and again getting stuck in an absolutely atrocious position and playing your way out of it. Much like driving, one achieves success after a succession of brown stains in the shorts. It is now played mostly in the black community so when you play against a strong black pair you may find the bidding ridiculous but they will steal your socks without removing your shoes on the play of the hand.

Now how do you set up an exam system to weed out those who are not about to lose face and ego in the process of aquiring the brown stains???
Damfino

Dick N&#65533;BK

1102. Re: Thanks, AC6V

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 00:48:30 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020311194830.06911.00000778@mb-cm.aol.com>
Source record: 37146

>I just wanted to express my gratitude and appreciation to AC6V for what
>has got to be THE finest "one-stop-shopping" web site for Amateur and other
>radio hobbyists.
>
> I started going thru QST for some sites to do some comaparitive shopping
>when a friend of mine reminded me about this site.
>
> All I can say is....WOW!
>
> Thank-you, Mr. Dinkins!
>
>73
>
>Steve, K4YZ

Hi Steve,

What's the website? He's got two associated with his QRZ bio, but I don't think either is the one you're talking about. Take care and 73.

Mark

1103. Re: ARS Licensing in the USA Since WW2

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 01:10:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020311201045.22805.00000147@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 37147

In article <u8q96ra36n7bf6@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote :
>
>A Brief History of Amateur Radio Licensing In The USA Since WW2 (1946-2002)
>
>
>Thanks MUCH for putting this on!
>
You're welcome, Val. Part 4 will appear as soon as it's done being revised.

If you would like more detail, just ask.

For a more thorough history of amateur radio in general, search the web for
"The Wayback Machine" by William Continelli, W2XOY.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1104. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 01:10:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020311201046.22805.00000148@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 37148

In article <3C8D0E94.89B62530@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Isn't Morse widely used by hams? Doesn't "expert" mean that someone
>> is very skilled and knowledgeable in ALL aspects of something? I don't see
>> how someone could claim to be an "expert" amateur radio operator and yet
>> have no Morse/CW skills. It would be like saying a driver who could not
>drive
>> a manual transmission vehicle was an expert driver.
>
>There's absolutely nothing prohibiting a driver from being an expert in
>driving automatic transmission cars.

Of course. But that person would not be an expert car driver. He/she would be
an expert automatic transmission car driver.

>He may have attended the bodyguard
>driving class without performing those driving miracles using a stick shift.

Sure. Which means that if called upon to do them with a manual transmission
car,
he/she may not be able to do so.

>I possess engineering expertise without knowing much about civil engineering.

Which means that you're not an engineering expert. You might be a digital
engineering
expert, however.

>A field of expertise can be extremely narrow. A person can be an expert
>amateur radio operator without ever having used SSB, for instance.

Nope. Maybe an "expert amateur radio CW operator" or "expert amateur radio
digital
operator", or something similar.

>A field of operational
>expertise can be extremely narrow.
>--
Of course - but it must be specified as such.

btw, in June 1989 QST I was decreed to be a "definitive expert".

73 de Jim, N2EY

1105. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 02:01:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C8D618B.2BB73D2E@adelphia.net>
Source record: 37149

But that's okay, Cecil. I actually think that Dick is a decent fellow. I think you're alright too.

Now are both of you going to accuse me of being a poor judge of character? 8^)

- Mike - KB3EIA xtra lite

CAM wrote:
>
> mike coslo wrote:
> > I can vouch that unless Dick has been deviously plotting an alternative
> > identity for some time now, Valentine is indeed who he says he is.
>
> Yep, but that doesn't keep him and Dick from being bosom buddies. IMO,
> no two strangers could compose postings so similar in style and content.

1106. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 02:18:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C8D657B.52DF422D@adelphia.net>
Source record: 37150

Now I begin to see what is happening. I think it is unfortunate that some people would let "others" dictate their enjoyment of a fine hobby. It doesn't have to be that way. In any hobby, there are a fair share of unsavory characters. It is sad if a person allows them to destroy their enjoyment of the hobby. It is doubly sad if a person doesn't even start a hobby because they see the activities of a few, and mistakenly believe all are that way.

- Mike - KB3EIA

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Len Over 21 wrote:

<Some snippage>

> > I thought it might be fun to have an amateur radio license as
> > well as a commercial license, but that "fun" concept seems to
> > have disappeared after certain others stepped in, swelled to a
> > straining point with their mighty DX accomplishments, dictating
> > their new regulations on "fun."
>
> So what'd the fun go out of, ham radio licenses or commercial licenses?
> It wasn't clear from your comment. If it is ham radio which is a
> disappointment to you, let me wish you luck in finding a suitable new
> hobby--one where others will appreciate having a newcomer walk on their
> traditions, find constant fault with long time participants and with
> their largest and oldest membership organizations and having you, as a
> beginner, tell them how things should be. I'm sure that there are any
> number of endeavors where a guy like you would be welcomed with a hearty
> handshake.
>
> > The "fun" seems to be a strict obediance to the new obersturm-
> > bandsfuhrers swaggering about with sticks at the ready, snarling
> > orders on what others should "enjoy." They are superior for they
> > have told everyone they are. All must believe them.
> >
> > Gruss gott...
>
> ...maybe rose gardening would be to your liking. "Good Old Mr. Wilson!"
> Is this the part where you claim to be a "happy old man"?
>
> Dave K8MN

1107. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 02:26:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C86CFEE.C1D273E9@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37151

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > The idea that "they" are monitoring the thousands of amateur QSOs that take
> > > place daily is ridiculous on its face.
> >
> > And again, you attribute statements to me that I *did not* make. You really have
> > learned your trolling lessons from Cecil quite well.
>
> Dick, has it ever occurred to you that the way you compose your statements just
> might be the problem? According to you, you rarely say what you meant to say.
> A small amount of care in composing your posts will alleviate the problem.

I'm truly beginning to believe that both you and Ed are a pair of real dumshits.
Should I have to fully explain what the FCC has held as a given for long years, that
no ham should be free to do anything he wishes on ham radio? And why?
I can't be responble for your lack of knowledge of history. OR the present.

1108. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 02:56:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8D6E69.A5A16896@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37152

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Dick, has it ever occurred to you that the way you compose your statements just
> > might be the problem? According to you, you rarely say what you meant to say.
> > A small amount of care in composing your posts will alleviate the problem.
>
> I'm truly beginning to believe that both you and Ed are a pair of real dumshits.
> Should I have to fully explain what the FCC has held as a given for long years, that
> no ham should be free to do anything he wishes on ham radio?

But, you see, that's not the same thing that you said before.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1109. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 02:58:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C86A2DF.7F215342@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37153

CAM wrote:

> > It is my belief that he would simply be in the way in a CW emergency

> > > net.
> >
> > Only if he needed to pass important traffic and was unable to do so. Why should it matter
> > if he is not highly skilled when he was the only means of getting the traffic handled?
>
> Do you really think a formal CW emergency net is going to put up with a ham who sends/
> receives Morse code at 8wpm? Dream on.
> --

In an emergency? It would be criminal for them to fail to take care of him. You obviously don't know very much about CW operations nor operators.

1110. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 02:58:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C86A32D.2A61DF2E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37154

W1RFI wrote:

> From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
> >something struck me as familiar about the name - there just aren't that
> >many people running around with nams like that. I remembered Valentine
> >from astronomy, one of my other hobbies. Lo and behold, I looked up some
> >messages from the old astro-officers list I used to belong to, and there
> >he was.
>
> And no one can possibly learn anything about astronomy by taking it up as a
> hobby because there are no tests for that one at all! :-)

And their licenses come from Wheaties box tops.

1111. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 02:58:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C86A360.37394D95@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37155

CAM wrote:

> mike coslo wrote:
> > I can vouch that unless Dick has been deviously plotting an alternative
> > identity for some time now, Valentine is indeed who he says he is.
>
> Yep, but that doesn't keep him and Dick from being bosom buddies. IMO,
> no two strangers could compose postings so similar in style and content.
>

So much for your opinion.

1112. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 02:58:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C86A3B6.CCA97D00@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37156

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > And you Dick, clearly still don't understand that a ham
> > > license is NOT a degree in anything. The license is a
> > > gateway to allow the license holder to be on the air.
> >
> > Ah, gee Bill. The light is going on. So no one is supposed to learn
> > anything meaningful without it resulting in a degree.
>
> One is supposed to meet the requirements, Dick, and that's all. Actual
> cheating is illegal. Any other procedure for meeting the requirements
> is acceptable to the sovereign government of the United States of America.
> If it is acceptable to the FCC, why is it unacceptable to you?
>
> > But the Extra class was intended to be different.
>
> You correctly used past tense, Dick. When are you going to accept that
> it was past tense and stop trying to live in the past?
>

So you *DO* agree that it has been dumbed down!

1113. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 02:58:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C86A5C2.96AF1B1D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37157

CAM wrote:

>
> We are not talking about slow/training nets, Jim. The point is that
> a bona fide emergency CW traffic net will not tolerate a 5wpm operator
> anymore than a bona fide US emergency SSB traffic net will tolerate
> an operator who speaks broken English.

You have no idea what you're talking about, in either case. I've heard both
those exact
things happen on the air. In fact, I've heard a slow CW station break into a SSB
traffic net and be recognized, and worked. It's the nocoders who are ethnocentric
about modes.

1114. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 02:58:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C86A77A.E362FCE6@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37158

Dave Heil wrote:

> Well, Leondardo,

Dave, are you dukin' it out with Learnardo di Raunchy again? Why don't you guys just allow him to slide back under his rock and hibernate, again? He'll do it if ya'll just ignore him for awhile...

1115. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 02:58:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C86A94F.50728130@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37159

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > But I know from past experience that before your time an Extra
> > class license test
> > was condsidered, (this I was told by an FCC district engineer) to be at least
> > as difficult as
> > a First Class Radiotelephone License, which was required to be chief engineer
> > of a commercial radio or TV station. So your assertion that nothing has changed
> > comes up VERY lame.
> > I'm sure that were that FCC district engineer still alive today he would
> > hold quite different beliefs.
>
> Consider that commercial radio or TV stations no longer require a First Class
> Radiotelephone Licensee

Yep. The owner is free to do it all himself, or ignore it as he wishes (and dares risk a citation in the rare event a Commission inspector shows up unannounced). Lobbying does
work, doesn't it? No one knows how many of them have fried themselves. And proper equipment maintenance is NOT getting done at many stations.

> and the commercial radio license Q&A are published
> for all to see.

Yep. Some examinees think the tests are hard, too.

> You wish things wouldn't have changed, Dick, but they have.

You wish I wish. I love lots of it, but some of it that you love stinks.

1116. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 02:58:54 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C86D185.5549B5DA@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37160

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > And you Dick, clearly still don't understand that a ham
> > > license is NOT a degree in anything. The license is a
> > > gateway to allow the license holder to be on the air.
> >
> > Ah, gee Bill. The light is going on. So no one is supposed to learn
> > anything meaningful without it resulting in a degree.
>
> One is supposed to meet the requirements, Dick, and that's all. Actual
> cheating is illegal. Any other procedure for meeting the requirements
> is acceptable to the sovereign government of the United States of America.
> If it is acceptable to the FCC, why is it unacceptable to you?
>
> > But the Extra class was intended to be different.
>
> You correctly used past tense, Dick. When are you going to accept that
> it was past tense and stop trying to live in the past?
>
> > Why have more than a single license if no one needs to do anything but
> > get a 'gateway to get on the air'? What's the point?
>
> Good point. Let's hear it for a single license.
>
> > A lot of people who have already left the hobby, to be sure. Evidently
> > no one at the League is very concerned, not that they could do anything
> > about it anyway.
>
> Do you know a way to do something about SK's?
> >
> > What this is leading up to. *IMO* is a single class license in the ARS
> > that will be about as simple and easy to get as the old Class D CB
> > license where you read the rules sheet, fill out a form and mail it in.
>
> Are you willing to bet $1000 that will happen by 2005? 2010? 2020?

Are you kidding? With an FCC that vacillates from high qualification for
hams to virtually none? What might their lone easily swayed ham decide next
week? Could anyone feel safe with ANY sort of bet on them? Not me. I'm, just
"contemplating my navel".

1117. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 02:58:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C86D248.E4B34305@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37161

Valentine Germann wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:
>
> >Let's ask Kim a question. Kim, have you learned anything
> >about radio technology and operating since you became a ham?
> >
> >73,
> >Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Now, you see, this is an entirely different question than the
> one revolving around the tests. Sure, anyone passing the
> tech test and buying a radio, and then using it, is going to
> learn SOMETHING, if only how to push a PTT switch.
> However, the quality of that learning, and its ultimate level,
> will in large part be determined by the quality of the people
> the original vetting procedure allows into Ham Radio. I think
> that is patently obvious and gets at the root of the problem.

Well stated. Indeed it does get to the root of the problem, one the
ARRL *and* the FCC would very much prefer to completely ignore, and
pretend didn't exist.

1118. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 03:05:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8D706F.BDD8CD66@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37162

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >There's absolutely nothing prohibiting a driver from being an expert in
> >driving automatic transmission cars.
>
> Of course. But that person would not be an expert car driver. He/she would be
> an expert automatic transmission car driver.

Uhhhhhhhhh Jim, an automatic transmission car is still a car. An expert automatic transmission car driver is an expert driver of *a* car.

> Which means that you're not an engineering expert.

I won't say I still am, but I once was an expert engineer. Depending on the context, the field may be irrelevant.

> >A field of operational expertise can be extremely narrow.

> Of course - but it must be specified as such.

Why? If someone is an expert on anything, he *is* an expert.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1119. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 03:07:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8D710B.1656EF1F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37163

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> >And no one can possibly learn anything about astronomy by
> >taking it up as a hobby because there are no tests for that
> >one at all! :-)
> >
> This is worth a thread all by itself. That is, testing is hardly
> necessary for amateur astronomy because one cannot harm
> or interfere with anyone else simply by observing astronomical
> objects with a telescope.

So it looks like safety, interference knowledge, and rules/regulations
is virtually all a ham needs to know. I've been saying that for years.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1120. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 03:15:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8D72BD.F9E8ED05@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37164

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Do you really think a formal CW emergency net is going to put up with a ham who sends/
> > receives Morse code at 8wpm? Dream on.
>
> In an emergency? It would be criminal for them to fail to take care of him. You obviously
> don't know very much about CW operations nor operators.

Please pay attention. The 8wpm guy is 200 miles away from the emergency location and is trying jump in and be part of the emergency net that is trying to help the people in the emergency area. If you were net control, what would you tell him?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1121. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 03:19:07 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c8ec748_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 37269

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C844AFE.D584F135@worldnet.att.net...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
> >
> > >Some people, perhaps "many" people, will do almost
> > >ANYTHING rather than truly learn the material.
> >
> > So you believe "many" people want to become amateur operators so they
won't
> > learn anything?
>
> You might ask W5TIT what she thinks, or better yet, reread what she has
> already said
> about ham radio testing.
>

Dick, don't even pretend that I endorse your thoughts of ham radio testing. I am of the firm opinion that testing does nothing to prove technical aptitude, it only proves that there is an understanding of materials that have been studied--whether by rote memorization or longer methods of information retention.

I am also a firm believer that everything to being a ham happens *after* one has passed the tests and has their ham radio license. I think you'll find that if you reread the posts I've made on this subject that is all I've ever said.

Kim W5TIT

1122. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 03:21:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8D742E.3067C8C7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37165

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > We are not talking about slow/training nets, Jim. The point is that
> > a bona fide emergency CW traffic net will not tolerate a 5wpm operator
> > anymore than a bona fide US emergency SSB traffic net will tolerate
> > an operator who speaks broken English.
>
> You have no idea what you're talking about, in either case.

Why would you deliberately risk lives by slowing down emergency operations
because some Lid, 200 miles away from the emergency, is a terrible CW operator?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1123. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 03:25:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8D7547.C1F46FC1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37166

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > and the commercial radio license Q&A are published
> > for all to see.
>
> Yep. Some examinees think the tests are hard, too.

Why? Why not just rote-memorize the Q&A?

> > You wish things wouldn't have changed, Dick, but they have.
>
> You wish I wish. I love lots of it, but some of it that you love stinks.

Some things stink real bad and other things stink real good.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1124. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 03:28:08 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c8ec966_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 37270

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020311064318.06075.00000769@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> So you believe "many" people want to become amateur operators so they
won't
> >> learn anything?
> >
> > You might ask W5TIT what she thinks, or better yet, reread what she has
> >already said
> >about ham radio testing.
>
> Okay, that's one. Now, seeing what other newcomers have posted here,
think
> 20:1 is about right?
>
> Let's ask Kim a question. Kim, have you learned anything about radio
technology
> and operating since you became a ham?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Absolutely! One cannot be a ham radio operator and learn nothing of radio technology and operating. At least I don't think they could. I have learned more than I ever wanted to know <BG> about building cables and getting electronic items to "talk" to each other in order to enable construction of an APRS tracker and full station. I have learned operating procedures in various nets, and under many different conditions. The only thing I haven't had to do yet is put disaster training to a test--and I hope I never do for it would mean someone is hurting somewhere.

Of course, in areas of ham radio that don't interest me, I remain just as ignorant. But then wasted knowledge is not much more than trivia.

Yes, I've learned a great deal...not to mention just plain having had the experience of a whole bunch of great people and get-together!

Kim W5TIT

1125. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 03:28:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8D75FA.3EA10664@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37167

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > But the Extra class was intended to be different.
> >
> > You correctly used past tense, Dick. When are you going to accept that
> > it was past tense and stop trying to live in the past?
>
> So you *DO* agree that it has been dumbed down!

Nope, that it was intended to be different. 20wpm Morse code is no longer
one of those differences but the technical complexity of the Extra written
exam Vs the General written exam is still there.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1126. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 03:30:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8D7664.D903577F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37168

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Are you willing to bet $1000 that will happen by 2005? 2010? 2020?
>
> Are you kidding? With an FCC that vacillates from high qualification for
> hams to virtually none? What might their lone easily swayed ham decide next
> week? Could anyone feel safe with ANY sort of bet on them? Not me. I'm, just
> "contemplating my navel".

Aha, I thought so. You guys back down when your money must be risked to back
up your statements and beliefs.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1127. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 03:32:03 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c8eca68_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 37271

Wasn't it you, Dick, who just a short time ago mentioned something about victims and their worthiness of being rescued if they didn't know CW? Yeah, that was you.

Kim W5TIT

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message news:3C863FBA.336F5B8F@worldnet.att.net...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > >> I don't believe that 1/3 of all hams could accurately handle formal traffic
> > >> under ideal band conditions.
> >
> > > I see you have your navel, too. :-) I DO believe everything above that you
> > >don't.
> > >So I have mine, too.
> >
> > Dick, you can't be serious. I doubt that 1/3 of hams know the formal NTS
> > procedures.
>
> So what? Do you really think that a formal NTS net would refuse to work a ham on
> CW
> who called in with emergency traffic just because he didn't follow procedures?
> Are you that unfamiliar with ham nets?
>
> > Nowhere near 1/3 of hams have participated in formal traffic
> > handling. Are you really suggesting that people could just jump right in and
> > handle formal traffic with absolutely no practice or skill?
>
> I'm saying that hams won't require a station calling in with emergency traffic to
> hold those
> skills. They'll work with him to handle his emergency. Sorry to find so many here
> who
> evidently wouldn't.
>

>

1128. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 03:36:53 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c8ecb72_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 37272

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C86A2DF.7F215342@worldnet.att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > > It is my belief that he would simply be in the way in a CW emergency
>
> > > > net.
> > >
> > > Only if he needed to pass important traffic and was unable to do so.
Why should it matter
> > > if he is not highly skilled when he was the only means of getting the
traffic handled?
> >
> > Do you really think a formal CW emergency net is going to put up with a
ham who sends/
> > receives Morse code at 8wpm? Dream on.
> > --
>
> In an emergency? It would be criminal for them to fail to take care of
him. You obviously
> don't know very much about CW operations nor operators.
>

Criminal? You're gonna have to do more than just proclaim that one, Little
Dick. Because, as usual, you are sadly mistaken.

Kim W5TIT

1129. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 04:37:39 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6k0so$pb5$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37169

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u8o87o527h604d@corp.supernews.com...
>
> W1RFI wrote
> >The idea that someone wants to rote memorize 1000
> >questions without understanding so they can do nothing
> >is ridiculous on its face.
>>
> >And if they do want to take the easy way out, it is easier
> >to learn the underlying material than to do all that memorizing.
>
> You are SO confused. Having the actual TEST QUESTIONS
> in front of you, cold, changes the entire idea of "testing." It's
> not about "memorization" per se, and never has been. If you
> have the QUESTIONS and ANSWERS ahead of time, going
> in, well, THAT in ITSELF is the problem, from my perspective.
> It cuts the AMOUNT of WORK you have to do by at least one
> order of magnitude, no matter HOW you do it.

Been that way for decades...so what? Where in Part 97
do I find the rules/regs regarding order of magnitude regarding
'amount of work" required to get licensed?

> Sheesh.
>
> If it wasn't that way . . . why would the whole Bash system have
> come into existence

It came into existence because Bash saw an opportunity
and took it. Free enterprise, what a concept.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1130. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 04:43:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6k23b$5e4$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37170

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C86D248.E4B34305@worldnet.att.net...
> Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> > W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > >Let's ask Kim a question. Kim, have you learned anything
> > >about radio technology and operating since you became a ham?
> > >
> > >73,
> > >Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
> > Now, you see, this is an entirely different question than the
> > one revolving around the tests. Sure, anyone passing the
> > tech test and buying a radio, and then using it, is going to
> > learn SOMETHING, if only how to push a PTT switch.
> > However, the quality of that learning, and its ultimate level,
> > will in large part be determined by the quality of the people
> > the original vetting procedure allows into Ham Radio. I think
> > that is patently obvious and gets at the root of the problem.
>
> Well stated. Indeed it does get to the root of the problem, one the
> ARRL *and* the FCC would very much prefer to completely ignore, and
> pretend didn't exist.

The root of WHAT problem? You make the statement
you do as if there is actually some real problem. PLEASE,
tell us all what that problem is...in difinitive terms.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1131. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 04:56:20 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6k25e$5e4$2@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37171

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C84D6D6.4FDE9CB0@worldnet.att.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C840467.2BBFF8E5@worldnet.att.net...
> > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >
> > > > "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:u8k8h9t9f8t5d1@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > > Hello, all!
> > > > >
> > > > > What you say is all well and good. HOWEVER, an "A"
> > > > > from Central Missouri State University is NOT the same
> > > > > thing as an "A" from Harvard, though both are quite
> > > > > "authoritative" in their own way. Taking tests over
> > > > > complicated material, "blind," in what amounts to a
> > > > > true academic setting, is VASTLY more difficult than
> > > > > what is going on today vis-a-vis the Ham Tests.
> > > >
> > > > Who cares, so what? Does that have any relavence
> > > > to ham licensing tests?
> > >
> > > Who cares if the ham radio tests actually test for knowledge?
> > > Obviously not you.
> >
> > And you Dick, clearly still don't understand that a ham
> > license is NOT a degree in anything. The license is a
> > gateway to allow the license holder to be on the air.
>
> Ah, gee Bill. The light is going on. So no one is supposed to learn
> anything meaningful without it resulting in a degree.

Not at all, every ham is FREE to learn whatever they want.
BUT, even if some people don't want to learn tech stuff, that's
OK too. There is NO rule that requires anyone to learn
anything. It all comes down to individual choice.

> So, are you having memory problems also? If you'll bother to look back
> into the archives you'll see where I said -several times- that no one
> expects or ever did expect the entry class licensees to know very much.
> But the Extra class was intended to be different. Now it no longer is,
> evidenced by your following paragraph......

> > What hams have done in the past and still do now is to
> > follow one or more paths after becoming a ham which
> > focuses their "advancement, knowledge, skills" into
> > specific areas.
>
> Why have more than a single license if no one needs to do anything but
> get a 'gateway to get on the air'? What's the point?

The point is that each ham is an individual. There's NO set
path that all must follow. As to multiple licenses, the FCC
already has narrowed that gap. IF you feel only ONE
license is needed, feel free to petition the FCC yourself.

> > I passed the Extra over two years ago...and have promptly
> > forgotten 2/3 of the stuff that was on the test. Why you may
> > ask? Simple...I have NO need or desire to retain the
> > amount of time I have to notify the FCC before I conduct
> > amateur space operations....or the details of VE rules
> > and regs (and yes, I am a VE...but I help when I can,
> > I don't run VE sessions myself).
> >
>
> I think you have just gone on to prove my point. If that's what you
> took
> from studying for an Extra class test, and much of the test was of that
> nature
> then its mostly pointless anyway, just a matter of going through the
> motions.

What else is it? I learned/memorized what was needed to pass
the test. What else did or would you expect?

> There should be a supplemental test for becoming a VE, that should be
> taken by any licensee who wishes to be a VE, regardless of his license
> class.

I actually agree that'd be a better approach.

> It is wrong to waste the much more limited number of questions on VE
> subjects
> instead of questions related to technical or operational subjects when
> the total number of questions has been seriously reduced already.

Agreed.

> > > > > This is REGARDLESS of the fact that an Extra-class
> > > > > test passed today is just as "authoritative" as one
> > > > > passed years ago. That is, both may be equal before
> > > > > the rulebook but HARDLY EQUAL as social facts.
> > > >
> > > > Again, who cares, so what?
> > > >
> > > > > Surely, this is too obvious to require further elucidation?
> > > >

> > > > Ditto my above.
> > >
> > > Well, thanks for clearing that up. You don't know and you don't
> > > care.
> >
> > So tell us Dick? Who but YOU and several others in
> > this newsgroup have any concern or care that:
>
> A lot of people who have already left the hobby, to be sure.

They are apparently not creating a void by their leaving.

> Evidently
> no one at the League is very concerned, not that they could do anything
> about it anyway.

You assume something needs to be done.

> FCC is pretty well disengaged, just waiting for the
> time to take away
> spectrum because "we didn't modernize".

The sky is falling again, eh?

> Meanwhile they were the biggest
> cause of that lack with the restructuring and reduction in testing
> standards.

What "lack" are you talking about?

> What this is leading up to. *IMO* is a single class license in the ARS
> that will be about as simple and easy to get as the old Class D CB
> license where you read the rules sheet, fill out a form and mail it in.

Dick, not that old diatribe again.

> In fact that might just be a good suggestion to make when their next
> NPRM comes around. Why keep up the charade?

I look forward to your self inflicted riducule if you wish to
pursue that line of comment. It's your call.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1132. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 05:03:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6k2b9vkl1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37172

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C863AD2.BA0E6F5E@worldnet.att.net...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > >> And you Dick, clearly still don't understand that a ham
> > >> license is NOT a degree in anything. The license is a
> > >> gateway to allow the license holder to be on the air.
> >
> > >Ah, gee Bill. The light is going on. So no one is supposed to learn
> > >anything meaningful without it resulting in a degree.
> >
> > > So, are you having memory problems also? If you'll bother to look back
> > >into the archives you'll see where I said -several times- that no one
> > >expects or ever did expect the entry class licensees to know very much.
> > >But the Extra class was intended to be different. Now it no longer is,
> > >evidenced by your following paragraph......
> >
> > The Extra Class license was never even close to being the equivalent of
a
> > degree in electronics, Dick. I bet you walked 5 miles to school, too.
>
> There he goes again. Did I say that it was "close to being the
equivalent
> of a degree"?
> No I did not. But I know from past experience that before your time an
Extra
> class license test
> was condsidered, (this I was told by an FCC district engineer) to be at
least
> as difficult as
> a First Class Radiotelephone License, which was required to be chief
engineer
> of a
> commercial radio or TV station. So your assertion that nothing has changed
> comes up
> VERY lame.

Yep, if I recall, there's no requirement anymore for the "chief engineer"
of a commercial station to have a 1st Class Radio License.

> I'm sure that were that FCC district engineer still alive today he would
> hold quite different beliefs.

He could join the "dead FCC dist eng society"

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1133. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 05:08:29 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6k2lqums1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37175

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C86A94F.50728130@worldnet.att.net...
> CAM wrote:
> > Consider that commercial radio or TV stations no longer require a First
Class
> > Radiotelephone Licensee
>
> Yep. The owner is free to do it all himself, or ignore it as he wishes
(and dares
> risk a citation in the rare event a Commission inspector shows up
unannounced).
> Lobbying does
> work, doesn't it? No one knows how many of them have fried themselves.

Sure, sure, the papers are full of all those deaths :-)

> And proper
> equipment maintenance is NOT getting done at many stations.

And YOU know this because?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1134. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 05:10:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312001034.23205.00000124@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 37173

In article <3C8D2E36.31FD5958@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>> > I suggest that you run your own experiment, Dick. Check into a CW traffic
>> > net at 5wpm and see what happens. I have found that they won't even slow
>> > down to 13wpm and don't seem to know the meaning of 'QRS'.
>>
>> I have found the opposite - IF you check into a slow/training net.
>
>We are not talking about slow/training nets, Jim.

You wrote:

"I suggest that you run your own experiment, Dick. Check into a CW traffic net
at 5wpm and see what happens. I have found that they won't even slow down to
13wpm and don't seem to know the meaning of 'QRS'."

Those are your exact words, Cecil. No mention of what kind of CW traffic net -
section, region, area, NTS, whatever. You did not exclude slow/training nets.

Have you ever checked into a CW net, Cecil?

>The point is that
>a bona fide emergency CW traffic net will not tolerate a 5wpm operator
>anymore than a bona fide US emergency SSB traffic net will tolerate
>an operator who speaks broken English.

How do you know? Ever check into one?

73 de Jim, N2EY
>--

1135. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 05:10:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312001034.23205.00000123@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 37174

In article <3c88b5a3_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>Did you ever notice how much more popular and prevalent
>the internet is? Could there be a reason? Could it be that
>it allows one to do so many things?

Actually, there are a bunch of reasons the 'net is so prevalent and popular:

1) The content
2) The ease of getting started
3) The low cost
4) The aggressive marketing and huge infrastructure investment
5) The dependability

>(And that set could
>encompass, and expand on "traditional" ham radio things ...
>it's called "diversification" ... and it can be a key factor in
>surviving in a competitive market ...)

Exactly how?
>
>> Ham radio should be an RF version of the Internet???
>
>Not exactly (or totally) but, to some degree that would be
>a valuable thing ... as I've pointed out, being able to bridge
>around outages in the wired infrastructure would be invaluable
>to the emergency management folks ...
>we could provide a robust, portable, wireless means to do
>that (granted we would not be able to provide the gigabits of
>bandwidth that the internet backbone can provide, but we
>COULD provide very useful amounts of bandwidth).

Sure - on UHF. And if the problem of content control can be solved. It's
not just a question of disallowing access to hotbabes.com and similar
stuff, but also filtering out all commercial content. Banner ads are a no-no.
>
>> That might be a way to get rid of a lot of hams.
>
>Why do you say that? Are you so set in your ways that YOU
>would go away if things changed a bit? I am NOT suggesting
>that folks couldn't continue to do what they do now ... just
>that MORE is possible, would broaden the audience to
>whom amateur radio would have interest, and would provide
>many benefits.

Why can't there be both the old and the new? An amateur network of digital RF infrastructure on UHF and more "conventional" stuff at lower frequencies.

Using directional antennas, a bit of power and some "better modulations and codings", how far will amateur UHF links go? Lots farther than "around the block!

>> How do you plan to keep interest in ham radio up with that
>> "plan"?
>
>Simple ... provide more variety in "services" and more
>capabilities in a spectrally efficient manner with less
>interference and contention ... make the "product" more
>attractive to a larger range of people than it is now ...
>have a little vision (and an open mind), man!

Don't forget publicity.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1136. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 05:28:07 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6k3ptbbr1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37176

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C85A468.4A618D22@worldnet.att.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020310104405.07180.00000883@mb-cr.aol.com...
> > > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> > >
> > > >The point was that FCC nor the government in general will be in any
way
> > > >inclined to turn ham radio loose to do anything anyone might way to
do
> > > >with ham radio re Carl's bright ideas for an idealistic digital
nirvana
> > in
> > > >ham radio. It would set us up to become an underground illicit means
of
> > > >international communication that could easily harbor hidden
> > > >terrorist communications which might escape detection, at least until
too
> > > >late to be effective Carl thinks he has all this figured out. He
needs a
> > new
> > > abacus.
> > >
> > > Whew, that is a bit far out even for you, Dick. :-)
> > > Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
> > Yup, I can hear them black helicopters comin'
> > in for Dick now.... whup, whup, whup :-)
> >
> > Funny thing is that you don't even need radio
> > to pass encrypted messages anymore.
>
> "Anymore"???" And when has that *not* been true?

bandwidth across a POTS line only increased to a sufficient
rate to allow good encryption within the last 10 years or so.

> > POTS (plain
> > old telephone service) gives you all anyone needs.
> > POTS plus a modem, a PC and an encryption program
> > will do it all...text or voice.
>
> So you believe your new-found discovery will cause the FCC to drop the

> amateur
> radio regulation prohibiting codes and ciphers?

Huh? By what bit of illogic do you jump to that conclusion?
I simply pointed out that encrypted text/voice has no need for
radio as the means of conveyence.

>
> Why do you think that regulation was formed in the first place?

Maybe Jim N2EY has a historical answer for us. IF the
concern originated to allow monitoring, the concern is pretty
lame today. Text can be encoded in hundreds of publicly
available codings yet I doubt the FCC cares or monitors
at all.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1137. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 05:34:16 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C8D9358.A00D4429@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 37177

>
> >
> > Only if he needed to pass important traffic and was unable to do so. Why should it matter
> > if he is not highly skilled when he was the only means of getting the traffic handled?
>
> Do you really think a formal CW emergency net is going to put up with a ham who sends/
> receives Morse code at 8wpm? Dream on.

Only if that ham is at the emergency site and is the only one on the air there.

1138. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 05:40:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C86DC6B.F3F4E59E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37178

CAM wrote:

> Valentine Germann wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > >And no one can possibly learn anything about astronomy by
> > >taking it up as a hobby because there are no tests for that
> > >one at all! :-)
> > >
> > This is worth a thread all by itself. That is, testing is hardly
> > necessary for amateur astronomy because one cannot harm
> > or interfere with anyone else simply by observing astronomical
> > objects with a telescope.
>
> So it looks like safety, interference knowledge, and rules/regulations
> is virtually all a ham needs to know. I've been saying that for years.

And, as I've been saying for years, that constitutes no more than CB.

1139. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 05:45:13 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6k4q8nqd1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37180

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020311001033.08046.00000163@mb-mj.aol.com...
> In article <a6h0pe$5me$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020310161052.19293.00000122@mb-fm.aol.com...
> >> In article <a6fpi7$7s4$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >Is it then your opinion that a person with NO morse skills
> >> >can, in fact, be a good operator...
> >>
> >> Sure! Did you see my list, posted in this thread a few days ago?
> >> Did anyone notice that none of the listed skills are exclusively Morse
> >> skills?
> >
> >You say that here...but skip down a few lines and...
> >
> >> >or, as Carl is trying to
> >> >ferret out, must the person have morse skills
> >> >for you to consider the person an expert operator?
> >> >
> >> To consider someone an "expert" amateur radio operator, I would
> >> have to include Morse skills, simply because the mode is so
> >> popular with hams. Earning the title "expert amateur radio operator"
> >> requires a LOT of skills. I do not consider someone with little or no
> >> Morse skills to be an expert amateur radio operator.
> >
> >Then you have a very archaic view of expertise.
>
> How so? Isn't Morse widely used by hams? Doesn't "expert" mean that
someone
> is very skilled and knowledgeable in ALL aspects of something?

In a word, NO. That YOU equate expert to mandate knowledge
in ALL aspects of anything goes far afield of what most people
would consider expert. Does a figure skater qualify as
an expert because s/he can't skate like a hocky player (or vise versa)?

> I don't see
> how someone could claim to be an "expert" amateur radio operator and yet
> have no Morse/CW skills. It would be like saying a driver who could not
drive
> a manual transmission vehicle was an expert driver.

Take a look at the current crop of Formula 1 cars...most are
automatics now. The fact IS that one need NOT know how to
drive a manual gearbox to be an expert driver.

> >> But I also do
> >> not think that amateur radio or emergencies are the sole province of'
> >> experts.
> >
> >Nor have I said so either.
>
> Then we agree. "Good operator" and "expert operator" are completely
> different things.

I think they are separaeted as a matter of degree. Neither,
however, needs CW knowledge to be an expert.

> >> I don't presume to call myself an expert amateur radio operator,
either.
> >> Still way too much out there for me to learn and get good at.
> >
> >After all these years, you don't consider yourself
> >an expert?
>
> Nope. Never claimed to be, either. I know too many ops who are way better
> than me.

Expert does NOT mean or imply there are none better than you.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1140. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 05:45:14 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C8D95E9.78A89BAA@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 37179

>
>
> Why would you deliberately risk lives by slowing down emergency operations
> because some Lid, 200 miles away from the emergency, is a terrible CW operator?
>

The lid 200 miles away should have enough sense to stay out of the way, or find a secondary path to pass whatever health and welfare message to a non-lid.

If the lid is the only operator on site at the emergency, then the CW net would have to slow down and work with him.

I would be a "lid" but I know that my best move is to stay out of the way and let the experts handle it.

1141. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 06:29:10 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a6md1j8k38@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 37263

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020308215104.08730.00000316@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net
>
> >Depends on how old he is.... if he is in his thirties, he may be working
> >many more years. I haven't a clue as to how old Ed is.
>
> Ed is young enough to have fun and old enough to know how. His wife says
he is
> old enough to know better.
>
> I am 51 right now, FWIW.

Hell Ed, your a youngster by ham standards..... Plenty of good years left in
ya.

>
> >By the way Ed, I was speaking with John, WB8RCR a local friend of mine
and
> >he said he had a QSO with ya in the past. Thought that was kinda neat.
>
> That was a QSO with me operating the original Tuna Tin 2, if memory
serves. He
> probably told you about the Certifi-cat?
>

Basically yes.... John is a great person who I admire alot. Not only does
he take the time to help others, he really is a patient, and has a really
upbeat personality. He is the kind of person I aspire to be like. In other
words I have the utmost respect for him.

> >Hopefully sometime in the future we may have a QSO in some form or
another
> >over the radio.
>
> I haven't been on much of late, but look for me near 7040 kHz when I do
get on.
>

Maybe if I eventually get a HF mobile rig setup. Cannot operate at my
residence whatsoever and PRB-1 does absolutely nothing to help me. Cannot
even put up a TV antenna or even one of those Dish Network satellite dishes.
This landlord must have some type of kick-back coming from the cable
company. Hopefully I will be moving in 3 years, and will be on the
begginnings of home ownership. Until then, mobile or portable operation is
the only way I can go.

Ryan KC8PMX

1142. Re: If I won the lottery (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 06:54:22 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a6md1r9k38@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 37264

Larry.... that was your mistake! Telling anyone about winning the lottery is a no-no. The least amount of people that know if I ever win is my goal. :) Although some of my ham friends might wonder how come I have all the new gear I would buy.

Ryan KC8PMX

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20020307231740.16305.00000055@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <20020307175537.08738.00000341@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >
> >I used to say that if I won the big one, I was going to go to work and quit.
> >I
> >have changed my mind. If I win the big one, I am going to go to work and they
> >are going to fire me!
> >
> >73,
> >Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Ed:
>
> Why would you get fired if you went to work after winning the lottery?
>
> I once won $800 in the lottery, and didn't quit or get fired. However,
> even after winning such a small amount, it was surprising how many
> people thought I "owed" them free drinks, meals, etc. I can just imagine
> what it must be like to win a few million -- but I'd still be willing to
> struggle with that problem!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>
>

1143. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 10:34:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312053414.08786.00001000@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 37181

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>> And proper
>> equipment maintenance is NOT getting done at many stations.
>
>And YOU know this because?

I am curious myself. In the few instances where I have been involved with the technical staff of broadcast stations, I have found them to be competent.

Dick, can you describe for us the instances of proper equipment maintenance not being done at broadcast stations?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1144. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 10:35:34 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312053534.08786.00001001@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 37182

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>Yep, if I recall, there's no requirement anymore for the "chief engineer"
>of a commercial station to have a 1st Class Radio License.

Good thing; that license no longer exists. The FCC decided that "one size fits all" is appropriate for the technical engineering required of broadcast stations.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1145. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 10:39:44 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312053944.08786.00001002@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 37183

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> So it looks like safety, interference knowledge, and rules/regulations
>> is virtually all a ham needs to know. I've been saying that for years.
>
> And, as I've been saying for years, that constitutes no more than CB.

So you think CBers have knowledge of RF safety, interference and rules and
regulations.

73, Ed Hare, W1RFI

1146. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 10:41:53 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312054153.08786.00001003@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 37184

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> A small amount of care in composing your posts will alleviate the problem.

> I'm truly beginning to believe that both you and Ed are a pair of real
>dumshits.

In what way did you have to "defend yourself" against what Cecil said by
cussing at someone else?

Just curious what triggered your "self-defense" mechanism.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1147. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 10:46:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312054602.08786.00001004@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 37185

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>> There are very few who can swell as much as lil Davie. :-)

>Anyone who has attained an amatreur radio license is entitled to pride
>in that achievement. Perhaps you can share in that pride at some point.

You can always tell when Len thinks he is losing an argument. He starts making up dimunutive names for people, CAPITALIZING things in a religious light or accusing his opponent of misdirection.

His next step will be to change from the dimunutive form to the last-name semi-formal form. At that point, he really is getting desparate. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1148. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 10:49:46 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312054946.08786.00001005@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 37186

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>However, the quality of that learning, and its ultimate level,
>will in large part be determined by the quality of the people
>the original vetting procedure allows into Ham Radio. I think
>that is patently obvious and gets at the root of the problem.

Then we are in just about the same shape as ever before -- ham radio is okay.
I see no correlation between the tests that people took and their conduct on
the air, at least not by looking at the FCC enforcement logs.

"Kids today! Why can't they be like we were -- perfect in every way!"

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1149. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 10:51:09 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312055109.08786.00001006@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 37187

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Well stated. Indeed it does get to the root of the problem, one the
>ARRL *and* the FCC would very much prefer to completely ignore, and
>pretend didn't exist.

And that problem would be what? This new generation of hams is doing technical
things I would have scarcely thought possible in 1963, Dick.

Is this another one of those "kids today" things?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1150. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 11:44:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312064427.08838.00001145@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 37188

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>W1RFI wrote:

>>Let's ask Kim a question. Kim, have you learned anything
>>about radio technology and operating since you became a ham?

>Now, you see, this is an entirely different question than the
>one revolving around the tests. Sure, anyone passing the
>tech test and buying a radio, and then using it, is going to
>learn SOMETHING, if only how to push a PTT switch.

Kim, have you learned more about radio than how to use the PTT switch?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1151. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 12:04:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C86FF47.791B1498@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37189

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Do you really think a formal CW emergency net is going to put up with a ham who sends/
> > > receives Morse code at 8wpm? Dream on.
> >
> > In an emergency? It would be criminal for them to fail to take care of him. You obviously
> > don't know very much about CW operations nor operators.
>
> Please pay attention. The 8wpm guy is 200 miles away from the emergency location and is
> trying jump in and be part of the emergency net that is trying to help the people in the
> emergency area. If you were net control, what would you tell him?

Please pay attention. If I was running an emergency traffic net and someone tried to break the
net on slow speed CW, I would ask him what emergency traffic he had for the net, not how far
away he was (How did you determine how far away he was? QRZ license data base?
recognize him from his callsign? How do you know he wasn't mobile or visiting in the disaster
area and really has emergency traffic? You omniscient or something?) If he had emergency
traffic, I would attempt to prioritize it in relation to the other emergency traffic on the net,
and get him together with whomever he needed to pass the traffic to, and move them off to a
discrete frequency away from the net frequency to get it passed.

You'll have a problem beating me at my own game. I did this sort of thing professionally for 20
years. Not to mention having had considerable experience on ham nets.

1152. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 12:04:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C86FFE7.205212C0@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37190

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > We are not talking about slow/training nets, Jim. The point is that
> > > a bona fide emergency CW traffic net will not tolerate a 5wpm operator
> > > anymore than a bona fide US emergency SSB traffic net will tolerate
> > > an operator who speaks broken English.
> >
> > You have no idea what you're talking about, in either case.
>
> Why would you deliberately risk lives by slowing down emergency operations
> because some Lid, 200 miles away from the emergency, is a terrible CW operator?

I can see where you might do just that, with your attitude. I would quickly find what his business was, and if he's just "checking in" he'd get cut off shortly. But you can not determine what his situation is just by his slow CW speed. YOU are the fellow who says hams don't need CW at all, so how is it that you advocate mistreating slow operators?

1153. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 12:04:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C870066.5DF488AD@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37191

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > and the commercial radio license Q&A are published
> > > for all to see.
> >
> > Yep. Some examinees think the tests are hard, too.
>
> Why? Why not just rote-memorize the Q&A?
>

Good question. I would surmise that those who don't think the tests are hard either did just that or already knew it.

>
> > > You wish things wouldn't have changed, Dick, but they have.
> >
> > You wish I wish. I love lots of it, but some of it that you love stinks.
>
> Some things stink real bad and other things stink real good.

Roses don't stink. Skunks do. That should tell you enough to sort it out.

1154. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 12:05:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C870275.D492A300@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37192

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C86A94F.50728130@worldnet.att.net...
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Consider that commercial radio or TV stations no longer require a First
> Class
> > > Radiotelephone Licensee
> >
> > Yep. The owner is free to do it all himself, or ignore it as he wishes
> (and dares
> > risk a citation in the rare event a Commission inspector shows up
> unannounced).
> > Lobbying does
> > work, doesn't it? No one knows how many of them have fried themselves.
>
> Sure, sure, the papers are full of all those deaths :-)

You really think it makes the front page of major newspapers when someone gets
hung
up in his own transmitters HV? Might make the obit column. It DOES happen.

>
>
> > And proper
> > equipment maintenance is NOT getting done at many stations.
>
> And YOU know this because?

Working in the field.

1155. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 12:05:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8704A2.57E4298A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37193

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C85A468.4A618D22@worldnet.att.net...
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > > "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20020310104405.07180.00000883@mb-cr.aol.com...
> > > > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> > > >
> > > > >The point was that FCC nor the government in general will be in any
> way
> > > > >inclined to turn ham radio loose to do anything anyone might way to
> do
> > > > >with ham radio re Carl's bright ideas for an idealistic digital
> nirvana
> > > in
> > > > >ham radio. It would set us up to become an underground illicit means
> of
> > > > >international communication that could easily harbor hidden
> > > > >terrorist communications which might escape detection, at least until
> too
> > > > >late to be effective Carl thinks he has all this figured out. He
> needs a
> > > new
> > > > abacus.
> > > >
> > > > Whew, that is a bit far out even for you, Dick. :-)
> > > > Ed Hare, W1RFI
> > >
> > > Yup, I can hear them black helicopters comin'
> > > in for Dick now.... whup, whup, whup :-)
> > >
> > > Funny thing is that you don't even need radio
> > > to pass encrypted messages anymore.
> >
> > "Anymore"???" And when has that *not* been true?
>
> bandwidth across a POTS line only increased to a sufficient
> rate to allow good encryption within the last 10 years or so.

Ah. So you're saying that radio still doesn't allow "good encryption"
Enigma didn't happen. (I know, it wasn't as good as current digital
types, but it was good).

> > > > POTS (plain
> > > > old telephone service) gives you all anyone needs.
> > > > POTS plus a modem, a PC and an encryption program
> > > > will do it all...text or voice.
> > >
> > > So you believe your new-found discovery will cause the FCC to drop the
> > > amateur
> > > radio regulation prohibiting codes and ciphers?
> >
> > Huh? By what bit of illogic do you jump to that conclusion?
> > I simply pointed out that encrypted text/voice has no need for
> > radio as the means of conveyence.
> >

And never did. Neither does the Internet.

> >
> > >
> > > Why do you think that regulation was formed in the first place?
> >
> > Maybe Jim N2EY has a historical answer for us. IF the
> > concern originated to allow monitoring, the concern is pretty
> > lame today. Text can be encoded in hundreds of publicly
> > available codings yet I doubt the FCC cares or monitors
> > at all.
> >

Whether or not FCC monitors is really not the point, the point being that is
why
the regulation was made initially. Rules that do not allow encryption will be
mostly
followed by those who follow rules, which is most hams. Any encrypted radio
traffic
is thus illegal. So anyone so doing will be subject to FCC interest. With the
increased
national security drive, and the added scrutiny of communications including
monitoring of the internet, it makes sense to look at amateur radio frequencies
as potential trouble spots.
As noted earlier, many non citizens hold US ham licenses. No one knows if any
terrorists do or not, just as no one knew why they were studying flying in the
US. I doubt all this if being overlooked.

1156. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 12:05:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C87066B.82991A87@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37194

Robert Casey wrote:

> >
> >
> > Why would you deliberately risk lives by slowing down emergency operations
> > because some Lid, 200 miles away from the emergency, is a terrible CW operator?
> >
>
> The lid 200 miles away should have enough sense to stay out of the way, or
> find a secondary path to pass whatever health and welfare message to a non-lid.
>
> If the lid is the only operator on site at the emergency, then the CW net would
> have to slow down and work with him.
>
> I would be a "lid" but I know that my best move is to stay out of the way and
> let the experts handle it.

The point in this scenario is that net control would have no way of knowing what the situation was, whether the slow operator was a lid getting in the way or if he actually had emergency traffic to handle, until he acknowledged him and asked what his business was.
Any net that refuses to handle slow operators calling in while working an emergency is acting very inappropriately.

1157. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 12:32:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312073250.14946.00000144@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 37195

In article <a6k3ptbbr1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> Why do you think that regulation was formed in the first place?
>
>Maybe Jim N2EY has a historical answer for us.

The regulation about "codes and ciphers" is meant to forbid
any form of encryption that hides the true meaning of a message.
Look at the entire rule and its meaning should be clear.

Note that the rule actually forbids concealing the meaning of radio
messages transmitted by amateurs, by any means, not just encryption.
For example, the message "Should everyone leave long envelopes? Not
required or necessary." looks innocent enough until you look at just the first
letter of each word.

These regulations originated early in the history of radio, and were driven by
experiences with the hiding secret messages in telegrams, and the covert use
of radio such as the Telefunken station in the USA during the early part of
WW1.

Does any of this stop the bad guys from encrypting stuff and hiding messages?
Probably not, but it gives the govt. something to prosecute with.

The FCC does monitor hams to some extent, and is required by law to be able to
monitor any amateur transmission.

73 de Jim "not an expert" N2EY

1158. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 12:32:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312073252.14946.00000145@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 37196

In article <a6k4q8nqd1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

(N2EY wrote):

>> >> To consider someone an "expert" amateur radio operator, I would
>> >> have to include Morse skills, simply because the mode is so
>> >> popular with hams. Earning the title "expert amateur radio operator"
>> >> requires a LOT of skills. I do not consider someone with little or no
>> >> Morse skills to be an expert amateur radio operator.
>> >
>> >Then you have a very archaic view of expertise.
>>
>> How so? Isn't Morse widely used by hams? Doesn't "expert" mean that
>someone
>> is very skilled and knowledgeable in ALL aspects of something?
>
>In a word, NO.

I disagree.

>That YOU equate expert to mandate knowledge
>in ALL aspects of anything goes far afield of what most people
>would consider expert.

I really don't think so.

>Does a figure skater qualify as
>an expert because s/he can't skate like a hocky player (or vise versa)?

I think you meant to write "not qualify".

That's not a valid analogy. A figure skater and a hockey player do different
kinds of skating, just as hams and broadcast DJs do different kinds of radio.
Saying a figure skater is an expert means that s/he can do all sorts of
figure skating moves with a high degree of skill. Saying a hockey player is
an expert means he/she can play the game well, with a high degree of skill
in all areas of ice hockey.

Would you call a figure skater an expert figure skater if s/he could not do a
toe loop
or a double axel? I wouldn't.

>> I don't see
>> how someone could claim to be an "expert" amateur radio operator and yet
>> have no Morse/CW skills. It would be like saying a driver who could not
>drive

>> a manual transmission vehicle was an expert driver.
>
>Take a look at the current crop of Formula 1 cars...most are
>automatics now.

So? Do you think there are any Formula 1 drivers who can't drive stick? I
don't.

>The fact IS that one need NOT know how to
>drive a manual gearbox to be an expert driver.

I disagree. Would you give the label "expert" to a plumber who
could not solder copper pipes? I wouldn't - even though it is possible
to do all of the plumbing in a house without any soldering.
>
>> >> But I also do
>> >> not think that amateur radio or emergencies are the sole province of'
>> >> experts.
>> >
>> >Nor have I said so either.
>>
>> Then we agree. "Good operator" and "expert operator" are completely
>> different things.
>
>I think they are separaeted as a matter of degree.

> Neither,
>however, needs CW knowledge to be an expert.

Then we disagree.
>
>> >> I don't presume to call myself an expert amateur radio operator,
>either.
>> >> Still way too much out there for me to learn and get good at.
>> >
>> >After all these years, you don't consider yourself
>> >an expert?
>>
>> Nope. Never claimed to be, either. I know too many ops who are way better
>> than me.
>
>Expert does NOT mean or imply there are none better than you.

That's not what I'm saying. I don't call myself an expert because I know hams
whose
skills are far above mine.

Even though QST did bestow the title "definitive expert" on me.....;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

1159. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 13:32:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203120532.61ca7db1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 37197

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C8D72BD.F9E8ED05@IEEE.org>...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Do you really think a formal CW emergency net is going to put up with a ham who sends/
> > > receives Morse code at 8wpm? Dream on.
> >
> > In an emergency? It would be criminal for them to fail to take care of him. You obviously
> > don't know very much about CW operations nor operators.
>
> The 8wpm guy is 200 miles away from the emergency location and is
> trying jump in and be part of the emergency net that is trying to help the people in the
> emergency area.

One does not "jump in" to a CW net unless one has an emergency. Those
who wish to join the net wait for the NCS to ask for QNI,then join the
net in standard fashion.

>If you were net control, what would you tell him?

"R TU AS"

and go right back to net business.

--

One of the many wonderful aspects of CW traffic handling "done right"
is the
extremely high efficiency and economy of words used. Not a dit wasted.

You oughta try it sometime, Cecil.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1160. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 13:52:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C875850.689F74@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37200

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > But the Extra class was intended to be different.
> > >
> > > You correctly used past tense, Dick. When are you going to accept that
> > > it was past tense and stop trying to live in the past?
> >
> > So you *DO* agree that it has been dumbed down!
>
> Nope, that it was intended to be different. 20wpm Morse code is no longer
> one of those differences but the technical complexity of the Extra written
> exam Vs the General written exam is still there.

Well, maybe, what little of it there is. There wasn't a single VE question,
and as I recall, there were about twice as many questions. Serious technical
stuff. Today, mostly fluff.

1161. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 13:52:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C875A76.7EDC1ED2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37199

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>
> >Yep, if I recall, there's no requirement anymore for the "chief engineer"
> >of a commercial station to have a 1st Class Radio License.
>
> Good thing; that license no longer exists. The FCC decided that "one size fits
> all" is appropriate for the technical engineering required of broadcast
> stations.
>

Wrong. FCC decided to drop all licensing requirements for broadcast engineering and leave all the responsibility for meeting the technical rules to the station owner. The only services where operator licensing is required is where it is required "by international treaty".

The implications of such a move should be obvious.

1162. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 13:52:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C875ACF.6E327102@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37201

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> So it looks like safety, interference knowledge, and rules/regulations
> >> is virtually all a ham needs to know. I've been saying that for years.
> >
> > And, as I've been saying for years, that constitutes no more than CB.
>
> So you think CBers have knowledge of RF safety, interference and rules and
> regulations.

Some do, and of course some don't. Just like hams.

1163. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 13:52:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C875B54.AB962CCC@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37202

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Well stated. Indeed it does get to the root of the problem, one the
> >ARRL *and* the FCC would very much prefer to completely ignore, and
> >pretend didn't exist.
>
> And that problem would be what? This new generation of hams is doing technical
> things I would have scarcely thought possible in 1963, Dick.
>
> Is this another one of those "kids today" things?

The Kims are kids???

1164. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 13:52:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C875BB6.38A93D0F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37203

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
> >W1RFI wrote:
>
> >>Let's ask Kim a question. Kim, have you learned anything
> >>about radio technology and operating since you became a ham?
>
> >Now, you see, this is an entirely different question than the
> >one revolving around the tests. Sure, anyone passing the
> >tech test and buying a radio, and then using it, is going to
> >learn SOMETHING, if only how to push a PTT switch.
>
> Kim, have you learned more about radio than how to use the PTT switch?

Sure she has, by now she has surely found the on-off switch. And if
pressed, she might even be able to hook up the antenna connector.

1165. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 13:52:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C877045.6BB35C64@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37204

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>
> >> And proper
> >> equipment maintenance is NOT getting done at many stations.
> > >
> > >And YOU know this because?
> >
> > I am curious myself. In the few instances where I have been involved with the
> > technical staff of broadcast stations, I have found them to be competent.
> >

That would be because you have dealt with stations that *have* a technical staff. That is no longer required by FCC regulation. The owner is free to do that work himself if he dares, or hire whomever he wants to do it. No qualification is necessary. A bright teenage disc jockey can be pressed into service if it can be made to work out. Some owners are astute about doing it right, and some, of course and as always, cut as many monetary corners as they can get by with. Most "have to" broadcast engineering these days is done by contracted consultants who often travel long distances to do it.

>
> Dick, can you describe for us the instances of proper equipment maintenance not
> being done at broadcast stations?

Wouldn't you agree that transmitter tuning and modulation adjustments should be done by someone who has an understanding of the issues and pitfalls involved? When a FCC licensed person was required, he knew that if he didn't follow the rules he could easily lose his license to work, and he would see that technical problems were taken care of.
Most wouldn't allow a deficient transmitter to go on the air, and insisted that problems which the owner might consider minor, but which left the station outside the rules, be corrected.
I have no doubt this was a part of the reason broadcasters worked to get the rules requiring licensed operators dropped.
With that requirement gone, and owners now can go as far as they dare in ignoring things they can get by with ignoring, and there are many. FCC visits to outlying stations are rare.

But as Jim Bromley correctly pointed out some time back in a private email, much less maintenance is required by new generation solid state transmitting gear. Of course that only resolves SOME of the problems.

All this is not a problem the FCC can't ignore. I'm sure they occasionally find, in a surprise inspection, a station so far out of tolerance they get to issue a

NAL. But generally it works out, and as with much of ham radio, they find it to be a situation they can live with, if only grudgingly. But I've heard some real cruddy sounding radio stations, too. Sometimes it's deliberately done, and sometimes it's the result of poor or nonexistent engineering..

I was once called by the owner of a 100kwERP FM small market station who couldn't get it to turn on. His regular "last resort emergency call" person was out of town and had given him my name to call if he had to have some technical help. Though I had never seen this transmitter before, I quickly determined that a thermal time delay relay was not closing, and confirmed this with a wire jumper. I asked the owner if he had a spare relay (it was a plug-in unit). He said, "Oh, I already replaced that with a new, that's not the problem".
I asked him if he had another spare. He did, I plugged it in, and the transmitter came on properly. He was amazed that a new relay could be defective. And all he lost this day was a few hours of expensive air time.
This fellow had learned a lot about keeping his transmitter on the air, and this was just another lesson. You can be sure that he made other miscues along the way, some probably more serious. It's almost inevitable. But he saved a lot of engineering expense, and didn't fry himself, so he's a success, to be sure..

Now, I'm quite sure you will downplay this just as you do all the "problems" in ham radio, after all, "that's the way it is", and all is well with the world. And, things do change over time.
When I last did broadcast engineering, solid state transmitters were not yet in widespread use.
If their use changed broadcasting as much as they have changed ham radio operations in areas such as thermal stability and reliability, there will be considerable differences. But there still remains antenna systems, and not that much seems to change in that area.

The striking feature seems to be the drastic change in rules that is involved. One day complete engineering responsibility is placed on a licensed person, next day poof! it's all gone, and it all is dumped onto the station owner, where no trust whatever had been invested the day before.
Bureaucracy at its finest.

1166. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 14:06:03 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8s1pd2mrub6d7@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37198

Hello again, Mr. Carroll!

This is becoming impossible to follow; time for
a new thread or two out on the main line.

Val

P.S. Does Mr. Hare have a two-line governor
on his keyboard? After a while it looks silly.

**

1167. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 15:21:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C87859F.F9293310@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37205

Valentine Germann wrote:

> Hello again, Mr. Carroll!
>
> This is becoming impossible to follow; time for
> a new thread or two out on the main line.
>

Probably, but the subject has about been covered anyway. Nothing is ever resolved on rrap.

>
> P.S. Does Mr. Hare have a two-line governor
> on his keyboard?

Mr Hare is a busy fella, and it looks like that many times he doesn't really read what is there.
Hence answers that don't really work well.

> After a while it looks silly.
>

This is, for some strange reason, basically a silly forum.

1168. Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 15:41:30 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8s7ca8muuhu93@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37206

Hello, all!

I am an old guy (52) who will be taking his Technician
test next Monday and then, with any luck at all, the
General tests, code and written, in April. My primary
interest in Ham Radio was the possibilty of making
international contacts with low or medium power, on
CW, since that is the "international language" of amateur
radio. However, if the ITU goes ahead and does away
with any CW requirement, what does the future hold
for an international community in Ham Radio? It seems
to me that if the CW treaty committments are abandoned
it is only a matter of time before CW itself will be aban-
doned, as well, as the numbers of Hams using it declines
to the point where the band plans are changed in its disfavor,
finishing the job that the treaty changes had begun.

No big deal, I guess, except in my case I had hoped that
this "international" aspect of the avocation would rermain
very, very important into the far future. If the CW treaty
requirements are removed won't amateur radio become
more or less balkanized by language groups? I know
this possibility is "down the road" but it is still, to me,
a very disturbing prospect.

Val Germann
Columbia, Missouri

1169. Re: Thanks, AC6V

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 15:42:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312104247.16220.00000983@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 37207

>Subject: Re: Thanks, AC6V
>From: radiohead11m@aol.com (Mark Pearsal)
>Date: 03/11/02 19:48 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020311194830.06911.00000778@mb-cm.aol.com>

>
>What's the website? He's got two associated with his QRZ bio, but I don't
>think
>either is the one you're talking about. Take care and 73.

Hey Mark....

www.ac6v.com. The place is jam-packed with links and pages of all sorts
of stuff related to radio of almost all persuations.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1170. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 16:01:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312110145.14041.00000816@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 37208

>Subject: Ending Code Requirement at International Level
>From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>Date: 03/12/02 10:41 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <u8s7ca8muuhu93@corp.supernews.com>

>No big deal, I guess, except in my case I had hoped that
>this "international" aspect of the avocation would rermain
>very, very important into the far future. If the CW treaty
>requirements are removed won't amateur radio become
>more or less balkanized by language groups? I know
>this possibility is "down the road" but it is still, to me,
>a very disturbing prospect.

This is a very real likelyhood, Val.

We can argue the "CW get's thru" arguement all day long...It IS true in MOST cases, but it's one other truly bonafide application IS international communications and for exactly the reason you cited.

I've had the darndest times getting a guys name and location before, struggling through heavy European or Balkan accents, but I have never had such a problem in CW.

The lack of requirement to know CW, and hence an exposure to it, will, in the long run, be it's demise. The human creature is one of "path of least resistence" and this will be no different. With the exception of a few "artisitc" hold-outs, Morse Code use will eventually die out.

And that will be a shame.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1171. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 16:08:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E2814.B07B6C68@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37209

N2EY wrote:
> One of the many wonderful aspects of CW traffic handling "done right"
> is the
> extremely high efficiency and economy of words used. Not a dit wasted.
>
> You oughta try it sometime, Cecil.

I have what might be considered as AADD. My mind wanders during CW QSOs.
I will be copying along and then lose it to a daydream but not realize
I've lost it until many seconds (minutes?) later.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1172. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 16:10:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E286D.C5BD3B4D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37210

Robert Casey wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Why would you deliberately risk lives by slowing down emergency operations
> > because some Lid, 200 miles away from the emergency, is a terrible CW operator?
>
> The lid 200 miles away should have enough sense to stay out of the way, or
> find a secondary path to pass whatever health and welfare message to a non-lid.
>
> If the lid is the only operator on site at the emergency, then the CW net would
> have to slow down and work with him.
>
> I would be a "lid" but I know that my best move is to stay out of the way and
> let the experts handle it.

My point exactly.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1173. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 16:15:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E29BE.CE84DA83@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37211

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Why would you deliberately risk lives by slowing down emergency operations
> > because some Lid, 200 miles away from the emergency, is a terrible CW operator?
>
> I would quickly find
> what his business was, and if he's just "checking in" he'd get cut off shortly.

My point exactly. He is worse than useless. He is interfering with
emergency communications.

> YOU are the
> fellow who says hams don't need CW at all, so how is it that you advocate
> mistreating slow operators?

Anyone interfering with emergency communications needs to be mistreated.

And what I have said is that it should be up to individual hams to decide
if they need CW, like deciding if they need to store bottled water.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1174. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 16:21:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E2B20.76967227@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37212

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Roses don't stink.

Well, they certainly can't smell without noses.

> Skunks do.

Skunk juice is used in expensive perfumes.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1175. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 16:23:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E2B84.9F13011E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37213

Valentine Germann wrote:
> Hello again, Mr. Carroll!
> This is becoming impossible to follow;

That's characteristic of Dick's postings. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1176. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 16:34:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E2E2E.7224A32A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37214

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > 20wpm Morse code is no longer
> > one of those differences but the technical complexity of the Extra written
> > exam Vs the General written exam is still there.
>
> Well, maybe, what little of it there is.

The 1957 ARRL License Manual had 279 Q&A in 25 pages. The 2000
ARRL Extra Class License Manual had 449 Q&A in 359 pages. Looks
like to me the material increased from 1957 to 2000.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1177. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 16:37:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E2EE7.74BC52AF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37215

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > Is this another one of those "kids today" things?
>
> The Kims are kids???

Kim's just a kid compared to me.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1178. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 16:41:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E2FB4.83AD2D03@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37216

Valentine Germann wrote:
> However, if the ITU goes ahead and does away
> with any CW requirement, what does the future hold
> for an international community in Ham Radio?

Whatever the international community of Ham Radio
wants it to hold. Just because the slaves were freed
didn't mean they stopped working.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1179. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 16:46:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E30E8.DF6E7FAD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37217

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> The human creature is one of "path of least
> resistence" and this will be no different. With the exception of a few
> "artisitc" hold-outs, Morse Code use will eventually die out.

Many people thought the slaves would quit working after they were freed
but many of them worked even harder.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1180. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 17:42:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203120942.76abcae7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 37218

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C8D0A5B.8DC094F8@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >That's the way Intel had their emergency communications organized, Dick.
> >
> > Did they ever have to deal with an actual emergency? Say, one where some of
> > their equipment didn't work?
>
> We didn't have an actual emergency while iEARS was in operation and I was
> at Intel.

That's good.

> We had backup equipment including generators and solar power.

That's good too.
>
> > >That's the way Intel had their emergency communications organized, Dick.
> > >Changing frequencies (at Intel) is a lot easier than changing modes,
> >
> > Not in all cases. You state it as if it were a universal fact.
>
> I'm obviously talking about Intel iEARS. It was certainly easier for me to
> change frequencies than try to learn to use a paddle during an emergency.
> I have added the context back in which you trimmed out of my statement.

> > >Intel
> > >didn't have a straight key and, at the time, I couldn't handle the paddles.
> >
> > That was simply a lack of proper planning and preparation. Or somebody with an
> > anti-CW/Morse agenda.
>
> Actually it was a pro-code Extra who specified the use of a paddle only and
> prohibited the use of a straight key. He said , "Real hams don't use straight keys!"

He was obviously not a Morse expert.

My statement is still true: Lack of proper planning and preparation,
or somebody with an ant-CW/Morse agenda.

It's poor planning/preparation not to have a straight key available.
Particularly in a setup such as the one you describe, where cost,
space and portability were not serious considerations.

It's also poor planning/preparation not to learn to use the equipment
which

did exist - including the paddles.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1181. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 17:58:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C879702.D503DEDF@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37220

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

> >Subject: Ending Code Requirement at International Level
> >From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
> >Date: 03/12/02 10:41 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <u8s7ca8muuhu93@corp.supernews.com>
>
> >No big deal, I guess, except in my case I had hoped that
> >this "international" aspect of the avocation would rermain
> >very, very important into the far future. If the CW treaty
> >requirements are removed won't amateur radio become
> >more or less balkanized by language groups? I know
> >this possibility is "down the road" but it is still, to me,
> >a very disturbing prospect.
>
> This is a very real likelyhood, Val.
>
> We can argue the "CW get's thru" arguement all day long...It IS true in
> MOST cases, but it's one other truly bonafide application IS international
> communications and for exactly the reason you cited.
>
> I've had the darndest times getting a guys name and location before,
> struggling through heavy European or Balkan accents, but I have never had such
> a problem in CW.
>
> The lack of requirement to know CW, and hence an exposure to it, will, in
> the long run, be it's demise. The human creature is one of "path of least
> resistence" and this will be no different. With the exception of a few
> "artisitc" hold-outs, Morse Code use will eventually die out.
>
> And that will be a shame.

That is pretty well the way I view the situation also, except for a couple of caveats.

For one, we can't automatically assume that all nations will automatically drop the CW test
just because ITU and USA does. I understand that Russia has already stated it will keep the CW test. There will surely be others. No rules changes take place quickly.
Also, none of this CW loss will occur in the near future. CW is very much alive and well on the air these days. So Val, you won't need to be concerned with a lack of other hams to chat with on CW, either locally or internationally, any time soon. Steve and you are surely right about the situation down the road, however.

Secondly, there are plenty of overseas hams who use digital modes who are very versed
in the English language who populate the bands, so the international aspect of ham radio is pretty well preserved. Many others are very conversant in spoken English and work the phone bands.
So go ahead and begin your ham radio experience, it isn't likely you'll find it disappointing.

Dick Carroll W0EX

1182. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 17:58:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C87975C.2C185ECA@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37223

CAM wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
> > One of the many wonderful aspects of CW traffic handling "done right"
> > is the
> > extremely high efficiency and economy of words used. Not a dit wasted.
> >
> > You oughta try it sometime, Cecil.
>
> I have what might be considered as AADD. My mind wanders during CW QSOs.
> I will be copying along and then lose it to a daydream but not realize
> I've lost it until many seconds (minutes?) later.

For all you've learned, you've never learned to pay attention?

1183. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 17:58:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8797CF.CD3A0314@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37221

CAM wrote:

> Robert Casey wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Why would you deliberately risk lives by slowing down emergency operations
> > > because some Lid, 200 miles away from the emergency, is a terrible CW operator?
> >
> > The lid 200 miles away should have enough sense to stay out of the way, or
> > find a secondary path to pass whatever health and welfare message to a non-lid.
> >
> > If the lid is the only operator on site at the emergency, then the CW net would
> > have to slow down and work with him.
> >
> > I would be a "lid" but I know that my best move is to stay out of the way and
> > let the experts handle it.
>
> My point exactly.

That's great as far as the LID is concerned, but does nothing whatever to assist a slow CW operator who has emergency traffic that needs to be handled.

1184. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 17:59:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C879A21.DCBD72D4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37222

Valentine Germann wrote:

..... After a while it looks silly.

Sometimes it looks like the "silly's" have taken over ham radio..

Spotted on another NG...

This from an Extra class licensee who holds an EE degree, yet..

"

> >
> > Turn off AGC/AVC.
>
> What is AGC/AVC? (I'm not even sure if my radio has it.)
> -------
>

Proving, surely beyond doubt, that not even a degree in electrical engineering automatically qualifies one for a ham radio license! And that the tests are pretty much a non-entity anyway.

Then....

"I'm running an amateur radio station this summer at a summer camp. Does
anyone know how i can get a telephone hooked into my system? This would permit me to broadcast live callers for call in shows, or contests.?

If anyone knows what this device is called or where to find one, please let
me know...."

This one was anon, and may have been a Cecilian troll, for all I know, but

AAAARGH!!!!!

1185. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 17:59:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C87A839.6C9CB0ED@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37224

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Why would you deliberately risk lives by slowing down emergency operations
> > > because some Lid, 200 miles away from the emergency, is a terrible CW operator?
> >
> > I would quickly find
> > what his business was, and if he's just "checking in" he'd get cut off shortly.
>
> My point exactly. He is worse than useless. He is interfering with
> emergency communications.

This is really novel. Just because he is a slow operator calling in on a fast emergency net,
you'd cut him off without ever checking to see what his business was, or where he was calling from. Your boundary condition that "he is 200 miles away from the emergency" is a non-starter since you did not state how you come by that information. If you don't know, you can't assume in an emergency.

>
>
> > YOU are the
> > fellow who says hams don't need CW at all, so how is it that you advocate
> > mistreating slow operators?
>
> Anyone interfering with emergency communications needs to be mistreated.
>

So how about we determine that he is indeed just interfering before we cut him off from any hope of assistance that he may desperately need

>
> And what I have said is that it should be up to individual hams to decide
> if they need CW, like deciding if they need to store bottled water.
>

Ah, yes, it's another vanilla "just a choice". Choose the possibility of having no communications rather than learn the most basic mode of radio communication, radiotelegraphy.

1186. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 17:59:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C87A876.32C1D3B3@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37225

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Roses don't stink.
>
> Well, they certainly can't smell without noses.

???

>
>
> > Skunks do.
>
> Skunk juice is used in expensive perfumes.

Nope. Just a highly refined component.

1187. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 17:59:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C87A8B2.DBCD0EEB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37226

CAM wrote:

> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > Hello again, Mr. Carroll!
> > This is becoming impossible to follow;
>
> That's characteristic of Dick's postings. :-)
>

It is???? Would you care to see if you can dredge up any such statement from me?

1188. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 17:59:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C87A942.212045C2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37227

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > 20wpm Morse code is no longer
> > > one of those differences but the technical complexity of the Extra written
> > > exam Vs the General written exam is still there.
> >
> > Well, maybe, what little of it there is.
>
> The 1957 ARRL License Manual had 279 Q&A in 25 pages. The 2000
> ARRL Extra Class License Manual had 449 Q&A in 359 pages. Looks
> like to me the material increased from 1957 to 2000.

Yep. One of the things the computer Age was supposed to do was eliminate paper,
too.
Didn't happen, did it? Just because there are more "pages" of questions doesn't
mean a thing.

1189. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 17:59:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C87A9AD.45474EF4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37228

CAM wrote:

> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > However, if the ITU goes ahead and does away
> > with any CW requirement, what does the future hold
> > for an international community in Ham Radio?
>
> Whatever the international community of Ham Radio
> wants it to hold. Just because the slaves were freed
> didn't mean they stopped working.
>

Got it Val? Cecil says because hams have always been required to pass a
code test
they are slaves. Isn't he something special?

1190. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 17:59:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C87AA2C.C3BDD43A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37229

CAM wrote:

> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> > The human creature is one of "path of least
> > resistence" and this will be no different. With the exception of a few
> > "artisitc" hold-outs, Morse Code use will eventually die out.
>
> Many people thought the slaves would quit working after they were freed
> but many of them worked even harder.

From that you indicate that you believe that future hams will leap to learn Morse code whereas all the NCI types have dedicated their lives to its very demise. To call you a dreamer would be gross disservice to dreamers.

1191. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 18:07:50 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8sfuko53uvq8e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37219

Dick Carroll wrote, about a new thread on the main board:

>. . . the subject has about been covered anyway.
>Nothing is ever resolved on rrap.

I'm going to give it a try anyway. What the heck!

Val

1192. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 18:30:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E493E.8F8BA8EC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37230

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > Actually it was a pro-code Extra who specified the use of a paddle only and
> > prohibited the use of a straight key. He said , "Real hams don't use straight keys!"
>
> He was obviously not a Morse expert.

Yes, he was/is - 300+ countries DXCC on CW. He just wanted us ordinary humans
to be as expert as he.

> My statement is still true: Lack of proper planning and preparation,
> or somebody with an anti-CW/Morse agenda.

He was/is an Extra, extremely pro-code, and in charge of iEARS. But I sneaked
my straight key into the Intel ham shack for ordinary QSO's.

> It's also poor planning/preparation not to learn to use the equipment
> which did exist - including the paddles.

I have practiced for hundreds of hours - still can't get the hang
of the paddles. My inherited palsy 'dit's when it should 'dah'.
The other night, a ham just stopped responding to me because I
had so much trouble with his callsign using the paddles.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1193. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 18:32:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E49B2.4E178221@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37231

Dick Carroll wrote:
> For all you've learned, you've never learned to pay attention?

It's an NMI, Dick.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1194. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 18:35:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E4A6B.DB5869FD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37232

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Robert Casey wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > Why would you deliberately risk lives by slowing down emergency operations
> > > > because some Lid, 200 miles away from the emergency, is a terrible CW operator?

> > > I would be a "lid" but I know that my best move is to stay out of the way and
> > > let the experts handle it.
> > >
> > My point exactly.
>
> That's great as far as the LID is concerned, but does nothing whatever to assist a
> slow CW operator who has emergency traffic that needs to be handled.

The subject (see above) is a 5wpm operator, 200 miles away from the emergency
zone, who wants to be part of the emergency CW net.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1195. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 18:44:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E4C93.A46DCBC9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37233

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > My point exactly. He is worse than useless. He is interfering with
> > emergency communications.
>
> This is really novel. Just because he is a slow operator calling in on a fast emergency net,
> you'd cut him off without ever checking to see what his business was, or where he was
> calling from. Your boundary condition that "he is 200 miles away from the emergency" is
> a non-starter since you did not state how you come by that information. If you don't
> know, you can't assume in an emergency.

It is a hypothetical case, Dick. I chose and published the initial boundary conditions. You can assume that he has already given his QTH as being 200 miles away from the emergency yet still wants to be in on the emergency action. I know such individuals.

> > Anyone interfering with emergency communications needs to be mistreated.
>
> So how about we determine that he is indeed just interfering before we cut him off from
> any hope of assistance that he may desperately need

It is a hypothetical case, Dick, part of the initial boundary conditions. If you want a different set of conditions, start another thread.

> Choose the possibility of having no
> communications rather than learn the most basic mode of radio communication,
> radiotelegraphy.

Do you have storage food and water, Dick? They are lots more important than Morse code skill. Do you think storage food and water should be mandated by the feds?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1196. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 18:45:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E4CE5.2E6D2180@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37234

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Skunk juice is used in expensive perfumes.
>
> Nope. Just a highly refined component.

A highly refined component of skunk juice is not skunk juice?
A rose by any other name ...
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1197. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 19:12:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E5311.FD3CEFCE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37238

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Valentine Germann wrote:
> > > Hello again, Mr. Carroll!
> > > This is becoming impossible to follow;
> > >
> > That's characteristic of Dick's postings. :-)
>
> It is???? Would you care to see if you can dredge up any such statement
> from me?

OK, here are a few of the classics:
****
On your theory that all HF troublemakers were originally licensed as
Conditionals, cheated, and never passed a Morse code:

> You require lab-quality "proof", while to most rational persons,
> recounting from many sources of such "deals" and having known a number
> of persons who obviously, from their lack of code ability, had never
> learned any code but held coded licenses, along with observing their
> attitudes toward the hobby, their actions within it, and it's value (or
> lack) as they evidently held it to be, one can gain an informed opinion
> without that laboratory grade proof.

On your theory that Morse code doesn't obey Shannon's law:

> Did OOK code perhaps slip through an infinestimally small crack in Shannon's
> works? The more I see and hear of Nyquist and Shannon, the less it applies to
> the *real* world of ham radio communincations, ...

On your attempt at English and Latin:

> Nope. Wrongee againee, O Geniusarius Magnificantus et Mensastasis.

On your theory that Extras are allowed to rest on their laurels:

> I suppose that you, never able to qualify for Extra class,
> would just naturally fail to admit that one who has passed
> the top grade license test has "arrived"...

> > Richard Carroll wrote:
> > > What YOU don't realize Cecil, is that the Extra class license is NOT
> > > the entry level--it's the TOP level.
> > >
> > So you can stop learning anything, eh?

>
> Well, yes--

On your theory about SWR:

> Which means that the incident wave is equal to the
> reflected wave, a Standing Wave Ratio of 1:1.
****
"Thanks For The Memories", Dick.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1198. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 19:16:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E5404.3052443@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37240

Dick Carroll wrote:

> an alleged EE wrote:
> > What is AGC/AVC? (I'm not even sure if my radio has it.)
>
> Proving, surely beyond doubt, that not even a degree in electrical
> engineering automatically qualifies one for a ham radio license! And
> that the tests are pretty much a non-entity anyway.

Why would a digital engineer know what AGC is, Dick? Do you know what
an NMI is?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1199. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 19:16:25 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8sjv86v8mvia5@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37235

Richard McCollum wrote, about the tests and their
abilities to vet those desiring an amateur radio license:

>While I tend to agree with most of your input, I think you are
>expecting too much of the testing process.

You're most likely right!

> . . . vetting is too strong a term and concept to unload on a
>testing process.

Yes, vetting can be only one component of what any test does.
However, I think it has to be an important one.

>And even among the anti-social types, having them in the tent
>pissing out has something to be said for it as opposed to
>(see 27 MHz) having them outside the tent pissing in.

Yes, there's an agrument there, too.

>The reduction in the code to 5wpm did not really seem to
>lower the barrier it presented. I have contended that it, like
>embarassment and boredom, is something one does to
>himself. So if you are of a mindset that being a good poseur
>equals (or betters - see Enron) actually doing anything it is
>a hell of a barrier to mewl, moan, whine, and agitate against
>and marshall all of your pseudo-learning to attack. And in fact
>we have seen just that: you will soon join the Group W bench
>with all the mother-rapers, father-rapers, and litterers -- you
>just haven't been around long enough.

Oh, boy, I can't (sic) wait!

>You will also see Lifer Tech Syndrome. There are those that
>in preference to actually doing something that admittedly makes
>not a lot of regulatory sense (but few exams do) will over-
>compensate to the point of the absurd. These are guys who
>will join everything including applying for a medical waiver to
>QCWA, make annual pilgrimages to Dayton and HP Maxim's
>grave, and become instant geniuses on things like the regs,
>160 grayline propagation, and (wait for it) digital techniques.
>Anything to achieve 'equality' but a blessed code test.

I think I've already met one of these!

>In a previous life, I played tournament bridge -- an easy game
>to play but a difficult one to play well. The secret to success is
>count, count, count and play with people better than you both

>to learn something and because they can be trusted not to do
>something stupid and insert a random event into things.

This is no doubt related to an idea floated here by Mr. Hare, that the erstwhile non-qualifiers will step up to the plate once they get into the tent and fall under the influence of current Hams. Could be.

>Now how do you set up an exam system to weed out those who
>are not about to lose face and ego in the process of aquiring the
>brown stains [of hard experience through trial and error]???

Well, that's a tall order. However, the exams have a public policy purpose and component that is denied at Ham Radio's peril. If too many of those "pissing in" are actually PISSING, well, before long you don't have anything anymore . . . but a lake of urine.

Val

1200. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 19:18:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E548E.98171AC2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37241

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > The 1957 ARRL License Manual had 279 Q&A in 25 pages. The 2000
> > ARRL Extra Class License Manual had 449 Q&A in 359 pages. Looks
> > like to me the material increased from 1957 to 2000.
>
> Yep. One of the things the computer Age was supposed to do was eliminate paper,
> too. Didn't happen, did it? Just because there are more "pages" of questions doesn't
> mean a thing.

Everyone has noticed that nothing means anything unless it supports your agenda.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1201. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 19:22:11 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8ska312h3noee@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37236

Hello, all!

CAM wrote, in reply to my reasonable message
concerning CW and the international amateur
radio community:

>Many people thought the slaves would quit working after
>they were freed but many of them worked even harder.

This is, of course, yet one more example of this poster's
valuable and spot-on UseNet contributions. The message
is relevant, clear and concise. In short, it's everything we
have come to expect from one of UseNet's finest. I tug
my forelock to you, sir, as I attend, once again, to the cotton.

Val

1202. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 19:25:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E5612.DB70833A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37242

Dick Carroll wrote:
> From that you indicate that you believe that future hams will leap to learn
> Morse code whereas all the NCI types have dedicated their lives to its very
> demise. To call you a dreamer would be gross disservice to dreamers.

Nobody has leaped (jumped off a cliff) to learn Morse code since I have been
a ham, Dick. Like it has been in the 51 years since I first obtained a ham
license, the hams who want to operate CW will operate CW. The hams who don't
want to operate CW will not operate CW. The General ham who gave me my Conditional
exam in 1952 couldn't copy Morse code as fast as I could send it. I had
to slow down for him.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1203. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 19:27:05 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8skjl1lvbmc41@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37237

Dick Carroll wrote:

>For one, we can't automatically assume that all nations
>will automatically drop the CW test just because ITU and
>USA does. I understand that Russia has already stated it will
>keep the CW test. There will surely be others. No rules changes
>take place quickly.

True. However, many nations likely WILL drop it, won't they?

>Also, none of this CW loss will occur in the near future.

I'm hoping that will prove correct!

>CW is very much alive and well on the air these days. So Val, you
>won't need to be concerned with a lack of other hams to chat with
>on CW, either locally or internationally, any time soon. Steve and
>you are surely right about the situation down the road, however.

I guess it's a good thing that'll I likely not see this, eh, since I'm on
the cusp of geezerhood NOW! "Apre mois, le deluge!"

>Many [overseas Hams] are very conversant in spoken English
>and work the phone bands. So go ahead and begin your ham
>radio experience, it isn't likely you'll find it disappointing.

I'm looking forward to it very much!

Val

1204. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 19:29:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E5727.83BC395E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37243

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Valentine Germann wrote:
> > > However, if the ITU goes ahead and does away
> > > with any CW requirement, what does the future hold
> > > for an international community in Ham Radio?
> > >
> > Whatever the international community of Ham Radio
> > wants it to hold. Just because the slaves were freed
> > didn't mean they stopped working.
>
> Got it Val? Cecil says because hams have always been required to pass a
> code test they are slaves. Isn't he something special?

Please pay attention, Dick. I was obviously referring to the slaves
freed by President Lincoln.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1205. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 19:30:01 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8skon74krvs76@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37239

Dick Carroll wrote, in response to CAM's "slave" message,
a message sent in repy to my original reasonable missive:

> Got it Val? Cecil says because hams have always
>been required to pass a code test they are slaves.
>Isn't he something special?

I can't tell just what Mr. Cecil is. I'm too busy tugging my
forelock, chopping cotton, and practicing: "Yessa, missa boss!"

Val

1206. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 19:47:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E5B5A.CDF83C16@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37244

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> Hello, all!
>
> CAM wrote, in reply to my reasonable message
> concerning CW and the international amateur
> radio community:
>
> >Many people thought the slaves would quit working after
> >they were freed but many of them worked even harder.
>
> This is, of course, yet one more example of this poster's
> valuable and spot-on UseNet contributions. The message
> is relevant, clear and concise. In short, it's everything we
> have come to expect from one of UseNet's finest. I tug
> my forelock to you, sir, as I attend, once again, to the cotton.

It is up to us OF's, who know the merits of CW, to convince the
newcomers that CW has enough merit for them to learn Morse code.
It's called an incentive, Val.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1207. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 20:14:58 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8snd1gh4g5oe5@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37245

CAM wrote:

>It is up to us OF's, who know the merits of CW, to convince
>the newcomers that CW has enough merit for them to learn
>Morse code. It's called an incentive, Val.

Oh, NOW it's all clear! You're actually a big FAN of the mode, perhaps in the same way Anderson, as the auditor of Enron, published honest information of use to the rank-and-file stockholder! Thanks for clearing that up!

And since it's up to "us" (and that includes YOU!), perhaps you might expound on your program to promote the benefits of CW in amateur radio? You do have, one, right?

Val

1208. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 20:18:01 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8snj0dflvkj16@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37247

CAM wrote, confusedly, in a message supposedly
referring to Ham Radio:

>Please pay attention, Dick. I was obviously referring to the slaves
>freed by President Lincoln.

I must have missed that part of N2EY's history of Ham Radio.
Can you fill me on what the licensing requirements were then?

Val

1209. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 20:33:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E6601.D5ED54F6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37248

Howard Goldstein wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> : I have what might be considered as AADD.
>
> The need to get fills to copy the entire message *will* break you of
> that.

Doubt it. My first grade teacher first noticed it 58 years ago.
However, I always knew the answer to the question even if I
didn't know what the question was. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1210. Is your antenna broken?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 20:34:36 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <1Ltj8.48634$Yd.2784484@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 37054

If you are in the market for a screwdriver mobile antenna, then I invite your attention to the
Carolina Cyclone shown on my website below. The difference in the Carolina Cyclone and
some of the others is in materials, workmanship, and price. Often, increases in signal strength
are achieved by increasing the size of the inductor, wire size, and spacing. This is what I have done with the Carolina Cyclone. Cyclone I, for example, is 2 1/2" dia compared to
only 2" for the DK3 clones and uses #14 wire spaced at 8 turns per inch for a better form
factor. Materials are black Nylon, the same materials used for Nyloc bolts, to handle high
power, and give rugged service for years and years. The result is 800 watts power handling
power (conservative) for Cyclone I and a full 1500 watts SSB for the Cyclone II, which is
a full 3" diameter to give the same "Q" as the famous Texas Bugcatchers. You will find that
you will be most successful with DX and pileups with the Carolina Cyclone series of antennas. AND the prices are well under those of most of the competition. For more details, please visit www.qsl.net/k4kwh .

1211. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 20:39:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E6797.4A83458D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37249

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> >It is up to us OF's, who know the merits of CW, to convince
> >the newcomers that CW has enough merit for them to learn
> >Morse code. It's called an incentive, Val.
>
> Oh, NOW it's all clear! You're actually a big FAN of the
> mode, ...

Yep, CW has always been my favorite mode. The only reason I got a Conditional license was to be able to continue 40m CW after my Novice license expired in 1952. Last Sunday was the first time I had been on SSB in a year - needed to get my SGC-500 amp working with my new IC-756pro.

> And since it's up to "us" (and that includes YOU!), perhaps
> you might expound on your program to promote the benefits
> of CW in amateur radio? You do have, one, right?

Yep, I promote CW usage in my home county ARC and encourage all other hams to do the same. I offer to teach classes in Morse code to anyone who is interested. I encourage all my GED students to try amateur radio as a hobby.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1212. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 20:47:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C87C5F4.CAB19E24@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37250

CAM wrote:

>
> > Choose the possibility of having no
> > communications rather than learn the most basic mode of radio communication,
> > radiotelegraphy.
>
> Do you have storage food and water, Dick? They are lots more important than Morse
> code skill. Do you think storage food and water should be mandated by the feds?

With working communications one can probably get food and water. Without, quite likely not.

1213. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 20:47:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C87C650.2B7E2A5C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37051

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Skunk juice is used in expensive perfumes.
> >
> > Nope. Just a highly refined component.
>
> A highly refined component of skunk juice is not skunk juice?

Does it have the same smell as skunk juice? NO? then it isn't skunk
juice, just a useful
highly refined component, which is useful.

>
> A rose by any other name ...

Is certainly not a skunk!

1214. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 20:47:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C87C764.1B44B099@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37052

Valentine Germann wrote:

> Richard McCollum wrote, about the tests and their
> abilities to vet those desiring an amateur radio license:
>
> >While I tend to agree with most of your input, I think you are
> >expecting too much of the testing process.
>
> You're most likely right!
>
> > . . . vetting is too strong a term and concept to unload on a
> >testing process.
>
> Yes, vetting can be only one component of what any test does.
> However, I think it has to be an important one.
>
> >And even among the anti-social types, having them in the tent
> >pissing out has something to be said for it as opposed to
> >(see 27 MHz) having them outside the tent pissing in.
>
> Yes, there's an agrument there, too.
>
> >The reduction in the code to 5wpm did not really seem to
> >lower the barrier it presented. I have contended that it, like
> >embarassment and boredom, is something one does to
> >himself. So if you are of a mindset that being a good poseur
> >equals (or betters - see Enron) actually doing anything it is
> >a hell of a barrier to mewl, moan, whine, and agitate against
> >and marshall all of your pseudo-learning to attack. And in fact
> >we have seen just that: you will soon join the Group W bench
> >with all the mother-rapers, father-rapers, and litterers -- you
> >just haven't been around long enough.
>
> Oh, boy, I can't (sic) wait!
>
> >You will also see Lifer Tech Syndrome. There are those that
> >in preference to actually doing something that admittedly makes
> >not a lot of regulatory sense (but few exams do) will over-
> >compensate to the point of the absurd. These are guys who
> >will join everything including applying for a medical waiver to
> >QCWA, make annual pilgrimages to Dayton and HP Maxim's
> >grave, and become instant geniuses on things like the regs,
> >160 grayline propagation, and (wait for it) digital techniques.
> >Anything to achieve 'equality' but a blessed code test.

>
> I think I've already met one of these!
>
> >In a previous life, I played tournament bridge -- an easy game
> >to play but a difficult one to play well. The secret to success is
> >count, count, count and play with people better than you both
> >to learn something and because they can be trusted not to do
> >something stupid and insert a random event into things.
>
> This is no doubt related to an idea floated here by Mr. Hare, that
> the erstwhile non-qualifiers will step up to the plate once they get
> into the tent and fall under the influence of current Hams. Could be.
>
> >Now how do you set up an exam system to weed out those who
> >are not about to lose face and ego in the process of aquiring the
> >brown stains [of hard experience through trial and error]???
>
> Well, that's a tall order. However, the exams have a public policy
> purpose and component that is denied at Ham Radio's peril. If
> too many of those "pissing in" are actually PISSING, well, before long
> you don't have anything anymore . . . but a lake of urine.
>
> Val

Well said, Val. I like your style. (Evidently Cecil does, too :-)))

1215. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 20:47:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C87CF1A.FE0C8158@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37053

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Valentine Germann wrote:
> > > > Hello again, Mr. Carroll!
> > > > This is becoming impossible to follow;
> > >
> > > That's characteristic of Dick's postings. :-)
> >
> > It is???? Would you care to see if you can dredge up any such statement
> > from me?
>
> OK, here are a few of the classics:
> **********
> On your theory that all HF troublemakers were originally licensed as
> Conditionals, cheated, and never passed a Morse code:
>
> > You require lab-quality "proof", while to most rational persons,
> > recounting from many sources of such "deals" and having known a number
> > of persons who obviously, from their lack of code ability, had never
> > learned any code but held coded licenses, along with observing their
> > attitudes toward the hobby, their actions within it, and it's value (or
> > lack) as they evidently held it to be, one can gain an informed opinion
> > without that laboratory grade proof.

I have strongly suspected, bolstered by your own admittances here, that you
probably were
one of the persons who were given a pass to your Conditional ticket by your buddies
who tested you. So you, and others, went on to bigger and better things. Many did
not, and some are the persons noted. That you would much rather it wasn't so is not
at issue.

>
>
> On your theory that Morse code doesn't obey Shannon's law:
>
> > Did OOK code perhaps slip through an infinestimally small crack in Shannon's
> > works? The more I see and hear of Nyquist and Shannon, the less it applies to
> > the *real* world of ham radio communincations, ...
>

Shannon's law cannot account for the fact that a well trained human can copy CW well below what machines are able to do, save the wildly different extremely slow HF moonbounce style CW, which is vastly different and you know it. Did Shannon know that
there was something there that was different? Too bad we can't ask him.
You had no valid rebuttal to my report of hearing several Europeans working PSK31 in very weaksignal conditions were the PSK mode was not copyable, yet the CW ID was clear. You came back with some lame remark about "a level playing field" which had no relevance whatever to the communications situation at hand.
Yes, by now the whole world knows about Shannon and his magic theory. So what? If a "more efficient mode" won't get through and a lesser one will, practical people will view the theory as unrelated to the practice.

"In theory, theory and practice are the same, but in practice they are different"
-Yogi Berra

>
> On your attempt at English and Latin:
>
> > Nope. Wrongee againee, O Geniusarius Magnificantus et Mensastasis.
>

Yup. Your right, a Latin maven I am definitely not, and never professed to be.
Your tail was being twisted but you didn't notice.

>
> On your theory that Extras are allowed to rest on their laurels:
>
> > I suppose that you, never able to qualify for Extra class,
> > would just naturally fail to admit that one who has passed
> > the top grade license test has "arrived"...
>
> > > Richard Carroll wrote:
> > > > What YOU don't realize Cecil, is that the Extra class license is NOT
> > > > the entry level--it's the TOP level.
> > >
> > > So you can stop learning anything, eh?
> >
> > Well, yes--
>

In the realm of ham radio testing, what could be more factual? Of course what I DID NOT say was that I stopped learning in 1969 right after I passed the Extra exam. It would have been difficult to accomplish what I did at work in the next 20 years if I had.
Of course you conveniently overlooked the context, as always when you're attempting to trounce an opponent. Nice guy, that Cecil. Lame, too.

> On your theory about SWR:
>
> > Which means that the incident wave is equal to the
> > reflected wave, a Standing Wave Ratio of 1:1.

Yep. And of course I knew that was incorrect, and didn't proof it before sending. The actual case is nearer the opposite, and if you don't believe I knew that, it's your problem, not mine. I don't have any problems making my antennas work. Nor did I have *at* work. Again, a trolling opportunity grabbed by you

> "Thanks For The Memories", Dick.

And you're more than just welcome, OT (that's Old Troll). Thanks for seeing to it that your context-busting trolling is never stale. Mistakes? Yeah, I make them. And I could go back
to the archives and glean out some of yours, too --they are there-- and YOU have no excuse, being a degreed engineer. But I don't intend to waste the time. It's a Pity you don't have anything more constructive to do with yours.

1216. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 21:01:00 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C8E6C8C.AF33AF9D@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 37055

Dick Carroll wrote:

>
> Also, none of this CW loss will occur in the near future. CW is very much alive
> and well on the air these days. So Val, you won't need to be concerned with a lack
> of other hams to chat with on CW, either locally or internationally, any time
> soon. Steve and you are surely right about the situation down the road, however.

One of the merits of code is that it requires a minimum of equipment to
operate with it. So there should be a lot of CW from the third world, yes?

1217. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 21:05:16 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C8E6D8B.6031C6AF@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 37056

Valentine Germann wrote:

> CAM wrote, confusedly, in a message supposedly
> referring to Ham Radio:
>
> >Please pay attention, Dick. I was obviously referring to the slaves
> >freed by President Lincoln.
>
> I must have missed that part of N2EY's history of Ham Radio.
> Can you fill me on what the licensing requirements were then?

You had to pick twenty bushels of cotton a minute back then.... :-)

1218. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 21:28:53 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8srnmimtc2150@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37057

CAM wrote, in response to a message about promoting
CW in amateur radio:

>Yep, CW has always been my favorite mode.

Why, this is EXCELLENT!

> Last Sunday was the first time I had been on SSB in a
>year - needed to get my SGC-500 amp working with
>my new IC-756pro.

Fantastic!

>Yep, I promote CW usage in my home county ARC . . .

I'm reading . . .

> . . . and encourage all other hams to do the same.

How do you "encourage ALL other hams to do the same?"
I haven't seen a messge like that from you on this NewsGroup.
Perhaps I have missed something, or perhaps that
encouragement is not considered important in this venue!

>I offer to teach classes in Morse code to anyone who
>is interested.

OUTSTANDING, though I must admit there is a slight waver
in that "to anyone who is interested" bit. That is, I would have
expected you to ENCOURAGE people to learn CW, perhaps
even in the face of a, er, dare I say it, certain lack of interest?

>I encourage all my GED students to try amateur radio
>as a hobby.

And then learn CW from you (?), after you have strongly
encouraged them to use your "favorite method?"

That certainly WOULD be fine!

Now, in the public policy realm, that is, rulemaking, what
do you recommend with reference to your "favorite mode?"

Val

1219. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 21:31:59 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8srtfod364p8b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37058

Robert Casey wrote, with reference to licensing requirements
during the Civil War:

>You had to pick twenty bushels of cotton a minute back then.. :-)

But wasn't that later reduced to only THIRTEEN bushels/minute?
I think I read that somewhere. Hm, I bet N2EY knows! :)

Val

1220. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 21:32:42 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8srusqlro1o9c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37059

Robert Casey wrote:

>One of the merits of code is that it requires a minimum
>of equipment to operate with it. So there should be a lot
>of CW from the third world, yes?

One would think so, yes!

Val

1221. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 21:45:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E7708.E4925FA8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37060

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > > Choose the possibility of having no
> > > communications rather than learn the most basic mode of radio communication,
> > > radiotelegraphy.
> >
> > Do you have storage food and water, Dick? They are lots more important than Morse
> > code skill. Do you think storage food and water should be mandated by the feds?
>
> With working communications one can probably get food and water. Without, quite likely
> not.

So you are depending upon CW to provide you with food and water in case
of an emergency? Remember, "The Morse God giveth and the Morse God taketh
away." Or was that the Norse God - I forget.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1222. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 21:47:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E7760.8C6FA923@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37061

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Well said, Val. I like your style. (Evidently Cecil does, too :-)))

I figured you would like it since it is virtually indistinguishable
from yours.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1223. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 21:49:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E77D4.1B4C237E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37062

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > Skunk juice is used in expensive perfumes.
> > >
> > > Nope. Just a highly refined component.
> >
> > A highly refined component of skunk juice is not skunk juice?
>
> Does it have the same smell as skunk juice? NO? then it isn't skunk
> juice, just a useful highly refined component, which is useful.

So refined skunk juice is not skunk juice. There, there, I think I
understand. (Somebody get the net!)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1224. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 21:49:51 UTC
From: Garvin@Truss.net
Message-ID: <1f8xj00.1ozj1p3z05gczN%Garvin@Truss.net>
Source record: 37063

Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net> wrote:

> Hello, all!
>
> I am an old guy (52) who will be taking his Technician
> test next Monday and then, with any luck at all, the
> General tests, code and written, in April. My primary
> interest in Ham Radio was the possibilty of making
> international contacts with low or medium power, on
> CW, since that is the "international language" of amateur
> radio. However, if the ITU goes ahead and does away
> with any CW requirement, what does the future hold
> for an international community in Ham Radio? It seems
> to me that if the CW treaty committments are abandoned
> it is only a matter of time before CW itself will be aban-
> doned, as well, as the numbers of Hams using it declines
> to the point where the band plans are changed in its disfavor,
> finishing the job that the treaty changes had begun.
>
> No big deal, I guess, except in my case I had hoped that
> this "international" aspect of the avocation would rermain
> very, very important into the far future. If the CW treaty
> requirements are removed won't amateur radio become
> more or less balkanized by language groups? I know
> this possibility is "down the road" but it is still, to me,
> a very disturbing prospect.
>
> Val Germann
> Columbia, Missouri

There will always be people using CW regardless. Don't sweat it one
bit.

--
If people from Poland are called Poles, why
aren't people from Holland called Holes?
- George Carlin

1225. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 22:03:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E7B4D.C68A16C6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37064

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I have strongly suspected, bolstered by your own admittances here, that you
> probably were
> one of the persons who were given a pass to your Conditional ticket by your buddies
> who tested you.

Could be, Dick. W5OLV is an SK so we have no way of knowing. He might have
fudged my test results (or he might not have). He certainly didn't fudge
the perfect score on my Extra exam so everything turned out OK after all.

> Shannon's law cannot account for the fact that a well trained human can copy CW
> well below what machines are able to do, ...

Of course, Shannon's law accounts for that, Dick. Don't be such a silly goose.
CW *cannot* perform past Shannon's limit.

> Yup. Your right, a Latin maven I am definitely not, and never professed to be.
> Your tail was being twisted but you didn't notice.

I lost my tail a few million years ago, Dick. Too bad about your species.

> In the realm of ham radio testing, what could be more factual?

Oh Yeah, I forgot that you believe that ham radio is unrelated to anything else
on this planet - that ham radio obeys a completely different set of laws of
physics than any other kind of radio.

> It's a Pity you don't have anything more constructive to do with yours. (time)

That's one of the few things upon which we agree. Come take care of my
parents so I can go to CA and have some fun.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1226. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 22:16:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C87D26D.78F2D42A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37066

Howard Goldstein wrote:

> On Tue, 12 Mar 2002 10:08:52 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> : N2EY wrote:
> : > One of the many wonderful aspects of CW traffic handling "done right"
> : > is the
> : > extremely high efficiency and economy of words used. Not a dit wasted.
> : >
> : > You oughta try it sometime, Cecil.
> :
> : I have what might be considered as AADD. My mind wanders during CW QSOs.
> : I will be copying along and then lose it to a daydream but not realize
> : I've lost it until many seconds (minutes?) later.
>
> The need to get fills to copy the entire message *will* break you of
> that.

Not him. To him, CW is just a novelty.

1227. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 22:16:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C87D2D5.FDB3FC6E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37067

CAM wrote:

> Howard Goldstein wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > : I have what might be considered as AADD.
> >
> > The need to get fills to copy the entire message *will* break you of
> > that.
>
> Doubt it. My first grade teacher first noticed it 58 years ago.
> However, I always knew the answer to the question even if I
> didn't know what the question was. :-)

Ah. Clairvoyance at work.

1228. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 22:18:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E7E9E.BB61BDA1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37068

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > . . . and encourage all other hams to do the same.
>
> How do you "encourage ALL other hams to do the same?"
> I haven't seen a messge like that from you on this NewsGroup.

If you have been reading this newsgroup for a year, there
is definitely something wrong with your reading ability.
Approximately once a month, I have encouraged all hams to try CW.
I think Bill and Ed will vouch for that. I am a member of The
International Morse Preservation Society. I am not a member of
NoCode International.

> Now, in the public policy realm, that is, rulemaking, what
> do you recommend with reference to your "favorite mode?"

If I were to base my beliefs upon my feelings, I would say
"Continue the Morse code testing, ad infinitum!" However, I
base my beliefs upon my rational thoughts as a Libertarian
and, for that reason, I must adopt a "live and let live"
attitude based on freedom of choice of modes in a hobby
in a free society. IMO, no rational freedom loving person
could come to any other conclusion.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1229. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 22:20:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E7F10.FEB6526B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37069

Robert Casey wrote:
> One of the merits of code is that it requires a minimum of equipment to
> operate with it. So there should be a lot of CW from the third world, yes?

Most of the third world hams I know about are of the rich elite class.
The average citizens are worrying about where their next meal is coming from.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1230. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 22:27:42 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8sv5tct5jv17b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37065

Fred Garvin wrote:

>There will always be people using CW regardless.

Well, yes, there probably will be. But how many? And where?
That is, if the band plans go away . . .

>Don't sweat it one bit.

I wish I could share your confidence!

Val

P.S. I know this is not an immediate concern.

1231. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 22:29:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E8138.88F139BC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37070

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Howard Goldstein wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > : I have what might be considered as AADD.
> > >
> > > The need to get fills to copy the entire message *will* break you of
> > > that.
> >
> > Doubt it. My first grade teacher first noticed it 58 years ago.
> > However, I always knew the answer to the question even if I
> > didn't know what the question was. :-)
>
> Ah. Clairvoyance at work.

Clairvoyance had nothing to do with it and knowledge had everything
to do with it. Thanks to my mother, I was already relatively fluent
in English, science, and math by the time I started school. The teacher
caught me daydreaming one day in the first grade and asked me a question.
The sound of my name snapped me back to reality and I asked her to repeat
the question. She said, "Aha, you weren't listening, were you? Why is the
South Pole colder than the North Pole?" I don't think that was the original
question but I answered, "Because there's land at the South Pole." Her jaw
dropped to the floor. She later told my mother about it and my mother said,
"Doesn't everyone know that?"
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1232. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 22:34:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8E8274.7213AEB4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37071

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> Fred Garvin wrote:
> >There will always be people using CW regardless.
>
> Well, yes, there probably will be. But how many? And where?
> That is, if the band plans go away . . .

But, but, but Val, don't you know that CW gets through when no
other mode will? Who cares about band plans if that is true?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1233. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 22:39:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C87E82A.9E05DDD0@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37072

Robert Casey wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> >
> > Also, none of this CW loss will occur in the near future. CW is very much alive
> > and well on the air these days. So Val, you won't need to be concerned with a lack
> > of other hams to chat with on CW, either locally or internationally, any time
> > soon. Steve and you are surely right about the situation down the road, however.
>
> One of the merits of code is that it requires a minimum of equipment to
> operate with it. So there should be a lot of CW from the third world, yes?

Should be, but it seems that there very little ham radio of any sort in the third world, where a large portion of the people are nearly or completely illiterate and are living subsistence lives.
The few hams usually are the more moneyed elite who can more afford whatever they want.
If ham radio ever makes inroads into the general populations CW might well be popular, unless gear with more advanced modes becomes inexpensive.

1234. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 22:39:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C87E8AD.C913D242@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37073

Valentine Germann wrote:

> CAM wrote, in response to a message about promoting
> CW in amateur radio:
>
> >Yep, CW has always been my favorite mode.
>
> Why, this is EXCELLENT!
>
> > Last Sunday was the first time I had been on SSB in a
> >year - needed to get my SGC-500 amp working with
> >my new IC-756pro.
>
> Fantastic!
>
> >Yep, I promote CW usage in my home county ARC . . .
>
> I'm reading . . .
>
> > . . . and encourage all other hams to do the same.
>
> How do you "encourage ALL other hams to do the same?"
> I haven't seen a messge like that from you on this NewsGroup.
> Perhaps I have missed something, or perhaps that
> encouragement is not considered important in this venue!
>
> >I offer to teach classes in Morse code to anyone who
> >is interested.
>
> OUTSTANDING, though I must admit there is a slight waver
> in that "to anyone who is interested" bit. That is, I would have
> expected you to ENCOURAGE people to learn CW, perhaps
> even in the face of a, er, dare I say it, certain lack of interest?
>
> >I encourage all my GED students to try amateur radio
> >as a hobby.
>
> And then learn CW from you (?), after you have strongly
> encouraged them to use your "favorite method?"
>
> That certainly WOULD be fine!
>
> Now, in the public policy realm, that is, rulemaking, what
> do you recommend with reference to your "favorite mode?"

>
> Val

(Cecil) Er, well, ah.....ahem!

1235. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 22:40:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C87E951.A71DDC7F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37075

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > Skunk juice is used in expensive perfumes.
> > > >
> > > > Nope. Just a highly refined component.
> > >
> > > A highly refined component of skunk juice is not skunk juice?
> >
> > Does it have the same smell as skunk juice? NO? then it isn't skunk
> > juice, just a useful highly refined component, which is useful.
>
> So refined skunk juice is not skunk juice. There, there, I think I
> understand. (Somebody get the net!--

If you knew some of what went into some of the foods you eat you'd
probably jump into the net.

1236. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 22:40:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C87EC03.108F348E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37074

CAM wrote:

> Shannon's law cannot account for the fact that a well trained human can copy CW

> > well below what machines are able to do, ...
>
> Of course, Shannon's law accounts for that, Dick. Don't be such a silly goose.
> CW *cannot* perform past Shannon's limit.
>

Yes, but in PRACTICE..... the CW ID on a PSK31 signal makes it through under conditions where the the phase shift keying cannot. (Yes I know about the theory... sorry it doesn't work out in practice).
To force one to close down the bandpass on a working mode to the point where it, too, no longer works just to prove it is "more efficient" is simply irrational. Even it is good engineering.

>
> Oh Yeah, I forgot that you believe that ham radio is unrelated to anything else
> on this planet - that ham radio obeys a completely different set of laws of
> physics than any other kind of radio.

The scenario above explains that in detail and is indeed one example of where pure engineering doesn't always hold up to the reality of practice, even if it is correct..

Remember our buddy Yogi---" In theory, theory and practice are the same, but in practice they are different" (at least they can easily be). Truer words were never spoken.

1237. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 23:22:53 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6m2oaqje1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37077

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C87A839.6C9CB0ED@worldnet.att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > Why would you deliberately risk lives by slowing down emergency
operations
> > > > because some Lid, 200 miles away from the emergency, is a terrible
CW operator?
> > >
> > > I would quickly find
> > > what his business was, and if he's just "checking in" he'd get cut off
shortly.
> >
> > My point exactly. He is worse than useless. He is interfering with
> > emergency communications.
>
> This is really novel. Just because he is a slow operator calling in on a
fast emergency
> net,
> you'd cut him off without ever checking to see what his business was, or
where he was
> calling from.

If the net is "fast" just how does "slow operator" even know it is
an emergency net...if he can't copy at the net speed?

> > And what I have said is that it should be up to individual hams to
decide
> > if they need CW, like deciding if they need to store bottled water.
>
> Ah, yes, it's another vanilla "just a choice". Choose the possibility of
having no
> communications rather than learn the most basic mode of radio
communication,
> radiotelegraphy.

Bingo....it is a personal decision. Does you car have a first aid kit?
Are you able to give CPR? Those too are personal choices. If
I decide NOT to learn CPR am I gulty of having no heart attack
emergency response rather than learn the most basic mode of response
(i.e. CPR)?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1238. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 23:24:53 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8t2h3bsfq9l23@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37076

CAM wrote, concerning public policy and rulemaking
in amateur radio, vis-a-vis CW, his favorite mode:

>If I were to base my beliefs upon my feelings, I would say
>"Continue the Morse code testing, ad infinitum!" However, I
>base my beliefs upon my rational thoughts as a Libertarian
>and, for that reason, I must adopt a "live and let live"
>attitude based on freedom of choice of modes in a hobby
>in a free society. IMO, no rational freedom loving person
>could come to any other conclusion.

And someone on this newsgroup said it was impossible
to come to any resolution on raap!

I think CAM has closed the book on THIS one!

Of course, when I encounter someone like this in real life,
and hear this kind of thing in real time, in person, very soon
I find myself edging for the door while at the same time
hoping my car keys are in my pocket, and my battery has
a good charge in it!

Val

1239. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-12 23:48:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312184845.08722.00000951@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 37078

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> That's great as far as the LID is concerned, but does nothing whatever to
>assist a
>slow CW operator who has emergency traffic that needs to be handled.

If it truly were an emergency, both the slow op and the net control station could switch to SSB or a digital mode right on the CW net frequency.

If conditions were so poor that SSB was not an option, I doubt that an unskilled CW op would have the ability to dig the encoding out of the noise.

What is your estimate of the percentage of hams that could pass emergency CW traffic under circumstances where conditions were bad enough that SSB could not be copied?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1240. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 00:00:11 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312190011.08722.00000955@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 37079

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>This is, of course, yet one more example of this poster's
>valuable and spot-on UseNet contributions. The message
>is relevant, clear and concise. In short, it's everything we
>have come to expect from one of UseNet's finest. I tug
>my forelock to you, sir, as I attend, once again, to the cotton.

Do you think that your post is a valuable, relevant, clear, concise post that
one should expect of UseNet's finest?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1241. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 00:03:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312190303.08722.00000956@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 37080

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>And since it's up to "us" (and that includes YOU!), perhaps
>you might expound on your program to promote the benefits
>of CW in amateur radio? You do have, one, right?

I can't speak for Cecil, but I feel that I promote the mode by having about 95% of my ham radio operating in Morse code. I have been part of some of the discussions on the QRP lists about why we need to work with the new hams who would like to improve their CW skills.

And, of course, I counter the disinformation offered by other OFs that CW does not have enough merit to be worth learning except to pass a test. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1242. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 00:06:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312190625.08722.00000957@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 37081

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>That is, I would have
>expected you to ENCOURAGE people to learn CW, perhaps
>even in the face of a, er, dare I say it, certain lack of interest?

I don't think that it is helpful to those who might be interested in ham radio to try to show them the parts of ham radio that the are not interested in. There are a lot of things to enjoy in ham radio and I don't feel diminished in any way by the presence of people who enjoy different things. As an Elmer, I see my role as helping someone discover what part of ham radio is right for them, not to impose my standards on them. As I tell them about different parts of ham radio, my enthusiasm for Morse code will show through.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1243. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 00:09:54 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312190954.08722.00000958@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 37082

From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com

>One of the merits of code is that it requires a minimum of equipment to
>operate with it. So there should be a lot of CW from the third world, yes?

Those that are not worried more about other facets of life. Even in developing nations, the poorest segment of society does not usually pursue ham radio.

Of course, your point is well taken that the inexpensive nature of the CW rigs can be quite appealing to hams. Hams are, after all, known to be frugal. :-)

The QRP column on the ARRL Web page just featured a nice article about QRP rigs, most of which are CW.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1244. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 00:13:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312191340.08722.00000959@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 37083

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>Wrong. FCC decided to drop all licensing requirements for broadcast
>engineering
>and leave all the responsibility for meeting the technical rules to the
>station
>owner.

> The implications of such a move should be obvious.

The implications are not obvious to me, Dick. In my dealings with broadcasters, I have generally found their technical staff to be competent. I don't see any significant change in the quality of the audio and video from local broadcast stations. I don't see a spate of FCC NALs to the broadcast industry.

What are the effects of such a move? I may be just not seeing them, so anything specific would be helpful.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1245. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 00:15:42 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312191542.08722.00000960@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 37084

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>P.S. Does Mr. Hare have a two-line governor
>on his keyboard? After a while it looks silly.

That's a pretty silly question, Val. Were you serious?

I generally try not to ramble on. Compared to some of my posts, that could be a blessing.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1246. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 00:19:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312191907.08722.00000961@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 37085

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> I am curious myself. In the few instances where I have been involved with
>the
>> technical staff of broadcast stations, I have found them to be competent.

> That would be because you have dealt with stations that *have* a technical
>staff.

I have never contacted a broadcaster only to be told they don't have a
technical staff.

> Wouldn't you agree that transmitter tuning and modulation adjustments should
>be
>done by someone who has an understanding of the issues and pitfalls involved?

I haven't heard any indication on my local broadcast stations that the
transmitters are mistuned and I have not seen a spate of NALs coming out the
FCC.

>When a FCC licensed person was required, he knew that if he didn't
>follow the rules he could easily lose his license to work, and he would
>see that technical problems were taken care of.

The broadcaster is at the same risk, only with a lot more than a single job at
stake.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1247. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 00:20:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312192035.08722.00000962@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 37086

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>Mr Hare is a busy fella, and it looks like that many times he doesn't
>really read what is there.
>Hence answers that don't really work well.

Actually, Dick, my reading comprehension is rather good.

When Cecil says things that don't support your position, he is "trolling." I guess my answers just "don't work well."

Same difference.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1248. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 00:22:09 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312192209.08722.00000964@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 37087

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>This one was anon, and may have been a Cecilian troll, for all I know,
>but

>AAAARGH!!!!!

I have to wonder how many old timers screamed at some of the stupid questions I asked when I was a new ham.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1249. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 01:04:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312200449.08722.00000972@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 37090

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>> Well said, Val. I like your style. (Evidently Cecil does, too :-)))
>
>I figured you would like it since it is virtually indistinguishable
>from yours.

Look more closely, Cecil. There are distinct differences in tone and
coherence.

Keep in mind that one is an aspiring ham, who cannot be expected to know all
the nuances.

Be kind.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1250. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 01:11:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312201109.06778.00000191@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 37092

In article <3C8E493E.8F8BA8EC@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>> > Actually it was a pro-code Extra who specified the use of a paddle only
>and
>> > prohibited the use of a straight key. He said , "Real hams don't use
>straight keys!"
>>
>> He was obviously not a Morse expert.
>
>Yes, he was/is - 300+ countries DXCC on CW.

That means he's a CW DX expert. Not a Morse expert.

>He just wanted us ordinary humans to be as expert as he.

Yeah, right.

>> My statement is still true: Lack of proper planning and preparation,
>> or somebody with an anti-CW/Morse agenda.
>
>He was/is an Extra, extremely pro-code, and in charge of iEARS. But I sneaked
>my straight key into the Intel ham shack for ordinary QSO's.

>> It's also poor planning/preparation not to learn to use the equipment
>> which did exist - including the paddles.
>
>I have practiced for hundreds of hours - still can't get the hang
>of the paddles.
>My inherited palsy 'dit's when it should 'dah'.
>The other night, a ham just stopped responding to me because I
>had so much trouble with his callsign using the paddles.
>--
Typical Cecil shaggy-dog story. This could drag on for a month. But not with me
involved.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1251. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 01:15:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8EA81F.4EA0692B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37093

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >> Well said, Val. I like your style. (Evidently Cecil does, too :-)))
> > >
> > >I figured you would like it since it is virtually indistinguishable
> > >from yours.
> >
> > Look more closely, Cecil. There are distinct differences in tone and
> > coherence.

You're right, Ed. Val is coherent. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1252. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 01:19:51 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8t98mbadico84@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37088

CAM wrote, in "TROLL - ON - FULL" mode:

>But, but, but Val, don't you know that CW gets through when no
>other mode will? Who cares about band plans if that is true?

I'm almost to the door on this guy. I don't THINK he's armed,
but you never know these days.

Val

1253. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 01:23:16 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8t9fgbgek6lea@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37089

CAM wrote, distractingly:

>Most of the third world hams I know about are of the rich
>elite class. The average citizens are worrying about where
>their next meal is coming from.

I guess I will take the trouble to ask: Do these "rich elite class"
Hams use any CW? I mean, it IS your favorite mode, and
you DO know them.

Val

1254. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 01:24:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8EAA3B.AC26B866@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37096

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Yes, but in PRACTICE..... the CW ID on a PSK31 signal makes it through under conditions
> where the the phase shift keying cannot.

At what power level? In what bandwidth? You are comparing apples
and oranges. PSK31 operates lots closer to Shannon's limit than
CW does.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1255. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 01:25:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8EAA99.49597EC0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37097

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >This one was anon, and may have been a Cecilian troll, for all I know,
> >but AAAARGH!!!!!
>
> I have to wonder how many old timers screamed at some of the stupid questions I
> asked when I was a new ham.

Why weren't you just born smart, like Dick was?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1256. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 01:26:59 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8t9m8ffkmeh5c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37091

Dick Carroll wrote:

> Should be, but it seems that there very little ham radio
>of any sort in the third world, where a large portion of the
>people are nearly or completely illiterate and are living
>subsistence lives. The few hams usually are the more
>moneyed elite who can more afford whatever they want.
>If ham radio ever makes inroads into the general populations
>CW might well be popular, unless gear with more advanced
>modes becomes inexpensive.

Ah, yes, a useful answer, unlike the one from Mr. CAM.
So, most of the CW, worldwide, is from "First-World" outfits,
such as Western Europe, Japan, and a few other locales,
like maybe a few large cities in Latin American and the
Middle East, and maybe Bahrain or some such? Is that fair?

Val

1257. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 01:31:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8EABF1.8E1934F0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37099

Dick Carroll wrote:

> Val wrote:
> > Now, in the public policy realm, that is, rulemaking, what
> > do you recommend with reference to your "favorite mode?"
>
> (Cecil) Er, well, ah.....ahem!

I'm consistent, Dick. The minimum number of necessary laws,
rules, and requirements is best. Is a Morse code requirement
necessary? Obviously not.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1258. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 01:34:08 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8ta3e6hp2gh5c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37094

W1RFI trolled, in reference to one of my more
scintillating UseNet posts:

>Do you think that your post is a valuable, relevant, clear,
>concise post that one should expect of UseNet's finest?

Two lines. Troll rating: 1 out of 10. Got to step it up.

Val

1259. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 01:37:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8EAD4D.A7E14A05@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37100

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> CAM wrote, in "TROLL - ON - FULL" mode:
>
> >But, but, but Val, don't you know that CW gets through when no
> >other mode will? Who cares about band plans if that is true?
>
> I'm almost to the door on this guy. I don't THINK he's armed,
> but you never know these days.

Texas CHL catagory SA (Colt .45)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1260. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 01:37:28 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8taa0ekke82cd@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37095

W1RFI wrote, in reference to what he has been doing
do promote CW in amateur radio:

>I can't speak for Cecil, but I feel that I promote the mode by
>having about 95% of my ham radio operating in Morse code.
>I have been part of some of the discussions on the QRP lists
>about why we need to work with the new hams who
>would like to improve their CW skills.

Well, you know, somehow I thought I might read something a
bit more, you know, ACTIVIST, somehow. Is it not a fact that
appearing on the QRP lists is, er, preaching to the choir? The
true evalgelist gets out among the heathens.

>And, of course, I counter the disinformation offered by other
>OFs that CW does not have enough merit to be worth learning
>except to pass a test. :-)

Oh, so THAT's what you're doing! Glad you cleared that up.

Val

1261. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 01:43:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8EAED3.9BC906D8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37251

N2EY wrote:
> >The other night, a ham just stopped responding to me because I
> >had so much trouble with his callsign using the paddles.

> Typical Cecil shaggy-dog story.

It's a true story. You might recognize his call.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1262. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 01:46:06 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8tapshb7li0a9@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37098

W1RFI wrote, strangely, concerning the promotion of
CW in the amateur service:

>I don't think that it is helpful to those who might be interested
>in ham radio to try to show them the parts of ham radio that
>the are not interested in.

Now, folks, I ask you to study this convoluted sentence from
this obviously seriously conflicted poster. He says he's FOR
the use of CW on the amateur bands but he writes material
such as the example you see above. There's something
seriously Freudian going on HERE, without ANY doubt!
That is, he really and truly feels that people who know nothing
about Ham Radio are not really interested in CW and so,
since that is a part of Ham Radio that they're not interested
in, even though they don't yet KNOW anthing about Ham
Radio, he's not going to show them that part of Ham Radio.
Do you have it now? I think I do. And, I now know why this
poster generally restricts himself to only two lines.

>There are a lot of things to enjoy in ham radio and I don't feel
>diminished in ny way by the presence of people who enjoy
>different things.

Show me the relevance, in the current discussion, for THIS
statement! With friends such as this, truly, does CW need any
enemies at all? I wonder.

>As an Elmer, I see my role as helping someone discover what
>part of ham radio is right for them, not to impose my standards
>on them. As I tell them about different parts of ham radio, my
>enthusiasm for Morse code will show through.

Yeah, of THAT how can I have ANY doubt! :-)

Val

1263. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 01:54:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8EB138.F18665C8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37252

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Should be, but it seems that there very little ham radio
> >of any sort in the third world, where a large portion of the
> >people are nearly or completely illiterate and are living
> >subsistence lives. The few hams usually are the more
> >moneyed elite who can more afford whatever they want.
>
> Ah, yes, a useful answer, unlike the one from Mr. CAM.

Dick and I said essentially the same thing. Why do you like
his better?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1264. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 02:08:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312210810.05062.00000164@mb-mt.aol.com>
Source record: 37253

In article <u8srtfod364p8b@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>Robert Casey wrote, with reference to licensing requirements
>during the Civil War:
>
>>You had to pick twenty bushels of cotton a minute back then.. :-)
>
>But wasn't that later reduced to only THIRTEEN bushels/minute?
>I think I read that somewhere. Hm, I bet N2EY knows! :)

HAW, that's a good one!

Quick survey of code test speds in the USA for a ham license:

1912-1917: 5 wpm
1919-1936: 10 wpm for all classes of license except 20 wpm for short-lived
"Amateur Extra" license in the early 1920s.
1936-1951: 13 wpm for all classes of license
1951-2000: 5 wpm for Novice and Technician, 13 wpm for General and
Advanced, 20 wpm for Extra
2000-present: 5 wpm for all classes of license.

Notes:

1) From 1990 to 2000 it was possible to get a "medical waiver" of the 13 and
20 wpm code tests by submitting a note from a medical doctor.
2) Amateur radio was completely shut down during WW1 and all existing
licenses expired. During WW2 all existing amateur station licenses were
suspended but it was possible to get a new amateur operator license and
renew/modify an existing amateur operator license.
3) For speed purposes, a "word" consists of 5 characters. Numbers and letters
count as a single character but punctuation marks and prosigns count as
two characters. 5 wpm = 25 characters/minute, 10 wpm = 50 characters/min,
13 wpm = 65 characters/min, 20 wpm = 100 characters/min
4) During the development of the "incentive licensing" changes of 1968-69, the
FCC proposed adding a 16 wpm code test for a new license class that would
have replaced the Advanced. This idea was never implemented.

--

True story from Civil War era land-wire telegraphy days:

During a particularly hard times a railroad advertised to fill an operator's
job.
Superintendent's office was full of applicants waiting for interviews. The
office

was a busy place, with RR employees rushing about doing their jobs and a telegraph sounder going at a furious pace practically non-stop.

The applicants waited patiently to be called, but none were. A young man arrived,
started to look for a seat, then stopped, walked to the Superintendent's office door
and entered without even knocking. A few minutes later the young man returned to the waiting area with the Superintendent, who announced that the position had
been filled.

There were angry protests from the waiting multitude who had not even had a chance to plead their cases. The Superintendent then pointed out that the sounder had been tapping out the same message over and over: "If you can read this, come into my office for an interview".

73 de Jim, N2EY

1265. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 02:37:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C882403.2D3BBE14@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37255

Valentine Germann wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> > Should be, but it seems that there very little ham radio
> >of any sort in the third world, where a large portion of the
> >people are nearly or completely illiterate and are living
> >subsistence lives. The few hams usually are the more
> >moneyed elite who can more afford whatever they want.
> >If ham radio ever makes inroads into the general populations
> >CW might well be popular, unless gear with more advanced
> >modes becomes inexpensive.
>
> Ah, yes, a useful answer, unlike the one from Mr. CAM.
> So, most of the CW, worldwide, is from "First-World" outfits,
> such as Western Europe, Japan, and a few other locales,
> like maybe a few large cities in Latin American and the
> Middle East, and maybe Bahrain or some such? Is that fair?
>

That's not really a complete picture in that some countries such as Russia have long encouraged ham radio and Morse code operation, and many Russian hams are among the best CW ops anywhere. Same for the Baltic and eastern European regions. There has always been a fair amount of CW from the Aussies and New Zealand, and considerable from central and South America. There are always Japanese CW ops on the DX bands.
The last CW contact I made a month ago was with a station in Scotland .(I've been busy working the digital modes while being berated as a retro Luddite for supporting some level of code testing for hams).
If you're interested, check the website <http:\\www.fists.org> which is FISTS, the Society for the Preservation of Morse Code and is worldwide, and has somewhere approaching 10,000 members. (FIST is the acronym for an operators sending style "his fist", and is a term that has long been in use). They have FISTS frequencies on each CW band where members meet and chat on CW, which may be of interest to you as a prospective CW op since it's a very good place to build your own skills. Slow speed ops are encouraged to participate for just that reason. (the frequencies are .058 up from the bottom of the "regular" HF bands, ie 7058 khz on 40 meters and 14058 khz on 20, to name two of the more popular. FISTS motto is "Accuracy transcends speed". You are welcome to join at any time, the only requirement is that you support the preservation of the Morse code. Details are on the website.

At this moment CW is far from history, but some of us truly believe that the end of all code testing will inevitably change that. It has

long been axiomatic that virtually all hams became exposed to the Morse code via the testing process, and few would have learned it to any realistic skill level if not for requirement of the test. That is now even more true than ever, since the military and maritime services do not train or use Morse operators to any extent. (there are a few Morse operators trained for special military ops). In earlier days many former military and maritime CW operators also were, or became, hams. Those sources are gone.
Some code opponents regard code tests as a "hazing ritual", to be avoided at all costs, as though it would contaminate them with some terminal disease instead of offering them a lifelong skill on which they can rely and which offers so much enjoyment to so many. They are, IMO, to be pitied, but also regarded warily. A few of them are indeed a half bubble off plumb. It shows in their rabidity when railing against code testing. Reasoned arguments are just that, but some of the rhetoric goes a bit beyond.

1266. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 02:38:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C87ED2F.C5DE371@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37256

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Howard Goldstein wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > > : I have what might be considered as AADD.
> > > >
> > > > The need to get fills to copy the entire message *will* break you of
> > > > that.
> > >
> > > Doubt it. My first grade teacher first noticed it 58 years ago.
> > > However, I always knew the answer to the question even if I
> > > didn't know what the question was. :-)
> >
> > Ah. Clairvoyance at work.
>
> Clairvoyance had nothing to do with it and knowledge had everything
> to do with it. Thanks to my mother, I was already relatively fluent
> in English, science, and math by the time I started school. The teacher
> caught me daydreaming one day in the first grade and asked me a question.
> The sound of my name snapped me back to reality and I asked her to repeat
> the question. She said, "Aha, you weren't listening, were you? Why is the
> South Pole colder than the North Pole?" I don't think that was the original
> question but I answered, "Because there's land at the South Pole." Her jaw
> dropped to the floor. She later told my mother about it and my mother said,
> "Doesn't everyone know that?"

It's a good story Cec, but that is not a first grade question.

1267. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 02:38:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C880C66.AB3F2834@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37258

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote .
> >
> > This is really novel. Just because he is a slow operator calling in on a
> fast emergency
> > net,
> > you'd cut him off without ever checking to see what his business was, or
> where he was
> > calling from.
>
> If the net is "fast" just how does "slow operator" even know it is
> an emergency net...if he can't copy at the net speed?

How can you say what his skills are? There are people who can copy faster than they can send, though normally the other case is so. What if he had received an injury in the disaster that caused him to send slow? How can you possibly know what his situation is if you don't even acknowledge his call for help merely because he is sending slowly?

>
>
> > > And what I have said is that it should be up to individual hams to
> decide
> > > if they need CW, like deciding if they need to store bottled water.
> >
> > Ah, yes, it's another vanilla "just a choice". Choose the possibility of
> having no
> > communications rather than learn the most basic mode of radio
> communication,
> > radiotelegraphy.
>
> Bingo....it is a personal decision. Does you car have a first aid kit?
> Are you able to give CPR? Those too are personal choices. If
> I decide NOT to learn CPR am I gulty of having no heart attack
> emergency response rather than learn the most basic mode of response
> (i.e. CPR)?
>

You're right, same principle applies. If you refuse to learn to operate CW, you don't deserve to have your butt saved by someone who did. Just as you don't deserve to have some one do CPR on you if you refuse to learn it to help others.

Good analogy. Choose your own poison.

1268. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 02:38:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C880F24.5AB5C138@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37257

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > That's great as far as the LID is concerned, but does nothing whatever to
> >assist a
> >slow CW operator who has emergency traffic that needs to be handled.
>
> If it truly were an emergency, both the slow op and the net control station
> could switch to SSB or a digital mode right on the CW net frequency.
>

Gee, Ed. How is net control going to know the slow CW station's capabilities
without communicating with him in the mode which he is using?

>
> If conditions were so poor that SSB was not an option, I doubt that an
> unskilled CW op would have the ability to dig the encoding out of the noise.
>

Actually this scenario happens to voice SSB nets just as often or even more so. It
isn't that unusual for a CW station to check into a SSB net. And it happens in
times of extreme distress that people learn suddenly that they had skills they
weren't aware of. But if the code test goes so does "Basic Training" for hams.

> What is your estimate of the percentage of hams that could pass emergency CW
> traffic under circumstances where conditions were bad enough that SSB could not
> be copied?

I see no reason to guess, do you? Why not just keep a learning level test so that
there will always be a modicum of CW skill within the ARS? I know, that's asking
far too much.

1269. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 02:38:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C881946.13FA0F07@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37259

W1RFI wrote:

> I have been part of some of the

> discussions on the QRP lists about why we need to work with the new hams who
> would like to improve their CW skills.

All well and good, but what will you do when new hams *have no* CW skills?

1270. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 02:38:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8819AC.CE697358@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37260

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >Mr Hare is a busy fella, and it looks like that many times he doesn't
> >really read what is there.
> >Hence answers that don't really work well.
>
> Actually, Dick, my reading comprehension is rather good.
>
> When Cecil says things that don't support your position, he is "trolling." I
> guess my answers just "don't work well."
>
> Same difference.
>

I agree, your non-working answers have become much like Cecil's inveterate
trolling.

1271. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 02:46:28 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6melv$ud8$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37262

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C880C66.AB3F2834@worldnet.att.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote .
> > >
> > > This is really novel. Just because he is a slow operator calling in on
a
> > fast emergency
> > > net,
> > > you'd cut him off without ever checking to see what his business was,
or
> > where he was
> > > calling from.
> >
> > If the net is "fast" just how does "slow operator" even know it is
> > an emergency net...if he can't copy at the net speed?
>
> How can you say what his skills are? There are people who can copy faster
than
> they can send, though normally the other case is so. What if he had
received an
> injury in the disaster that caused him to send slow? How can you possibly
know
> what his situation is if you don't even acknowledge his call for help
merely
> because he is sending slowly?

I didn't say I would or wouldn't...I merely gave something
to think about regarding the scenario being considered.

> > > > And what I have said is that it should be up to individual hams to
> > decide
> > > > if they need CW, like deciding if they need to store bottled water.
> > >
> > > Ah, yes, it's another vanilla "just a choice". Choose the possibility
of
> > having no
> > > communications rather than learn the most basic mode of radio
> > communication,
> > > radiotelegraphy.
> >
> > Bingo....it is a personal decision. Does you car have a first aid kit?
> > Are you able to give CPR? Those too are personal choices. If
> > I decide NOT to learn CPR am I gulty of having no heart attack

> > emergency response rather than learn the most basic mode of response
> > (i.e. CPR)?
> >
>
> You're right, same principle applies. If you refuse to learn to operate CW, you
> don't deserve to have your butt saved by someone who did. Just as you don't
> deserve to have some one do CPR on you if you refuse to learn it to help others.
>
> Good analogy. Choose your own poison.

Good anology...poor response from you. Since just about anyone
can learn CPR, you are saying the millions of people that have
not learned CPR don't deserve to be saved by someone that did.
Pretty sick attitude on your part.

No cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1272. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 02:55:10 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8tercc0dpvl51@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37254

CAM wrote, informatively, with reference to a light-hearted message of mine about him possibly being armed:

>Texas CHL catagory SA (Colt .45)

Not being a Texan, I can only assume that the "C" in "CHL" refers to "concealed."

And now we have, perhaps, more than we really wanted to know!

Val

1273. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 02:56:36 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6mf8qhk1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37265

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020312073252.14946.00000145@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <a6k4q8nqd1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> (N2EY wrote):
>
> >> >> To consider someone an "expert" amateur radio operator, I would
> >> >> have to include Morse skills, simply because the mode is so
> >> >> popular with hams. Earning the title "expert amateur radio operator"
> >> >> requires a LOT of skills. I do not consider someone with little or
no
> >> >> Morse skills to be an expert amateur radio operator.
> >> >
> >> >Then you have a very archaic view of expertise.
> >>
> >> How so? Isn't Morse widely used by hams? Doesn't "expert" mean that
> >someone
> >> is very skilled and knowledgeable in ALL aspects of something?
> >
> >In a word, NO.
>
> I disagree.

We will then agree to disagree.

> >That YOU equate expert to mandate knowledge
> >in ALL aspects of anything goes far afield of what most people
> >would consider expert.
>
> I really don't think so.

I do.

> >Does a figure skater qualify as
> >an expert because s/he can't skate like a hocky player (or vise versa)?
>
> I think you meant to write "not qualify".

Yup.

> That's not a valid analogy. A figure skater and a hockey player do
different
> kinds of skating, just as hams and broadcast DJs do different kinds of
radio.
> Saying a figure skater is an expert means that s/he can do all sorts of

> figure skating moves with a high degree of skill. Saying a hockey player
is
> an expert means he/she can play the game well, with a high degree of skill
> in all areas of ice hockey.
>
> Would you call a figure skater an expert figure skater if s/he could not
do a
> toe loop or a double axel? I wouldn't.

Too limited example...but why not.

> >> I don't see
> >> how someone could claim to be an "expert" amateur radio operator and
yet
> >> have no Morse/CW skills. It would be like saying a driver who could not
> >> drive a manual transmission vehicle was an expert driver.
> >
> >Take a look at the current crop of Formula 1 cars...most are
> >automatics now.
>
> So? Do you think there are any Formula 1 drivers who can't drive stick? I
> don't.

I don't know...but the future sure appears likly.

> >The fact IS that one need NOT know how to
> >drive a manual gearbox to be an expert driver.
>
> I disagree. Would you give the label "expert" to a plumber who
> could not solder copper pipes? I wouldn't - even though it is possible
> to do all of the plumbing in a house without any soldering.

Today, probably so.

> >> >> But I also do
> >> >> not think that amateur radio or emergencies are the sole province
of'
> >> >> experts.
> >> >
> >> >Nor have I said so either.
> >>
> >> Then we agree. "Good operator" and "expert operator" are completely
> >> different things.
> >
> >I think they are separaeted as a matter of degree.
>
> > Neither,
> >however, needs CW knowledge to be an expert.
>
> Then we disagree.

So be it.

> >> >> I don't presume to call myself an expert amateur radio operator,
> >> >> either Still way too much out there for me to learn and get good at.
> >> >
> >> >After all these years, you don't consider yourself
> >> >an expert?
> >>
> >> Nope. Never claimed to be, either. I know too many ops who are way
better
> >> than me.
> >
> >Expert does NOT mean or imply there are none better than you.
>
> That's not what I'm saying. I don't call myself an expert because I know
hams
> whose
> skills are far above mine.

That they may know more than you doesn't mean YOU aren't
an expert too.

> Even though QST did bestow the title "definitive expert" on me.....;-)

Congrats,
Bill K2UNK

1274. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 03:02:16 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8tf8m7haq98f5@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37261

N2EY wrote, in response to a wheeze concerning
the speed at which slaves picked cotton in the
middle of the last century:

>1836-1851: 13 bpm for all classes of license.

See, I told you he'd know!

Val

P.S. Thanks for the information, and the "sounder" story!

**

1275. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 03:16:23 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6mgikced1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37266

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C877045.6BB35C64@worldnet.att.net...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
> >
> > >> And proper
> > >> equipment maintenance is NOT getting done at many stations.
> > >
> > >And YOU know this because?
> >
> > I am curious myself. In the few instances where I have been involved
with the
> > technical staff of broadcast stations, I have found them to be
competent.
> >
>
> That would be because you have dealt with stations that *have* a
technical staff.
> That is no longer required by FCC regulation. The owner is free to do that
work
> himself if he dares, or hire whomever he wants to do it. No qualification
is
> necessary. A bright teenage disc jockey can be pressed into service if it
can be
> made to work out. Some owners are astute about doing it right, and some,
of course
> and as always, cut as many monetary corners as they can get by with. Most
"have to"
> broadcast engineering these days is done by contracted consultants who
often travel
> long distances to do it.

So? You have NOT offered any examples of the poor maintenance you
claim is going on.

> > Dick, can you describe for us the instances of proper equipment
maintenance not
> > being done at broadcast stations?
>
> Wouldn't you agree that transmitter tuning and modulation adjustments
should be
> done by someone who has an understanding of the issues and pitfalls
involved?

How do you know they are NOT being done by someone that knows
what they are doing.

> When a FCC licensed person was required, he knew that if he didn't follow
the rules
> he could easily lose his license to work, and he would see that technical
problems
> were taken care of.

And that tells us what?

> Most wouldn't allow a deficient transmitter to go on the air, and insisted
that
> problems which the owner might consider minor, but which left the station
outside
> the rules, be corrected.

From this, I presume you have examples then of defienct trans,itters
being on the air because an FCC license isn't needed anymore?

> I have no doubt this was a part of the reason broadcasters worked to get
the rules
> requiring licensed operators dropped.

Can you say conspiracy theory again?

> With that requirement gone, and owners now can go as far as they dare in
ignoring
> things they can get by with ignoring, and there are many. FCC visits to
outlying
> stations are rare.

So where are YOUR examples?

> But as Jim Bromley correctly pointed out some time back in a private
email, much
> less maintenance is required by new generation solid state transmitting
gear. Of
> course that only resolves SOME of the problems.

So how come we can build automobiles that can be driven for years
while still meeting emissions standards yet requiring next to no
maintenance.

> All this is not a problem the FCC can't ignore.

Pssst, Dick, you gotta convince the FCC they got a problem.
Have you taken that first step?

> I'm sure they occasionally find,
> in a surprise inspection, a station so far out of tolerance they get to
issue a
> NAL.

So please produce the list of NALs. It should be public info.

> But generally it works out, and as with much of ham radio, they find it to
be
> a situation they can live with, if only grudgingly. But I've heard some
real cruddy
> sounding radio stations, too. Sometimes it's deliberately done, and
sometimes it's
> the result of poor or nonexistent engineering..

What a crock...nothing but supposition...not one shred of hard evidence
to suport your claims.

> I was once called by the owner of a 100kwERP FM small market station who
couldn't
> get it to turn on. His regular "last resort emergency call" person was out
of town
> and had given him my name to call if he had to have some technical help.
Though I
> had never seen this transmitter before, I quickly determined that a
thermal time
> delay relay was not closing, and confirmed this with a wire jumper. I
asked the
> owner if he had a spare relay (it was a plug-in unit). He said, "Oh, I
already
> replaced that with a new, that's not the problem".
> I asked him if he had another spare. He did, I plugged it in, and the
transmitter
> came on properly. He was amazed that a new relay could be defective. And
all he
> lost this day was a few hours of expensive air time.

So the guy wasn't technically competent.

> This fellow had learned a lot about keeping his transmitter on the air,
and this
> was just another lesson. You can be sure that he made other miscues along
the way,
> some probably more serious. It's almost inevitable. But he saved a lot of
> engineering expense, and didn't fry himself, so he's a success, to be
sure..

And the problem is????

> Now, I'm quite sure you will downplay this just as you do all the
"problems" in
> ham radio, after all, "that's the way it is", and all is well with the
world.

You bet...you have FAILED to identify that ANY problem exists.

> And, things do change over time.
> When I last did broadcast engineering, solid state transmitters were not
yet in
> widespread use.
> If their use changed broadcasting as much as they have changed ham radio

operations
> in areas such as thermal stability and reliability, there will be
considerable
> differences. But there still remains antenna systems, and not that much
seems to
> change in that area.

Yet your evidence bag seems empty as to examples.

> The striking feature seems to be the drastic change in rules that is
involved. One
> day complete engineering responsibility is placed on a licensed person,
next day
> poof! it's all gone, and it all is dumped onto the station owner, where no
trust
> whatever had been invested the day before.
> Bureaucracy at its finest.

And this has been going on for how long?

And how many REAL problems have come up?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1276. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 03:18:50 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6mgilced2@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37267

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C870275.D492A300@worldnet.att.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C86A94F.50728130@worldnet.att.net...
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > Consider that commercial radio or TV stations no longer require a
First
> > Class
> > > > Radiotelephone Licensee
> > >
> > > Yep. The owner is free to do it all himself, or ignore it as he
wishes
> > (and dares
> > > risk a citation in the rare event a Commission inspector shows up
> > unannounced).
> > > Lobbying does
> > > work, doesn't it? No one knows how many of them have fried
themselves.
> >
> > Sure, sure, the papers are full of all those deaths :-)
>
> You really think it makes the front page of major newspapers when someone
> gets hung up in his own transmitters HV?
> Might make the obit column. It DOES happen.

Most such accidents DO end up being reported.

> > > And proper
> > > equipment maintenance is NOT getting done at many stations.
> >
> > And YOU know this because?
>
> Working in the field.

Yet you offer not ONE example.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1277. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 03:23:37 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6mgre$m3s$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37268

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C875A76.7EDC1ED2@worldnet.att.net...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
> >
> > >Yep, if I recall, there's no requirement anymore for the "chief
engineer"
> > >of a commercial station to have a 1st Class Radio License.
> >
> > Good thing; that license no longer exists. The FCC decided that "one
size fits
> > all" is appropriate for the technical engineering required of broadcast
> > stations.
>
> Wrong. FCC decided to drop all licensing requirements for broadcast
engineering
> and leave all the responsibility for meeting the technical rules to the
station
> owner. The only services where operator licensing is required is where it
is
> required "by international treaty".
>
> The implications of such a move should be obvious.

Obvious to you maybe...but why not indulge us that can't see
the obvious that you do and offer something specific?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1278. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 03:34:51 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6miacvbg1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37274

```
"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C8704A2.57E4298A@worldnet.att.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C85A468.4A618D22@worldnet.att.net...
> > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >
> > > > "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:20020310104405.07180.00000883@mb-cr.aol.com...
> > > > > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> > > > >
> > > > > >The point was that FCC nor the government in general will be in
any
> > way
> > > > > >inclined to turn ham radio loose to do anything anyone might way
to
> > do
> > > > > >with ham radio re Carl's bright ideas for an idealistic digital
> > nirvana
> > > > in
> > > > > >ham radio. It would set us up to become an underground illicit
means
> > of
> > > > > >international communication that could easily harbor hidden
> > > > > >terrorist communications which might escape detection, at least
until
> > too
> > > > > >late to be effective Carl thinks he has all this figured out. He
> > needs a
> > > > new
> > > > > abacus.
> > > > >
> > > > > Whew, that is a bit far out even for you, Dick. :-)
> > > > > Ed Hare, W1RFI
> > > >
> > > > Yup, I can hear them black helicopters comin'
> > > > in for Dick now.... whup, whup, whup :-)
> > > >
> > > > Funny thing is that you don't even need radio
> > > > to pass encrypted messages anymore.
> > >
> > > "Anymore"???" And when has that *not* been true?
> >
```

> > bandwidth across a POTS line only increased to a sufficient
> > rate to allow good encryption within the last 10 years or so.
>
> Ah. So you're saying that radio still doesn't allow "good encryption"
> Enigma didn't happen. (I know, it wasn't as good as current digital
> types, but it was good).

Today, enigma would be broken very quickly. The super
computer's give incredible code breaking capabilities.

> > > > POTS (plain
> > > > old telephone service) gives you all anyone needs.
> > > > POTS plus a modem, a PC and an encryption program
> > > > will do it all...text or voice.
> > >
> > > So you believe your new-found discovery will cause the FCC to drop the
> > > amateur
> > > radio regulation prohibiting codes and ciphers?
> >
> > Huh? By what bit of illogic do you jump to that conclusion?
> > I simply pointed out that encrypted text/voice has no need for
> > radio as the means of conveyence.
>
> And never did. Neither does the Internet.

Agreed.

> > > Why do you think that regulation was formed in the first place?
> >
> > Maybe Jim N2EY has a historical answer for us. IF the
> > concern originated to allow monitoring, the concern is pretty
> > lame today. Text can be encoded in hundreds of publicly
> > available codings yet I doubt the FCC cares or monitors
> > at all.
>
> Whether or not FCC monitors is really not the point, the point being
that is
> why
> the regulation was made initially. Rules that do not allow encryption will
be
> mostly
> followed by those who follow rules, which is most hams. Any encrypted
radio
> traffic
> is thus illegal. So anyone so doing will be subject to FCC interest.

At any point in time, how does the FCC know if a digital signal
is "illegal". If Ed Hare and I "publish" a new coding scheme in QST,
does the FCC suddenly "plug it in" to FCC monitoring stations?

> With the increased
> national security drive, and the added scrutiny of communications

including
> monitoring of the internet, it makes sense to look at amateur radio
frequencies
> as potential trouble spots.

So?

> As noted earlier, many non citizens hold US ham licenses. No one knows if
any
> terrorists do or not, just as no one knew why they were studying flying
in the
> US. I doubt all this if being overlooked.

Whup, whup, whup...here comes the choppers again.

ROTFLMAO,
Bill K2UNK

1279. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 03:48:22 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6miadvbg2@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37273

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u8taa0ekke82cd@corp.supernews.com...
>
> W1RFI wrote, in reference to what he has been doing
> do promote CW in amateur radio:
>
> >I can't speak for Cecil, but I feel that I promote the mode by
> >having about 95% of my ham radio operating in Morse code.
> >I have been part of some of the discussions on the QRP lists
> >about why we need to work with the new hams who
> >would like to improve their CW skills.
>
> Well, you know, somehow I thought I might read something a
> bit more, you know, ACTIVIST, somehow.

So how come you don't look for the "activist" responses
from Dick, Larry and a few other of the pro-code test
contingent?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1280. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 03:52:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312225246.20502.00000156@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 37275

In article <u8snd1gh4g5oe5@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>CAM wrote:
>
>>It is up to us OF's, who know the merits of CW, to convince
>>the newcomers that CW has enough merit for them to learn
>>Morse code. It's called an incentive, Val.
>
>Oh, NOW it's all clear! You're actually a big FAN of the
>mode, perhaps in the same way Anderson, as the auditor
>of Enron, published honest information of use to the rank-
>and-file stockholder! Thanks for clearing that up!

That's Andersen, old fella. Ends with "E...N" not "O...N."

That company's name begins with "A" just as the ARRL begins
with an "A." That the rest of the names aren't the same doesn't
mean that they are alike...although both the auditing and
consultation done by the Arthur Andersen company seem to
have been acting strangely akin on certain tasks within their
respective activities..

1281. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 03:52:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312225248.20502.00000157@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 37280

In article <20020311172340.21386.00000813@mb-cv.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>>Interesting. Jim knows that I hang out on rrap and he hasn't had a problem
>>>with that. He didn't have a problem when I didn't post here for 6 months,
>>either.
>
>>...then Haynie changed his mind over several years.
>
>Not at all. He does not believe that ARRL should have a presence on rrap.
>Our internet outlet is the ARRL web page. He does not have the right to tell
me
>where I spend my personal time, nor would he want to.

Then why should anyone in here demand some certificate of
compliance or whatever to post on amateur radio regulations?

That is, besides automotive expertise and their transmission
controls...or commercial broadcasting, especially by those
who never got a full First 'Phone, only a Second...or government
operations in a third-world country...to name a few subjects in
the last couple of days.

>>It is obviously good to have as many propaganda outlets as possible.
>
>Yeah, but if I were the ARRL propaganda outlet, I wouldn't have time to work
>on RFI.

That may be why you are not doing the ARRL Spin very well.

>>>My goodness, you mean that all those people who are not ARRL members read
>>>rrap and think I am an ARRL apologist?
>
>>Some DO think that. Try to live with it. Everyone else must.
>
>Whew, only "some" now. You had me worried for a bit. "Some" think that ARRL
>has Ed Hare be their secret propaganda outlet on rec.radio.amateur.policy,
too. I
>can live with it just fine, thanks.

I have no idea how many the "some" are outside of rrap...there is no
way to determine that quantitatively...for either myself of Ed Hare.

Try to stay with the "important" RFI work and stop the ARRL
apolgistic propaganda here. You are not doing it well by quoting

standard ARRL phraseology.

>>Is it a "ridiculous conclusion" based on over 2600 individual Comments
>>exclusive of the ARRL's on 98-143?
>
>That is great, Len. I am glad that each and every ham with a view sent that
>view to the FCC. QST and every other ARRL outlet asked hams to do just that.

Did they ask "everyone" with an interest? I don't think so...despite
the allegations four years ago that the League was implied to do
just that. That was dismissed as the "usual ARRL propaganda"
then and never proved conclusively.

>>Again, no "loss." If "all it took was a letter," why does the ARRL
>>have a legal firm representing them in DC?
>
>To write the letter, Len. Duh!

Are there no secretaries at ARRL Hq that can write in the
proper format?

Does the ARRL have a legal firm on retainer in the DC area?
Please answer yes or no.

If "all it takes to write a letter" is the ability to compose a
literate letter in approximately the standard format, why is the
ARRL paying a legal firm in DC out of membership monies?

>>Why does the ARRL insist on being a "middleman" in "how to file
>>comments?" The FCC explains the procedures directly on its
>>website.
>
>Um, the same website that ARRL links to in the part of ITS website that tells
>hams how to file comments? You are seeing the Devil behind every bush!

Not at all. I am trying to get a straight answer. I haven't gotten a
straight answer yet. Why is that so hard to answer?

>>Question repeat #1: Why does the ARRL keep a legal firm in DC
>>if "all it takes is a letter?" Can't the ARRL Hq staff compose a
>>"letter?"
>
>Sure, I compose them all the time, but not for FCC filings. Chris composes
>them better and he knows the law. We have a deal; he doesn't tell hams how
>to fix RFI problems and I don't tell him how to represent ARRL with the FCC.

Comment on NPRM 98-143 did not require either expertise on RFI
matters or expertise in "legal wording."

You haven't answered my question at all.

>>Question repeat #2: Why does the ARRL have it OWN "FCC rule
>>book" when the FCC has its own rule book available free for
>>download and explains the procedure and format for Comments?

>
>Because hams want to buy it. Those that do apparently prefer the plain
>language explanations to the rules.

Are you saying that "hams" cannot comprehend the wording in
Part 97, Title 47 CFR? From your alleged "answer" above, that
shines through.

Part 97 is one of the smallest, if not the smallest of all Parts in
Title 47, Code of Federal Regulations. All the definitions are
given, all the regulations are written in English. All of the Parts
in Title 47 can be downloaded free of charge from the US
Government Printing Office site on the Internet; it had been
available on the FCC site (may still be) as were several other
Parts.

The alleged "plain language" translation done by the ARRL seems
more to be little more than a re-write of the freely-available
regulations direct from the FCC. I will admit that a color-coded
"ham band" chart made by the ARRL has much more cosmetic
appeal than the plain black-and-white in the government document
but the ARRL "version" seems incomplete and is NO substitute for
the codified regulations.

Are you saying that "hams" cannot set their VCR timers either?
Or able to read their ready-built radio equipment operating
instructions?

I give them far more credit and intellectual capability than you do,
Ed Hare. Of course, only a tiny practically-miniscule number of
"hams" are reading rrap. You must be insulting them, not the
"ARS Community."

>Well, there you go. You did, after all, chastize me for asking questions,
>now, di'n't'cha?

Why did you ask that?

>I think that most members would feel that it is "not possible" that ARRL
>exerts some sort of mind control over them, Len.

True Believers cannot see or comprehend that they've been had by
88 years of self-promotional propaganda or their overwhelmingly
major source of news about amateur radio coming from a single
organization.

>>What is almost always overlooked is that a large organization MUST
>>try to influence others that it is the "best" organization.
>
>Big difference between "opinion" and "influence" and "control," Len. Talk
>about misdirection!

There's absolutely NO "misdirection" in what I said. It is simply
propaganda designed to convince others that an organization is

the "best." Standard marketing technique all over the world in every field of activity requiring monetary input for survival.

If a "competitor" gains a monopolistic position in influencing others, and does it for a long period (88 years is safely defined as a "long period") then they are using the "Big Lie" technique. That is a very definite CONTROL condition. Denial does not make that go away, no matter how hard you try.

The membership of the ARRL is still less than a quarter of all licensed US radio amateurs.

1282. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 03:52:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312225249.20502.00000158@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 37281

In article <20020311063148.06075.00000766@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
writes:

>From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
>>> >The point was that FCC nor the government in general will be in any way
>>> >inclined to turn ham radio loose to do anything anyone might way to do
>>> >with ham radio re Carl's bright ideas for an idealistic digital nirvana
>in
>>> >ham radio. It would set us up to become an underground illicit means of
>>> >international communication that could easily harbor hidden
>>> >terrorist communications which might escape detection, at least until too
>>> >late to be effective Carl thinks he has all this figured out. He needs a
>>new
>>> abacus.
>
>>> Whew, that is a bit far out even for you, Dick. :-)
>
>> So you disagree? If so, please explain for us YOUR interpretation of the
>>rule prohibiting codes and ciphers on ham radio.
>
>My conclusion that your statement was pretty far out was related to the
thought
>that spies and terrorists will develop new digital encoding methods and use
ham
>radio to communicate covert messages if the FCC allows hams to develop new
>digital encoding methods ans use ham radio for its intended purpose.

KGB Colonel Rudolf Abel used amateur radio equipment as part of his
"cover" or disguise ("it was his hobby") as an espionage agent for the
USSR. That "ham radio equipment" was actually a method for
communications with the USSR during the late 1950s. He was
arrested in 1957. Several items of that KGB field agent's paraphenalia
are on a CIA "tour" display that is at the Ronald Reagan Presidential
Library in Simi Valley, CA, until mid-July. [my wife and I looked in on
it this Tuesday morning, most interesting display]

It did not escape newspaper reporters' scrutiny that "amateur radio
equipment" was "part of a spy's toolbox" and so reported on some
stories of that time. Considering that Dick Carroll was perhaps
young and impressionable in 1957, he might have been influenced
by those lurid stories. They would appeal to someone being
schooled in television broadcasting techniques, I am sure.

>Fortunately, you are wrong, because the rules do permit hams to develop and
>use new encoding methods.

That is an arguable subject. The US amateur regulations do not allow a free reign on all possible modes. Only relatively recently were the pseudo-random sequence coding hardware on DSSS spreading codes freed-up somewhat by a regulation change. US regulations still maintain a very long records-keeping requirement for unspecific (non-standard) modes.

PSK31 was NOT developed or even first tried in the USA. That was done in the UK by Peter Martinez, G3PLX. Trials and wring-out of the system were done in the UK and Europe.

What has the ARRL promoted for a new, original mode in the last quarter century?

1283. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 03:52:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312225251.20502.00000159@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 37276

In article <20020312054602.08786.00001004@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
>>> There are very few who can swell as much as lil Davie. :-)
>
>>Anyone who has attained an amatreur radio license is entitled to pride
>>in that achievement. Perhaps you can share in that pride at some point.
>
>You can always tell when Len thinks he is losing an argument. He starts
>making up dimunutive names for people, CAPITALIZING things in a religious
>light or accusing his opponent of misdirection.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, Ed Hare seems oblivious to others using "cute" or diminutive names for myself...doing it well before I have returned the favor.

Capitalization is done by many others to EMPHASIZE a point.

>His next step will be to change from the dimunutive form to the last-name
>semi-formal form. At that point, he really is getting desparate. :-)

Hare is wrong, of course. :-)

1284. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 03:52:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312225254.20502.00000161@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 37277

In article <3C8E7708.E4925FA8@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> With working communications one can probably get food and water. Without,
>quite likely
>> not.
>
>So you are depending upon CW to provide you with food and water in case
>of an emergency? Remember, "The Morse God giveth and the Morse God taketh
>away." Or was that the Norse God - I forget.

It couldn't have been the Norse god...he was too Thor to anther... :-)

1285. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 03:52:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312225254.20502.00000160@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 37278

In article <3C8D2EF3.C397D836@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3C8CF5F9.20222656@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <3C8BD06D.80D41C94@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >W1RFI wrote:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >No, you used my correction of your error (and elevated yourself to
>> >> >> >victim status by tying your error to a spinal chord injury) to hurl
>> >> >> >another insult.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> The word is "cord."
>> >> >
>> >> >Ed, I don't type so well since that awful volleyball accident.
>> >>
>> >> Oh, my! It does seem to affected your personality as well!
>> >>
>> >> No doubt that "awful volleyball accident" left a permanent
>> >> swelling of the ego. Tsk, tsk.
>> >
>> >Do you refer to my pride in being a radio amateur, Len. Pass a radio
>> >amateur licensing exam--any of 'em--and you can swell with pride too,
>> >Leonardo.
>>
>> There are very few who can swell as much as lil Davie. :-)
>
>Anyone who has attained an amatreur radio license is entitled to pride
>in that achievement. Perhaps you can share in that pride at some point.

For what reason?

>> >> Tell us about this "accident." Did that happen while on secret
>> >> air force duty in a commie squadron?

>> >
>> >What does your statement mean, Len?
>>
>> Why does lil Davie "answer" a question with another question?
>
>Well, Leondardo, most of the time when someone answers a question with a
>question, he doesn't understand what the questioner meant.
>
>> Let me rephrase it since "commie squadron" is an old military
>> nickname for "communications squadron."
>
>I was attached to the 46th Communications Squadron for two years.
>During that period, I never heard anyone refer to it as a "commie
>squadron". Either your quaint name for such an organization is a)
>archaic useage, b) used in the Army and not the Air Force or c) is BS.

Tsk, tsk. Heil is just not "with it" insofar as interservice rivalry is
concerned. Perhaps that is "too much pride."

>> Did that "accident" happen while on duty in the air force in a
>> communications squadron?
>
>You writing a book?

I've already contract-written two of them and am working on a
third. Why does Heil ask? I am a professional writer; i.e., I
accept pecuniary compensation for work performed.

There is NO pecuniary compensation for the message writing
in here, ergo all such writers are writing in an amateur mode,
not receiving money. An exception might be made in Ed Hare's
case since he is in the curious postion of being a "professional
amateur."

Is Heil implying that professional writters "cannot" write in here
because it is about amateur activities?

>> Perhaps it was "while doing work for NASA?"
>
>...leave this chapter out and make it a mystery.

There is NO "mystery." Heil never "worked" on anything
"for NASA."

>> >> Did that happen while defending the free world with morse as
>> >> the only ham in all of Guinea-Bissau?
>> >
>> >What does this one mean, Len?
>>
>> Oh, my, lil Davie is all a-twitter again.
>
>> What does lil Davie's question mean?
>

>It indicates that I don't know what you mean by your question.

Sigh. Let me explain in terms a child can understand.

Heil made the claim of "being the only ham in Guinea-Bisseau"
while with the US Department of State in that country.

Heil did not make any claims of paying his own way to that
terribly important country in middle Africa (population 1.2
million, chief export being cashew nuts) nor of working for
State without any compensation. He is therefore in the
professional category (unless verifiable claims otherwise
are submitted). "Pride" at being "the only ham in Guinea-
Bisseau" is misplaced or a rationalization of his taking
advantage of a situation where he was monetarily
compensated, his transport paid for and housing furnished
by the government.

Heil fell into the "professional amateur" communications
category.

>Who is lil Davy?

"Lil Davie" (use the correct quote) is Heil who was using
"Leonardo."

I shall go back to "The Dynamic Duo" of "Ratman and
Wobblin."

"The Thin Man" would never apply to either...

>Sure there are limits, Len. What do you have to do with amateur radio
>other than posting your lengthy diatribes in this venue?

Why does Heil insist on being a "judge" of who does what anywhere?

Why does Heil insist on defing all according to his personal
preferences?

>So you wouldn't feel obliged to take pot shots at the ARRL.

The ARRL is a political special-interest group. Any political
group is open to negative or positive criticsm. It's the
American Way.

Why does the Dynamic Duo insist on some specious "rule"
of No Criticsm for a political special-interest group?

>I know it has been pointed out to you before: This isn't a
>"professional" radio newsgroup. This is an amateur radio newsgroup.

This is specifically an amateur radio policy newsgroup.

Since when does amateur radio policy involve automobiles and
transmission operation thereof...or commercial radio operation...
or being a professional amateur in a small middle-Africa country

while on duty with the US government?

>So what'd the fun go out of, ham radio licenses or commercial licenses?
>It wasn't clear from your comment.

The feldwebel is trying to dodge his own order-issuing and pretending not to "understand" what is written. That's the "Nuremberg defense."

The ISSUE is, and has been in THIS NEWSGROUP designed to hold it, the retention or elimination of the code test for any amateur radio license. Self-styled "leaders" (Heil pretends to be one as well as judge-jury on radio "fun") insist on keeping the code test. Others argue for the elimination of the code test, entirely. The TEST, not the elimination of code use.

People like Heil seem to have "fun" in NOT ARGUING THE ISSUE but rather in displaying the usual sociopathic "superior" behavior against those not in agreement with his views.

Has Heil read and understood the definitions as they have been explained to him?

>...maybe rose gardening would be to your liking. "Good Old Mr. Wilson!"
>Is this the part where you claim to be a "happy old man"?

Heil is no Dennis the Menace, he is merely just another sociopath looking for an outlet for his personal frustrations. He should see a shrink, not a cartoonist.

Gruss Gott, Herr Obersturmbandsfuhrer.

1286. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 03:52:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020312225256.20502.00000162@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 37279

In article <3C8E49B2.4E178221@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>> For all you've learned, you've never learned to pay attention?
>
>It's an NMI, Dick.

Give it up, Cecil, he's a NOP. :-)

1287. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 04:18:20 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8tjndomjqru9d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37282

CAM wrote, informatively, responding to a message
referring to the chance that he, CAM, might be armed:

>Texas CHL catagory SA (Colt .45)

May I assume that the "C" in "CHL" stands for
"concealed"?

In any case, I'm out the door now. Pistol-packing
Libertarian wackos are not exactly my cup of tea.
Set's a fine example for Ham Radio, though.

See ya!

Val

1288. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 04:27:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8ED535.9AF14C6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37285

Dick Carroll wrote:
> It's a good story Cec, but that is not a first grade question.

The point is that my first grade teacher tried to stump me.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1289. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 04:28:56 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8tkbbnj8gc2cf@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37283

Bill Sohl wrote, in TROLL-ON-FULL mode, in
response to a conflicted message from an employee
of a well-known, amateur radio related organization,
an organization with ability to, perhaps, make a con-
siderable difference in whatever Ham Radio is
or might become:

>So how come you don't look for the "activist"
>responses from Dick, Larry and a few other of
>the pro-code test contingent?

Gee, bozo, I guess it was because they haven't
made any pompous, self-serving statements in
this area -- yet. Are YOU stepping up to that next?
Oh, wait, you already HAVE!

By the by, are you carrying, too?

Val

1290. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 04:30:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8ED5F9.9983F365@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37286

Bill Sohl wrote:
> Good anology...poor response from you. Since just about anyone
> can learn CPR, you are saying the millions of people that have
> not learned CPR don't deserve to be saved by someone that did.
> Pretty sick attitude on your part.

Wonder if someone who stored food and water is going to share it
with Dick who didn't?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1291. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 04:33:16 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8tkjcrcibcl52@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37284

Len-Over-21 wrote, under the influence of his
medication, which is obviously not properly
adjusted:

>That company's name begins with "A" just as the ARRL begins
>with an "A." That the rest of the names aren't the same doesn't
>mean that they are alike...although both the auditing and
>consultation done by the Arthur Andersen company seem to
>have been acting strangely akin on certain tasks within their
>respective activities.

Another quarter heard from . . . wow. What kind of a LAME
board IS this, anyway? Sheesh! No wonder it's down to about
six regular posters, of whom only about two make sense.

And can you guess that THIS poster is NOT one of them?

Val

1292. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 04:37:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8ED778.D60B3C2D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37287

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > I have been part of some of the
> > discussions on the QRP lists about why we need to work with the new hams who
> > would like to improve their CW skills.
>
> All well and good, but what will you do when new hams *have no* CW skills?

Any new skill at all will be an infinite improvement.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1293. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 04:43:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8824B0.D7B76217@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37288

Valentine Germann wrote:

> W1RFI trolled, in reference to one of my more
> scintillating UseNet posts:
>
> >Do you think that your post is a valuable, relevant, clear,
> >concise post that one should expect of UseNet's finest?
>
> Two lines. Troll rating: 1 out of 10. Got to step it up.
>
> Val

With Cecil as his guide, Ed is improving.

1294. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 04:43:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C88253E.C37E1DF7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37289

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Yes, but in PRACTICE..... the CW ID on a PSK31 signal makes it through under conditions
> > where the the phase shift keying cannot.
>
> At what power level? In what bandwidth? You are comparing apples
> and oranges. PSK31 operates lots closer to Shannon's limit than
> CW does.

Theory does not equal practice. You theorize. I'll practice.

1295. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 04:44:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C882652.252A1DAA@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37290

Valentine Germann wrote:

> W1RFI wrote, strangely, concerning the promotion of
> CW in the amateur service:
>
> >I don't think that it is helpful to those who might be interested
> >in ham radio to try to show them the parts of ham radio that
> >the are not interested in.
>
> Now, folks, I ask you to study this convoluted sentence from
> this obviously seriously conflicted poster. He says he's FOR
> the use of CW on the amateur bands but he writes material
> such as the example you see above. There's something
> seriously Freudian going on HERE, without ANY doubt!
> That is, he really and truly feels that people who know nothing
> about Ham Radio are not really interested in CW and so,
> since that is a part of Ham Radio that they're not interested
> in, even though they don't yet KNOW anthing about Ham
> Radio, he's not going to show them that part of Ham Radio.
> Do you have it now? I think I do. And, I now know why this
> poster generally restricts himself to only two lines.
>
> >There are a lot of things to enjoy in ham radio and I don't feel
> >diminished in ny way by the presence of people who enjoy
> >different things.
>
> Show me the relevance, in the current discussion, for THIS
> statement! With friends such as this, truly, does CW need any
> enemies at all? I wonder.
>
> >As an Elmer, I see my role as helping someone discover what
> >part of ham radio is right for them, not to impose my standards
> >on them. As I tell them about different parts of ham radio, my
> >enthusiasm for Morse code will show through.
>
> Yeah, of THAT how can I have ANY doubt! :-)
>
> Val

Yep.The VERY LAST thing these "code supporters" would dare to do is to even gently nudge someone toward learning it. They will automatically do that on their own, should they have an epiphany that orients them in that direction. Right.

1296. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 04:44:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C882E07.D6477DB8@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37291

Bill Sohl wrote:

> > > Are you able to give CPR? Those too are personal choices. If
> > > I decide NOT to learn CPR am I gulty of having no heart attack
> > > emergency response rather than learn the most basic mode of response
> > > (i.e. CPR)?
> > >
> >
> > You're right, same principle applies. If you refuse to learn to operate
> CW, you
> > don't deserve to have your butt saved by someone who did. Just as you
> don't
> > deserve to have some one do CPR on you if you refuse to learn it to help
> others.
> >
> > Good analogy. Choose your own poison.
>
> Good anology...poor response from you. Since just about anyone
> can learn CPR, you are saying the millions of people that have
> not learned CPR don't deserve to be saved by someone that did.
> Pretty sick attitude on your part.

Read it again, Bill. This time concentrate and try to comprehend.

What I said was "Those who REFUSE to learn CPR deserve to be overlooked
just as hams who refuse to learn Morse code deserve (the same)".

Why is it that all you code agin-ers have turned Troll and also shifted to
"dishonest" in the bargain?

1297. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 04:44:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C882F99.AEDAA4A1@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37292

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020312073252.14946.00000145@mb-fy.aol.com...
> > In article <a6k4q8nqd1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> > <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >
> > (N2EY wrote):
> >
> > >> >> To consider someone an "expert"

Didn't you guys know? An Expert is anyone wearing a suit and carrying a briefcase who is over 25 miles away from home.

1298. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 04:44:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C88408B.34A19005@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37293

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C8704A2.57E4298A@worldnet.att.net...
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C85A468.4A618D22@worldnet.att.net...
> > > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:20020310104405.07180.00000883@mb-cr.aol.com...
> > > > > > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> > > > > >
> > > > > > >The point was that FCC nor the government in general will be in
> any
> > > way
> > > > > > >inclined to turn ham radio loose to do anything anyone might way
> to
> > > do
> > > > > > >with ham radio re Carl's bright ideas for an idealistic digital
> > > nirvana
> > > > > > in
> > > > > > >ham radio. It would set us up to become an underground illicit
> means
> > > of
> > > > > > >international communication that could easily harbor hidden
> > > > > > >terrorist communications which might escape detection, at least
> until
> > > too
> > > > > > >late to be effective Carl thinks he has all this figured out. He
> > > needs a
> > > > > > new
> > > > > > abacus.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Whew, that is a bit far out even for you, Dick. :-)
> > > > > > Ed Hare, W1RFI
> > > > >
> > > > > Yup, I can hear them black helicopters comin'
> > > > > in for Dick now.... whup, whup, whup :-)
> > > > >
> > > > > Funny thing is that you don't even need radio
> > > > > to pass encrypted messages anymore.
> > > >

> > > > "Anymore"???" And when has that *not* been true?
> > >
> > > bandwidth across a POTS line only increased to a sufficient
> > > rate to allow good encryption within the last 10 years or so.
> >
> > Ah. So you're saying that radio still doesn't allow "good encryption"
> > Enigma didn't happen. (I know, it wasn't as good as current digital
> > types, but it was good).
>
> Today, enigma would be broken very quickly. The super
> computer's give incredible code breaking capabilities.
>
> > > > > > POTS (plain
> > > > > > old telephone service) gives you all anyone needs.
> > > > > > POTS plus a modem, a PC and an encryption program
> > > > > > will do it all...text or voice.
> > > > >
> > > > > So you believe your new-found discovery will cause the FCC to drop the
> > > > > amateur
> > > > > radio regulation prohibiting codes and ciphers?
> > > >
> > > > Huh? By what bit of illogic do you jump to that conclusion?
> > > > I simply pointed out that encrypted text/voice has no need for
> > > > radio as the means of conveyence.
> > >
> > > And never did. Neither does the Internet.
> >
> > Agreed.
> >
> > > > > > Why do you think that regulation was formed in the first place?
> > > > >
> > > > > Maybe Jim N2EY has a historical answer for us. IF the
> > > > > concern originated to allow monitoring, the concern is pretty
> > > > > lame today. Text can be encoded in hundreds of publicly
> > > > > available codings yet I doubt the FCC cares or monitors
> > > > > at all.
> > >
> > > Whether or not FCC monitors is really not the point, the point being
> > that is
> > > why
> > > the regulation was made initially. Rules that do not allow encryption will
> > be
> > > mostly
> > > followed by those who follow rules, which is most hams. Any encrypted
> > radio
> > > traffic
> > > is thus illegal. So anyone so doing will be subject to FCC interest.
> >
> > At any point in time, how does the FCC know if a digital signal
> > is "illegal". If Ed Hare and I "publish" a new coding scheme in QST,

> does the FCC suddenly "plug it in" to FCC monitoring stations?
>
> > With the increased
> > national security drive, and the added scrutiny of communications
> including
> > monitoring of the internet, it makes sense to look at amateur radio
> frequencies
> > as potential trouble spots.
>
> So?
>
> > As noted earlier, many non citizens hold US ham licenses. No one knows if
> any
> > terrorists do or not, just as no one knew why they were studying flying
> in the
> > US. I doubt all this if being overlooked.
>
> Whup, whup, whup...here comes the choppers again.

And this genius lives across the river from NYC. Without a doubt, without a clue.

1299. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 04:44:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C884129.ECE47F75@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37294

Valentine Germann wrote:

> Len-Over-21 wrote, under the influence of his
> medication, which is obviously not properly
> adjusted:
>
> >That company's name begins with "A" just as the ARRL begins
> >with an "A." That the rest of the names aren't the same doesn't
> >mean that they are alike...although both the auditing and
> >consultation done by the Arthur Andersen company seem to
> >have been acting strangely akin on certain tasks within their
> >respective activities.
>
> Another quarter heard from . . . wow. What kind of a LAME
> board IS this, anyway? Sheesh! No wonder it's down to about
> six regular posters, of whom only about two make sense.
>
> And can you guess that THIS poster is NOT one of them?
>
> Val

You learn fast, Val. But what should they expect, you teach.

1300. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 04:44:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C88417F.D47833B6@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37295

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > It's a good story Cec, but that is not a first grade question.
>
> The point is that my first grade teacher tried to stump me.
>

Sure, right, she was just lying in wait for you with a high school
level science question. Right.

1301. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 04:47:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8ED9F7.5D9C73E5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37296

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> CAM wrote, informatively, with reference to a light-
> hearted message of mine about him possibly being
> armed:
>
> >Texas CHL catagory SA (Colt .45)
>
> Not being a Texan, I can only assume that the "C"
> in "CHL" refers to "concealed."
>
> And now we have, perhaps, more than we really
> wanted to know!

Actually, if you have been reading r.r.a.p for a year, you
will have seen an extensive discussion of firearms, concealed
and otherwise. Texas has reciprocal CHL agreements with at
least five other states.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1302. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 04:59:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8EDCB2.7DD7B29F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37298

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> CAM wrote, informatively, responding to a message
> referring to the chance that he, CAM, might be armed:
>
> >Texas CHL catagory SA (Colt .45)
>
> May I assume that the "C" in "CHL" stands for
> "concealed"?

Yep, "concealed handgun license - category semiautomatic".
In Texas, one cannot carry a semiautomatic unless one
qualifies for the license using a semiautomatic. So there
are people licensed to carry a .44 Magnum revolver who
cannot legally carry a .22 cal semiautomatic. Go figure.

> In any case, I'm out the door now. Pistol-packing
> Libertarian wackos are not exactly my cup of tea.
> Set's a fine example for Ham Radio, though.

My ham radios are not afraid of burglars. :-) Did you
see the movie, "Miss Congeniality", where Sandra Bullock
tackles a guy whom she spots carrying a gun? Her admonition
was, "Silly girl, this is Texas - everyone carries a gun."
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1303. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 05:04:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8EDDDB.1BC6FC7B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37300

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > It's a good story Cec, but that is not a first grade question.
> > >
> > The point is that my first grade teacher tried to stump me.
>
> Sure, right, she was just lying in wait for you with a high school
> level science question. Right.

I was daydreaming in class so she deliberately tried to stump me.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1304. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 05:06:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8EDE43.F02A53B0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37351

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Read it again, Bill. This time concentrate and try to comprehend.
>
> What I said was "Those who REFUSE to learn CPR deserve to be overlooked
> just as hams who refuse to learn Morse code deserve (the same)".

That's what we thought you said, Dick. Nice guy.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1305. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 05:07:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8EDEAA.FB33939A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37352

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Yes, but in PRACTICE..... the CW ID on a PSK31 signal makes it through under conditions
> > > where the the phase shift keying cannot.
> >
> > At what power level? In what bandwidth? You are comparing apples
> > and oranges. PSK31 operates lots closer to Shannon's limit than
> > CW does.
>
> Theory does not equal practice. You theorize. I'll practice.

How much practice till you get it right?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1306. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 05:10:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313001036.13086.00000189@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 37353

In article <20020312184845.08722.00000951@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
>> That's great as far as the LID is concerned, but does nothing whatever to
>>assist a
>>slow CW operator who has emergency traffic that needs to be handled.
>
>If it truly were an emergency, both the slow op and the net control station
>could switch to SSB or a digital mode right on the CW net frequency.

Yup - if one of those modes were available.
>
>If conditions were so poor that SSB was not an option, I doubt that an
>unskilled CW op would have the ability to dig the encoding out of the noise.

All depends on the conditions. How many dB advantage would you say CW has over SSB, given decent equipment for each mode?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1307. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 05:10:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313001036.13086.00000188@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 37354

In article <3C875850.689F74@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>> Dick Carroll wrote:
>> >
>> > CAM wrote:
>> >
>> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
>> > > > But the Extra class was intended to be different.
>> > >
>> > > You correctly used past tense, Dick. When are you going to accept that
>> > > it was past tense and stop trying to live in the past?
>> >
>> > So you *DO* agree that it has been dumbed down!
>>
>> Nope, that it was intended to be different. 20wpm Morse code is no longer
>> one of those differences but the technical complexity of the Extra written
>> exam Vs the General written exam is still there.
>
>Well, maybe, what little of it there is. There wasn't a single VE question,
>and as I recall, there were about twice as many questions. Serious technical
>stuff. Today, mostly fluff.
>
Consider these simple facts:

Before April 15, 2000, going from General to Extra required taking two written tests, one of 50 questions (for the Advanced) and one of 40 questions (for the Extra). After that date, only a single 50 question test, based on the combined Q&A pools, was required.

You be the judge.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1308. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 05:11:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8EDF92.E08A5D74@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37355

Dick Carroll wrote:
> The VERY LAST thing these "code supporters" would dare to do is to
> even gently nudge someone toward learning it.

You are describing yourself, Dick. You have told everyone that there
won't be anyone learning code after the requirement is dropped. What
if you convince all the newcomers that is true? If you don't discourage
all newcomers from learning Morse code then you will be proven wrong.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1309. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 05:14:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8EE033.1A040E8B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37356

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote, concerning some posters purporting to
> be "code supporters" on this board:
>
> >Yep.The VERY LAST thing these "code supporters" would dare
> >to do is to even gently nudge someone toward learning it. They
> >will automatically do that on their own, should they have an
> >epiphany that orients them in that direction. Right.
>
> Yes, so it would appear. And what a crew they are, these so-called
> "code-supporters." One of them carries a concealed weapon, most
> likely, and the other one knows what people are not interested in
> before he knows what they ARE interested in. I think I've found out
> what I wanted to know here, about these folks, in about 48 hours.

Dick is the worst of all. He must discourage all newcomers from
learning Morse code in order to be proven correct in his assertion
that newcomers will not learn Morse code without the governmental
requirement. He has no other choice now except to discourage them.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1310. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 05:14:28 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8tn0iamh5ffb9@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37297

Dick Carroll wrote, concerning some posters purporting to
be "code supporters" on this board:

>Yep.The VERY LAST thing these "code supporters" would dare
>to do is to even gently nudge someone toward learning it. They
>will automatically do that on their own, should they have an
>epiphany that orients them in that direction. Right.

Yes, so it would appear. And what a crew they are, these so-called
"code-supporters." One of them carries a concealed weapon, most
likely, and the other one knows what people are not interested in
before he knows what they ARE interested in. I think I've found out
what I wanted to know here, about these folks, in about 48 hours.

Val

1311. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 05:20:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8EE19F.A8AAF1CA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37357

N2EY wrote:
> All depends on the conditions. How many dB advantage would you say CW
> has over SSB, given decent equipment for each mode?

Around 10dB depending on CW speed.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1312. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 05:21:16 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8tndi7ql8t2db@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37299

Dick Carroll wrote, with regard to the very strange
Len-Over-21

>You learn fast, Val. But what should they
>expect, you teach.

And, heavens, have I learned some things that
I really didn't WANT to know! Owweee!

Val

1313. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 05:28:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C8EE381.D2EB806F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 37358

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3C8D2EF3.C397D836@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3C8CF5F9.20222656@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> In article <3C8BD06D.80D41C94@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> >> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> >> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >W1RFI wrote:
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >No, you used my correction of your error (and elevated yourself to
> >> >> >> >victim status by tying your error to a spinal chord injury) to hurl
> >> >> >> >another insult.
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> The word is "cord."
> >> >> >
> >> >> >Ed, I don't type so well since that awful volleyball accident.
> >> >>
> >> >> Oh, my! It does seem to affected your personality as well!
> >> >>
> >> >> No doubt that "awful volleyball accident" left a permanent
> >> >> swelling of the ego. Tsk, tsk.
> >> >
> >> >Do you refer to my pride in being a radio amateur, Len. Pass a radio
> >> >amateur licensing exam--any of 'em--and you can swell with pride too,
> >> >Leonardo.
> >>
> >> There are very few who can swell as much as lil Davie. :-)
> >
> >Anyone who has attained an amatreur radio license is entitled to pride
> >in that achievement. Perhaps you can share in that pride at some point.
>
> For what reason?

If it has to be explained to you, it likely won't take place.

> >> >> Tell us about this "accident." Did that happen while on secret
> >> >> air force duty in a commie squadron?
> >> >
> >> >What does your statement mean, Len?
> >>
> >> Why does lil Davie "answer" a question with another question?
> >
> >Well, Leondardo, most of the time when someone answers a question with a
> >question, he doesn't understand what the questioner meant.
> >
> >> Let me rephrase it since "commie squadron" is an old military
> >> nickname for "communications squadron."
> >
> >I was attached to the 46th Communications Squadron for two years.
> >During that period, I never heard anyone refer to it as a "commie
> >squadron". Either your quaint name for such an organization is a)
> >archaic useage, b) used in the Army and not the Air Force or c) is BS.
>
> Tsk, tsk. Heil is just not "with it" insofar as interservice rivalry is
> concerned. Perhaps that is "too much pride."

Tsk, tsk indeed! I never heard the term used by anyone in two years
while at Barksdale AFB. While I was not in a Communications Squadron
for the two following years in the Air Force, I never heard it used by
anyone during my year in Vietnam nor by anyone during my year in Texas.

> >> Did that "accident" happen while on duty in the air force in a
> >> communications squadron?
> >
> >You writing a book?
>
> I've already contract-written two of them and am working on a
> third. Why does Heil ask? I am a professional writer; i.e., I
> accept pecuniary compensation for work performed.
>
> There is NO pecuniary compensation for the message writing
> in here, ergo all such writers are writing in an amateur mode,
> not receiving money. An exception might be made in Ed Hare's
> case since he is in the curious postion of being a "professional
> amateur."
>
> Is Heil implying that professional writters "cannot" write in here
> because it is about amateur activities?

No, Len. I thought you might be writing a book on me. I guess it was
all of the questions indicating your interest in my life.

> >> Perhaps it was "while doing work for NASA?"
> >
> >...leave this chapter out and make it a mystery.
>

> There is NO "mystery." Heil never "worked" on anything
> "for NASA."

Len, Len, Len. You speak with great conviction but without any
authority. Why not admit that you have no idea what I've done at any
time except for what I've chosen to reveal to you.

> >> >> Did that happen while defending the free world with morse as
> >> >> the only ham in all of Guinea-Bissau?
> >> >
> >> >What does this one mean, Len?
> >>
> >> Oh, my, lil Davie is all a-twitter again.
> >
> >> What does lil Davie's question mean?
> >
> >It indicates that I don't know what you mean by your question.
>
> Sigh. Let me explain in terms a child can understand.

You don't have to go that far. Just make it so that your questions have
something to do with what was actually posted.

>
> Heil made the claim of "being the only ham in Guinea-Bisseau"
> while with the US Department of State in that country.

...not in the post to which you responded. "Heil" not only claims to
have been the only ham *for most of his tour in Guinea-Bissau*, it is
known widely that "Heil" was there. It is known by radio amateurs and
by the State Dept. What of it?

> Heil did not make any claims of paying his own way to that
> terribly important country in middle Africa (population 1.2
> million, chief export being cashew nuts) nor of working for
> State without any compensation. He is therefore in the
> professional category (unless verifiable claims otherwise
> are submitted).

I think you've gone to great lengths to say that I went there to work.
Yeah, that's right. I was in the "professional" category for about
eight hours per day. The rest of the time I was simply doing what I
wanted to--you know, like other people who go to work. I'm not only not
required to submit verifiable claims to you, I'm not required to submit
any claims to you.

> "Pride" at being "the only ham in Guinea-
> Bisseau" is misplaced or a rationalization of his taking
> advantage of a situation where he was monetarily
> compensated, his transport paid for and housing furnished
> by the government.

I wonder if you have any idea of how Foreign Service members are assigned. Your comments make it sound as if you do not. I bid on the position in Guinea-Bissau. Did you ever "take advantage" of a situation where you were monetarily compensated? I suppose this translates, "You enjoyed benefits of life because you took a job somewhere".

> Heil fell into the "professional amateur" communications
> category.

The what? You pathetic old sap. That could apply to anyone who is a radio amateur and who holds a job.

> >Who is lil Davy?
>
> "Lil Davie" (use the correct quote) is Heil who was using
> "Leonardo."

You aren't being entirely forthright, are you? You've long used the diminuitive or have used your favorite German terms. Now you've reverted to the formal "Heil".

> I shall go back to "The Dynamic Duo" of "Ratman and
> Wobblin."

You aren't taking your pills as the doctor prescribed them.

> "The Thin Man" would never apply to either...

...or maybe you've taken a mitt full.

> >Sure there are limits, Len. What do you have to do with amateur radio
> >other than posting your lengthy diatribes in this venue?
>
> Why does Heil insist on being a "judge" of who does what anywhere?

Allow me to turn your own device on you: Why are you answering questions with a question? Aside from your multitude of postings here, what have you to do with amateur radio?

> Why does Heil insist on defing all according to his personal
> preferences?

Are you going "def"?

> >So you wouldn't feel obliged to take pot shots at the ARRL.
>
> The ARRL is a political special-interest group.

It is?

> Any political
> group is open to negative or positive criticsm. It's the
> American Way.

Naw, Len. The American way isn't to make it your life mission to post criticism of an amateur radio membership organization you've never been

associated with. You aren't even a radio amateur. That'd lean toward really peculiar behavior.

> Why does the Dynamic Duo insist on some specious "rule"
> of No Criticsm for a political special-interest group?

I don't know the Dynamic Duo but I'll ask 'em if I run into them.

> >I know it has been pointed out to you before: This isn't a
> >"professional" radio newsgroup. This is an amateur radio newsgroup.
>
> This is specifically an amateur radio policy newsgroup.

You always try to find something. It is still *an amateur radio newsgroup*.

> Since when does amateur radio policy involve automobiles and
> transmission operation thereof...or commercial radio operation...
> or being a professional amateur in a small middle-Africa country
> while on duty with the US government?

Each of those things has been used directly in the discussion over amateur radio licensing matters. In my case--you know, the one about the *West*, not middle-African country--my comments were directly addressed to one clueless individual who claimed that the U.S. government no longer used morse code. I think the guy making the claim was you.

> >So what'd the fun go out of, ham radio licenses or commercial licenses?
> >It wasn't clear from your comment.
>
> The feldwebel is trying to dodge his own order-issuing and
> pretending not to "understand" what is written. That's the
> "Nuremberg defense."

If you don't write it clearly, it is difficult to divine your meaning from the ether. I note that you snipped the incriminating portion to save yourself further embarrassment.

> The ISSUE is, and has been in THIS NEWSGROUP designed to
> hold it, the retention or elimination of the code test for any
> amateur radio license. Self-styled "leaders" (Heil pretends to be
> one as well as judge-jury on radio "fun") insist on keeping the
> code test. Others argue for the elimination of the code test,
> entirely. The TEST, not the elimination of code use.

That's AN ISSUE. Regardless of the original idea behind the formation of the newsgroup, the title includes the terms "radio amateur" and "policy". THIS NEWSGROUP seems to be about any amateur radio policy maters. The morse TEST is only a part of policy. I don't claim any leadership role here. I'm just a cast member.

> People like Heil seem to have "fun" in NOT ARGUING THE
> ISSUE but rather in displaying the usual sociopathic "superior"

> behavior against those not in agreement with his views.

What you've described sounds an awful lot like some of us see you,
Anderson.

> Has Heil read and understood the definitions as they have been
> explained to him?

What are you playing now--prosecutor?

> >...maybe rose gardening would be to your liking. "Good Old Mr. Wilson!"
> >Is this the part where you claim to be a "happy old man"?
>
> Heil is no Dennis the Menace, he is merely just another sociopath
> looking for an outlet for his personal frustrations. He should see a
> shrink, not a cartoonist.
>
> Gruss Gott, Herr Obersturmbandsfuhrer.

Len, I don't have a great number of personal frustrations. Unlike you,
a poseur in the world of amateur radio, I've been involved with and
enjoying ham radio for decades.

By the way, I didn't claim to *be* Dennis the Menace, I just read it
with amusement. Your portrayal of George Wilson is startling in its
accuracy. Is THIS the part where you play the "Happy Old Man"?

Dave K8MN

1314. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 05:36:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8EE545.36DD43D9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37359

N2EY wrote:
> Before April 15, 2000, going from General to Extra required taking two written
> tests, one of 50 questions (for the Advanced) and one of 40 questions (for the
> Extra). After that date, only a single 50 question test, based on the combined
> Q&A pools, was required.
>
> You be the judge.

A random 50 question exam covering the identical Q&A as two random 50/40
question exams will average out to be the same difficulty. The percentage
variance will be greater for the 50 question exam.

Would a one question Extra exam would be more difficult or less difficult?
Why?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1315. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 06:06:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313010645.19520.00000725@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 37360

>Subject: Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/11/02 15:57 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020311155702.08328.00000109@mb-fk.aol.com>

>>My goodness, you mean that all those people who are not ARRL members read
>>rrap and think I am an ARRL apologist?
>
>Some DO think that. Try to live with it. Everyone else must.

Are you including your multiple-personality-disorder opinions, Lennie?

1316. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 06:15:57 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a6nllm42fmb@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 37383

I kind of agree with that too.... After taking all the classes required for me as a firefighter, I had even more questions that I did before I went through the classes. The biggest thing a person goes through all of that is to remove as many "what if's" and other questions. Same thing can be applied to ham radio. Kinda like the statement "The more you know, the less you know," because you are enlightened to the point that your scope of the topic has a much broader view.

Ryan KC8PMX

> Cecil:
>
> I, for one, was a heck of a lot "dumber" after passing all of my amateur
> radio tests -- mainly because I was intelligent enough to realize that I
> still had a lot more to learn, and had, in fact, only scratched the
surface
> of the total knowledge available to me. Over the years as a ham, I have
> attempted to access some of that greater knowledge, and have enjoyed
> learning about several operating modes, methods, and techniques that
> are generally not tried by hams who do not advance beyond entry-level
> testing requirements.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

1317. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 06:53:42 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a6nllo52fmb@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 37391

Mine does.... Quite an extravagant Medical Jump Kit. About the only things I do not have due to cost and/or space limitations are:

Back Boards/K.E.D. Board (do carry C-spine collars though)
Automatic External Defibrillator (costs a bunch)
Suction (costs alot)
PulseOximeter (costs alot)

Overall, I am about at 80 percent of what is required to have in an emergency medical rescue truck that most all fire departments have. The requirements are not there for personal vehicles but due to the fact that I am on a township department, there is a great chance that I could arrive on scene well before the rescue rig gets there, at least I will have most of the tools required to do my job.

I would encourage all to keep a small first aid kit, and I can provide a shopping list for those that may be interested. Obviously to perform care on others it is better to have some form of training, but if they have this material, at least they can attend to their own injuries and maybe their immediate family.

I would encourage ALL hams to pursue Red Cross (or similar equivalent) First Aid and C.P.R. training. Why?

*Aging ham population---never know when one of us may possibly have a medical
condition.
*When out and about you never know when you may run across an medical situation, like
choking, heart attack, lacerations etc.
*When working a disaster as a ham we may actually run across someone who needs
medical attention and medical services personell may not be immediately available.

Training involved? Usually about 4-6 hours for the First aid, and between 6-10 hours for the C.P.R. depending on where, how and when you take the courses.

Ryan KC8PMX
Firefighter/Medical First Responder

> Bingo....it is a personal decision. Does you car have a first aid kit?
> Are you able to give CPR? Those too are personal choices. If
> I decide NOT to learn CPR am I gulty of having no heart attack
> emergency response rather than learn the most basic mode of response
> (i.e. CPR)?

>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>

1318. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 07:00:11 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a6nllp62fmb@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 37384

I would take his traffic if I was in that position of net control of a CW net. It would be silly and stupid not to take the emergency message traffic from someone who didn't meet the "master level" of morse code. On the average how long exactly in time would it take for a person to send the "average" emergency message at 8wpm? Doesn't seem to me like it would be a huge deal. At least they participating in the mode that some hold dearer to themselves than God, albeit not as fast as the best ops. After all, how does a person get better and faster? Practice of course, and actual operation too.

Ryan KC8PMX

> Please pay attention. The 8wpm guy is 200 miles away from the emergency location and is
> trying jump in and be part of the emergency net that is trying to help the people in the
> emergency area. If you were net control, what would you tell him?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1319. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 07:03:33 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a6nllq72fmb@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 37387

Is it ADD or is it just that some people can think of multiple things at the same time? Kinda like "multitasking" in a different form? Some people are capable of that, and some people are the one-track thinker types (not the gutter minded either.)

Just a thought....
Ryan KC8PMX

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C8E2814.B07B6C68@IEEE.org...
> N2EY wrote:
> > One of the many wonderful aspects of CW traffic handling "done right"
> > is the
> > extremely high efficiency and economy of words used. Not a dit wasted.
> >
> > You oughta try it sometime, Cecil.
>
> I have what might be considered as AADD. My mind wanders during CW QSOs.
> I will be copying along and then lose it to a daydream but not realize
> I've lost it until many seconds (minutes?) later.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1320. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 07:16:05 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a6nlls82fmb@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 37389

I did all the way up to and including high school..... I didn't live 5 miles "as the crow flies" but 5 actual walking miles. And that was only as of 13-14 years ago at the lastest.
And depending on the route I took, it could be "uphill" both ways! :)

Ryan KC8PMX

BTW Ed, I was emailed by a wonderful person here in this newsgroup, a copy of the .pdf file for the application to the ARRL, and soon as I save up for the membership, I will join..

> The Extra Class license was never even close to being the equivalent of a
> degree in electronics, Dick. I bet you walked 5 miles to school, too.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >

1321. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 07:25:38 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a6nllt92fmb@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 37386

And to think I have in a file somewhere, the license for broadcasting....
and it is useless. Air jocks work under the station license. Now they just
drop anyone with a voice and not necessarily talent into the booth now.
Worked at a CHR FM station in 93-95.

Ryan KC8PMX

> Wrong. FCC decided to drop all licensing requirements for broadcast
engineering
> and leave all the responsibility for meeting the technical rules to the
station
> owner. The only services where operator licensing is required is where it
is
> required "by international treaty".
>
> The implications of such a move should be obvious.
>
>
>

1322. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 07:46:09 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a6nllv02fmb@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 37390

I don't agree with 90% percent of that.... Although use of morse code (the language) (cw is mode of transmission) may drop somewhat over that past years, but it will still be there.

Just because a forced requirement may be removed does not mean that a person must stop using it. There are many people in the hobby that do enjoy morse code and some of these people will still influence others as to what they beleive as the benefits of morse code. As to the 10 percent of what I do agree with, is that I do see morse code being phased out completely, eventually, but not anywhere time soon. Like when I am long into retirement, which will be 35-40 years from now.

Ryan KC8PMX

> The lack of requirement to know CW, and hence an exposure to it,
will, in
> the long run, be it's demise. The human creature is one of "path of least
> resistence" and this will be no different. With the exception of a few
> "artisitc" hold-outs, Morse Code use will eventually die out.
>
> And that will be a shame.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>

1323. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 07:50:14 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a6nlm012fmb@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 37388

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C881946.13FA0F07@worldnet.att.net...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > I have been part of some of the
>
> > discussions on the QRP lists about why we need to work with the new hams
who
> > would like to improve their CW skills.
>
> All well and good, but what will you do when new hams *have no* CW
skills?

And what have you personally done in attempt to "turn those tables around?"

Ryan KC8PMX

1324. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 07:51:59 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a6nlm122fmb@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 37385

Yep Cecil.... you described the Good Ole USA pretty good there!

Ryan
KC8PMX

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C8E7F10.FEB6526B@IEEE.org...
> Robert Casey wrote:
> > One of the merits of code is that it requires a minimum of equipment to
> > operate with it. So there should be a lot of CW from the third world,
yes?
>
> Most of the third world hams I know about are of the rich elite class.
> The average citizens are worrying about where their next meal is coming
from.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1325. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 08:13:45 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a6nlm232fmb@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 37392

> Hmmm...no remarks about the "impact" of the only ARRL staffer
> who is a "regular" in this chat room?
>
> Jim Haynie thought it reasonable that no ARRL Hq person should
> give opinions in here. Of course, that was in private mail that
> ensued after he popped in here shortly after his election.

Hmmmm.... attempts to control ever aspect of a persons personal life? Is Ed revealing private business of the ARRL here? Shit, I like the fact the he is here. He is the only ARRL affiliated person I can actually speak (or actually type) to. As far as him having a personal opinion.... encouraged also. What's the alternative? Remember Hitler?

> >If I admit you are right, will you become an ARRL member?

I am gonna eventually.... Saving up 3900 pennies! Shipping on those will be a pain but am sending them in!

1326. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 10:51:11 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313055111.07180.00001279@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 37361

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>>Not at all. He does not believe that ARRL should have a presence on rrap.
>>Our internet outlet is the ARRL web page. He does not have the right to tell
>>me where I spend my personal time, nor would he want to.

>Then why should anyone in here demand some certificate of
>compliance or whatever to post on amateur radio regulations?

No one in here should make such demands, IMHO.

>That may be why you are not doing the ARRL Spin very well.

Then if it were really my job, they would fire me. I post what I believe to be true. It must hit close to home; you keep trying to trivialize it as "ARRL Spin..." -- Capitalizations and all!

>Try to stay with the "important" RFI work and stop the ARRL
>apolgistic propaganda here. You are not doing it well by quoting
>standard ARRL phraseology.

As long as you keep calling it "spin" and deeming me an apologist, I know I am doing better that you would let on, Len. :-)

>Did they ask "everyone" with an interest? I don't think so...despite
>the allegations four years ago that the League was implied to do
>just that. That was dismissed as the "usual ARRL propaganda"
>then and never proved conclusively.

One can "prove" what ARRL asked by reading the pages of QST and ARRL's website, Len. I told you what I believe their words meant; your interpretation appears to be the usual "usual ARRL propaganda." I am content to let the three people reading this make up their own minds, after hearing both of our opinions.

>Does the ARRL have a legal firm on retainer in the DC area?
>Please answer yes or no.

I'm sorry; I thought you knew that. Yes, they do.

>If "all it takes to write a letter" is the ability to compose a
>literate letter in approximately the standard format, why is the
>ARRL paying a legal firm in DC out of membership monies?

I'm sorry, Len; I thought you knew that. ARRL is paying a legal firm for legal advice on the impact of proposed regulations and the best strategy to take with the FCC on filings.

>>>Why does the ARRL insist on being a "middleman" in "how to file
>>>comments?" The FCC explains the procedures directly on its

>>>website.

>>Um, the same website that ARRL links to in the part of ITS website that
>tells
>>hams how to file comments? You are seeing the Devil behind every bush!

>Not at all. I am trying to get a straight answer. I haven't gotten a
>straight answer yet. Why is that so hard to answer?

Because the ARRL is not "insisting" on being a middleman in filings with the FCC, Len. I thought you would understand that when I pointed out that ARRL encourages all hams to file their own comments. Perhaps you did, but it didn't fit your agenda, so you just keep repeating the question.

>Comment on NPRM 98-143 did not require either expertise on RFI
>matters or expertise in "legal wording."

You are correct on the first half; I was not asked for any of my professional input wrt 98-143. I disagree with you that the services of an attorney are not appropriate to the legal wording of an FCC filing.

>You haven't answered my question at all.

You just don't like the answer. To use your favorite words, live with it.

>>Because hams want to buy it. Those that do apparently prefer the plain
>>language explanations to the rules.

>Are you saying that "hams" cannot comprehend the wording in
>Part 97, Title 47 CFR? From your alleged "answer" above, that
>shines through.

What he said: "prefer..." What he heard: "cannot comprehend..."

>All of the Parts
>in Title 47 can be downloaded free of charge from the US
>Government Printing Office site on the Internet; it had been
>available on the FCC site (may still be) as were several other
>Parts.

The links to the FCC rules are available free of charge on the ARRL web site. If hams "cannot comprehend" the ARRL FCC Rule Book and "prefer" to download them for free, the ARRL will stop producing and selling the Rule Book. BTW, Riley Hollingsworth periodically taps his low friend in high places in the ARRL Lab for copies to pass around the FCC, so perhaps the FCC "cannot comprehend" the rules, either. :-)
>Are you saying that "hams" cannot set their VCR timers either?
>Or able to read their ready-built radio equipment operating
>instructions?

What he said: "...hams want to buy it." What he heard" Hams can't read."

Uh, Len, if hams can't read, they wouldn't buy the book, now, eh?

>I give them far more credit and intellectual capability than you do,
>Ed Hare.

By implying that "hams want to buy the FCC Rule Book" to mean that "they can't program a VCR or read the owners manuals of their rig? Kind of an offhand way of offering them "credit," eh?

>You must be insulting them, not the
>"ARS Community."

What he said... What he heard: "Ed hare just insulted the ARS Community." (Capitalization for emphasis that would not otherwise exist duly noted...)

>>I think that most members would feel that it is "not possible" that ARRL
>>exerts some sort of mind control over them, Len.

>True Believers cannot see or comprehend that they've been had by
>88 years of self-promotional propaganda or their overwhelmingly
>major source of news about amateur radio coming from a single
>organization.

Now who is insulting who?

Would you like some links to the other news sources, Len? They are on the ARRL Web site...

>>Big difference between "opinion" and "influence" and "control," Len. Talk
>>about misdirection!
>
>There's absolutely NO "misdirection" in what I said. It is simply
>propaganda designed to convince others that an organization is
>the "best."

Okay, I will take you at your word that what you said is not misdirection, but propaganda.

73,
Ed Hare

1327. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 10:53:23 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313055323.07180.00001280@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 37362

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>What has the ARRL promoted for a new, original mode in the last
>quarter century?

Developed by staff? None. Given exposure in QST, QEX, web page? Nearly every new thing that has come down the pike.

Why do you ask? The question seemed to be tacked on to a post about the history of military communications. Misdirecting again?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1328. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 10:55:04 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313055504.07180.00001282@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 37363

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>There is NO pecuniary compensation for the message writing
>in here, ergo all such writers are writing in an amateur mode,
>not receiving money. An exception might be made in Ed Hare's
>case since he is in the curious postion of being a "professional
>amateur."

No cigar for you, Len. I am not paid to write words on rrap.

I thought you understood that. More'n'likely, you do...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1329. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 10:57:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313055718.07180.00001284@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 37364

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>Tsk, tsk, tsk, Ed Hare seems oblivious to others using "cute" or
>diminutive names for myself...doing it well before I have returned
>the favor.

They don't help their arguements, either. I don't recall; has Dave ever used
"Little Lennie" with you? I am just wondering why you felt you needed to
"defend yourself."

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1330. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 11:04:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313060403.07180.00001288@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 37365

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>W1RFI trolled, in reference to one of my more
>scintillating UseNet posts:

>>Do you think that your post is a valuable, relevant, clear,
>>concise post that one should expect of UseNet's finest?

>Two lines. Troll rating: 1 out of 10. Got to step it up.

I take that as a "no." If all you can do is to call my post a "troll," I will
assume correctly that you had nothing substantive to offer.

Cec', you may be right after all. :-)
73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1331. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 11:05:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313060518.07180.00001289@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 37366

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>Not him. To him, CW is just a novelty.

Uh, oh, call out Val. Only two sentences. Our new Net Cop needs to lash him for it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1332. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 11:07:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313060733.07180.00001290@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 37367

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> All well and good, but what will you do when new hams *have no* CW skills?

Tell them why the mode has value and why code is worth learning.

When new hams have no CW skills, will you keep telling them that it is not worth learning because there is no test?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1333. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 11:09:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313060913.07180.00001292@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 37368

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>What kind of a LAME board IS this, anyway?

Now, THAT has the classic signs of being a troll -- a gratuitous insult intended to stir up a reaction.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1334. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 11:11:32 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313061132.07180.00001293@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 37369

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> If it truly were an emergency, both the slow op and the net control station
>> could switch to SSB or a digital mode right on the CW net frequency.

> Gee, Ed. How is net control going to know the slow CW station's capabilities
>without communicating with him in the mode which he is using?

Both CW and SSB are generally detected using a product detector. The station with the emergency can call the net on SSB and they will hear him just fine. If it is the dire emergency you postulate, such communication is perfectly legal.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1335. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 11:15:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313061519.07180.00001295@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 37370

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> What is your estimate of the percentage of hams that could pass
>>emergency CW traffic under circumstances where conditions
>>were bad enough that SSB could not
>> be copied?

>I see no reason to guess, do you? Why not just keep a learning level test so
>that there will always be a modicum of CW skill within the ARS? I know, that's
>asking far too much.

I think that "guessing" is an important step to determining if Amateur Radio testing is meeting its present goals.

All hams today were tested under a system that has a requirement to demonstrate a modicum of CW skill for some classes of operators. What percentage of those hams do you think could handle emergency traffic on CW under conditions where SSB could not be copied? If the percentage is high, you have made your point. If the percentage is low, the point is lost.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1336. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 11:21:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313062108.07180.00001297@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 37371

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>All depends on the conditions. How many dB advantage would you say CW
>has over SSB, given decent equipment for each mode?

Depends on a few factors, Jim. The first is bandwidth. The necessary bandwidth for slow CW is about 25 Hz. That would give a 20 dB advantage over 2500 Hz. But not many hams have 25 Hz filtering in their rigs. Let's take 500 Hz. That will give 10log(2500/500) dB advantage over SSB, or 7 dB. If the CW station is being received on equipment normally used for SSB, it may have a 2500 Hz bandwidth, giving it 0 dB advantage.

Now, a skilled op can have "mental DSP" that can be might effective at filtering, but I think we can safely presume that this 5 wpm desparate ham will not have such capability.

Even worse, the big reason that Dick offers that it is not possible to change bands is that the emergency is a strorm and static levels are high. There is nothing WORSE than slow CW in high static. Either one has to go about 40 wpm to get bursts of information through in between the crashes, or one has to go about 150 wpm and use voice. Either way, fills will be required, but the 5 wpm CW will probably have a static crash on every character, on average.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1337. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 12:35:26 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313073526.07164.00001121@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 37372

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>Gee, bozo...

You're winning, Bill; Val has devolved to petty insult.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1338. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 12:36:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313073622.20892.00000130@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 37377

In article <3C8E548E.98171AC2@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>>
>> CAM wrote:
>> > The 1957 ARRL License Manual had 279 Q&A in 25 pages. The 2000
>> > ARRL Extra Class License Manual had 449 Q&A in 359 pages. Looks
>> > like to me the material increased from 1957 to 2000.
>>
>> Yep. One of the things the computer Age was supposed to do was eliminate
>paper,
>> too. Didn't happen, did it? Just because there are more "pages" of
>questions doesn't
>> mean a thing.
>
>Everyone has noticed that nothing means anything unless it supports your
>agenda.

He's making a valid point, Cecil.

Here are two questions on the same electrical engineering subject. Which requires more knowledge to answer correctly? Can YOU answer either of them?

Q1: How many electrical connections are there on a typical single impedance bond?

A - 1
B - 2
C - 3
D - 4

Q2: Describe the purpose, construction, operation and testing of a typical single impedance bond.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1339. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 12:36:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313073623.20892.00000131@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 37375

In article <3C8E5404.3052443@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>
>> an alleged EE wrote:
>> > What is AGC/AVC? (I'm not even sure if my radio has it.)
>>
>> Proving, surely beyond doubt, that not even a degree in electrical
>> engineering automatically qualifies one for a ham radio license! And
>> that the tests are pretty much a non-entity anyway.
>
>Why would a digital engineer know what AGC is, Dick?

The person quoted is both an EE and an Extra, Cecil.

> Do you know what
>an NMI is?

Sure. I also know what AVC/AGC is, and why it's a good idea to turn it off
in many situations.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1340. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 12:36:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313073623.20892.00000132@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 37376

In article <3C8E77D4.1B4C237E@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>>
>> CAM wrote:
>>
>> > Dick Carroll wrote:
>> > >
>> > > CAM wrote:
>> > > > Skunk juice is used in expensive perfumes.
>> > >
>> > > Nope. Just a highly refined component.
>> >
>> > A highly refined component of skunk juice is not skunk juice?
>>
>> Does it have the same smell as skunk juice? NO? then it isn't skunk
>> juice, just a useful highly refined component, which is useful.
>
>So refined skunk juice is not skunk juice. There, there, I think I
>understand. (Somebody get the net!)
>--
If you refine skunk juice enough, you can probably end up with plain water,
which is a useful highly refined component. Does this mean that skunk juice
is water? Nope.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1341. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 12:36:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313073624.20892.00000134@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 37373

In article <3C8EE19F.A8AAF1CA@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> All depends on the conditions. How many dB advantage would you say CW
>> has over SSB, given decent equipment for each mode?
>
>Around 10dB depending on CW speed.
>--

Which is the difference between 0 dB S/N and clear copy.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1342. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 12:36:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313073624.20892.00000133@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 37374

In article <3C8EAED3.9BC906D8@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> >The other night, a ham just stopped responding to me because I
>> >had so much trouble with his callsign using the paddles.
>
>> Typical Cecil shaggy-dog story.
>
>It's a true story.

Maybe, maybe not. Since you have often told us that you "never post seriously
to rrap", it could be true or it could be a "tall tale".

> You might recognize his call.

Maybe.

That's not the shaggy-dog aspect of the story.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1343. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 12:36:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313073626.20892.00000135@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 37378

In article <a6mf8qhk1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020312073252.14946.00000145@mb-fy.aol.com...
>> In article <a6k4q8nqd1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> (N2EY wrote):
>>
>> >> >> To consider someone an "expert" amateur radio operator, I would
>> >> >> have to include Morse skills, simply because the mode is so
>> >> >> popular with hams. Earning the title "expert amateur radio operator"
>> >> >> requires a LOT of skills. I do not consider someone with little or
>no
>> >> >> Morse skills to be an expert amateur radio operator.
>> >> >
>> >> >Then you have a very archaic view of expertise.
>> >>
>> >> How so? Isn't Morse widely used by hams? Doesn't "expert" mean that
>> >someone
>> >> is very skilled and knowledgeable in ALL aspects of something?
>> >
>> >In a word, NO.
>>
>> I disagree.
>
>We will then agree to disagree.

Agreed. No, wait, then I'd be agreeing. So I should disagree. But if I do that,
I would actually be agreeing, because I'd be disagreeing with disagreement...
>
>> >That YOU equate expert to mandate knowledge
>> >in ALL aspects of anything goes far afield of what most people
>> >would consider expert.
>>
>> I really don't think so.
>
>I do.

I'm not gonna do the dictionary thing. Cecil's the expert on that one.
>
>> >Does a figure skater qualify as
>> >an expert because s/he can't skate like a hocky player (or vise versa)?
>>

>> I think you meant to write "not qualify".
>
>Yup.
>
>> That's not a valid analogy. A figure skater and a hockey player do
>different
>> kinds of skating, just as hams and broadcast DJs do different kinds of
>radio.
>> Saying a figure skater is an expert means that s/he can do all sorts of
>> figure skating moves with a high degree of skill. Saying a hockey player
>is
>> an expert means he/she can play the game well, with a high degree of skill
>> in all areas of ice hockey.
>>
>> Would you call a figure skater an expert figure skater if s/he could not
>do a
>> toe loop or a double axel? I wouldn't.
>
>Too limited example...but why not.

The point is that toe loops and double axels are such a part of figure-skating expertise that a person who can't do them really can't be considered an expert figure skater. They are not a part of ice hockey, however.

>
>> >> I don't see
>> >> how someone could claim to be an "expert" amateur radio operator and
>yet
>> >> have no Morse/CW skills. It would be like saying a driver who could not
>> >> drive a manual transmission vehicle was an expert driver.
>> >
>> >Take a look at the current crop of Formula 1 cars...most are
>> >automatics now.
>>
>> So? Do you think there are any Formula 1 drivers who can't drive stick? I
>> don't.
>
>I don't know...but the future sure appears likly.

Point is, even though Formula 1 doesn't require every driver to know how to drive stick, they most probably all do.

>
>> >The fact IS that one need NOT know how to
>> >drive a manual gearbox to be an expert driver.
>>
>> I disagree. Would you give the label "expert" to a plumber who
>> could not solder copper pipes? I wouldn't - even though it is possible
>> to do all of the plumbing in a house without any soldering.
>
>Today, probably so.

Would a no-soldering-skills plumber be an expert plumber? Nope.
>
>> >> >> But I also do
>> >> >> not think that amateur radio or emergencies are the sole province
>of'
>> >> >> experts.
>> >> >
>> >> >Nor have I said so either.
>> >>
>> >> Then we agree. "Good operator" and "expert operator" are completely
>> >> different things.
>> >>
>> >I think they are separaeted as a matter of degree.
>>
>> > Neither,
>> >however, needs CW knowledge to be an expert.
>>
>> Then we disagree.
>
>So be it.

Agreed - I think.
>
>> >> >> I don't presume to call myself an expert amateur radio operator,
>> >> >> either Still way too much out there for me to learn and get good at.
>> >> >
>> >> >After all these years, you don't consider yourself
>> >> >an expert?
>> >>
>> >> Nope. Never claimed to be, either. I know too many ops who are way
>better
>> >> than me.
>> >>
>> >Expert does NOT mean or imply there are none better than you.
>>
>> That's not what I'm saying. I don't call myself an expert because I know
>hams
>> whose
>> skills are far above mine.
>
>That they may know more than you doesn't mean YOU aren't
>an expert too.

Mere seniority doesn't make one an expert, either.
>
>> Even though QST did bestow the title "definitive expert" on me.....;-)
>
>Congrats,

Thanks!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1344. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 13:06:36 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6nj0j$d50$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37379

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C882E07.D6477DB8@worldnet.att.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > > > Are you able to give CPR? Those too are personal choices. If
> > > > I decide NOT to learn CPR am I gulty of having no heart attack
> > > > emergency response rather than learn the most basic mode of response
> > > > (i.e. CPR)?
> > > >
> > >
> > > You're right, same principle applies. If you refuse to learn to
operate
> > CW, you
> > > don't deserve to have your butt saved by someone who did. Just as you
> > don't
> > > deserve to have some one do CPR on you if you refuse to learn it to
help
> > others.
> > >
> > > Good analogy. Choose your own poison.
> >
> > Good anology...poor response from you. Since just about anyone
> > can learn CPR, you are saying the millions of people that have
> > not learned CPR don't deserve to be saved by someone that did.
> > Pretty sick attitude on your part.
>
> Read it again, Bill. This time concentrate and try to comprehend.
>
> What I said was "Those who REFUSE to learn CPR deserve to be overlooked
> just as hams who refuse to learn Morse code deserve (the same)".

Think it again... Those that refuse to learn CPR include just
about every adult who is capable but hasn't done
so. That IS hundreds of millions of people. CPR classes are
offered in hundreds of venues: Red Cross, Adult Ed programs,
eompany education, etc.

> Why is it that all you code agin-ers have turned Troll and also shifted to
> "dishonest" in the bargain?

Dishonest?
Now there's a perjorative and highly emotional
catagorization... from one of the PCTAdvocates.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1345. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 13:20:30 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6nkav$28n$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37380

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C88253E.C37E1DF7@worldnet.att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Yes, but in PRACTICE..... the CW ID on a PSK31 signal makes it
through under conditions
> > > where the the phase shift keying cannot.
> >
> > At what power level? In what bandwidth? You are comparing apples
> > and oranges. PSK31 operates lots closer to Shannon's limit than
> > CW does.
>
> Theory does not equal practice. You theorize. I'll practice.

If your practice disproves Shannon's limits I'm sure that
would be news to the entire communications, data, and
telecommunications industries as well as the science
departments of most univercities.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1346. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 13:29:15 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6nkb0$28n$2@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37381

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C882652.252A1DAA@worldnet.att.net...
> Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> > W1RFI wrote, strangely, concerning the promotion of
> > >As an Elmer, I see my role as helping someone discover what
> > >part of ham radio is right for them, not to impose my standards
> > >on them. As I tell them about different parts of ham radio, my
> > >enthusiasm for Morse code will show through.
> >
> > Yeah, of THAT how can I have ANY doubt! :-)
> > Val
>
> Yep.The VERY LAST thing these "code supporters" would dare to do is to
> even gently nudge someone toward learning it.

Dick,
YOU have the role and responsibility of recruiting, advocating,
gently nudging. Ed tells you haw he does it. I actually
would consider it a loss if ALL morse operation ceased...BUT
by saying that I do NOT jump to a mandatory need for a
test requirement. That's no different than many "voluntary"
endeavors that people take up. With absolutly NO
government intervention or prompting, people still
take up archery, they learn to drive manual gearbox
vehicles, they learn CPR, they buy, repair, maintain antique
cars, etc. There are HUNDREDS of voluntary efforts
that keep archaic interests alive today....the same will be so
for Morse Code in the amateur bands...of that I have NO
doubt at all.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

They will automatically do
> that on their own, should they have an epiphany that orients them in
> that direction. Right.

1347. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 13:32:40 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6nkm8$bh6$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37382

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u8tkbbnj8gc2cf@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Bill Sohl wrote, in TROLL-ON-FULL mode, in
> response to a conflicted message from an employee
> of a well-known, amateur radio related organization,
> an organization with ability to, perhaps, make a con-
> siderable difference in whatever Ham Radio is
> or might become:
>
> >So how come you don't look for the "activist"
> >responses from Dick, Larry and a few other of
> >the pro-code test contingent?
>
> Gee, bozo, I guess it was because they haven't
> made any pompous, self-serving statements in
> this area -- yet. Are YOU stepping up to that next?
> Oh, wait, you already HAVE!
>
> By the by, are you carrying, too?

Val,

I see you've exhausted your bag of commentary and
now join Dick in the perjorative labeling and inuendo
game. Carrying? Sure I carry...lot's of things...did
you have something specific in mind?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1348. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 14:37:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C884BD7.C1CB1EEE@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37393

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Read it again, Bill. This time concentrate and try to comprehend.
> >
> > What I said was "Those who REFUSE to learn CPR deserve to be overlooked
> > just as hams who refuse to learn Morse code deserve (the same)".
>
> That's what we thought you said, Dick. Nice guy.
>

So you have comprehension problems all your own. No surprise. That is NOT
what he quoted me as having said.
Refuse to help others and you shouldn't be too surprised to find others not
to anxious to help you.

1349. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 14:37:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C88C165.18F9786E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37394

CAM wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
> > Before April 15, 2000, going from General to Extra required taking two written
> > tests, one of 50 questions (for the Advanced) and one of 40 questions (for the
> > Extra). After that date, only a single 50 question test, based on the combined
> > Q&A pools, was required.
> >
> > You be the judge.
>
> A random 50 question exam covering the identical Q&A as two random 50/40
> question exams will average out to be the same difficulty.

Yep,with all the questions and answers in hand well in advance, it's a matter of annoyance, not difficulty.

1350. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 14:37:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C88C323.ABE99FE5@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37396

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> If it truly were an emergency, both the slow op and the net control station
> >> could switch to SSB or a digital mode right on the CW net frequency.
>
> > Gee, Ed. How is net control going to know the slow CW station's capabilities
> >without communicating with him in the mode which he is using?
>
> Both CW and SSB are generally detected using a product detector. The station
> with the emergency can call the net on SSB and they will hear him just fine.
> If it is the dire emergency you postulate, such communication is perfectly
> legal.

A couple of points to consider. If the guy is calling on CW, that is what he has available. If he had SSB available, *I* assume he'd be using it, as I would in his situation, so long as it was usable. So, since he is on CW I won't likely waste much time suggesting to him that we shift to SSB, however a quick question on his capabilities and gear certainly would be proper, so as to overlook nothing. But you can't assume anything.

1351. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 14:37:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C88C445.10E80A9F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37395

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> What is your estimate of the percentage of hams that could pass
> >>emergency CW traffic under circumstances where conditions
> >>were bad enough that SSB could not
> >> be copied?
>
> >I see no reason to guess, do you? Why not just keep a learning level test so
> >that there will always be a modicum of CW skill within the ARS? I know, that's
> >asking far too much.
>
> I think that "guessing" is an important step to determining if Amateur Radio
> testing is meeting its present goals.
>
> All hams today were tested under a system that has a requirement to demonstrate
> a modicum of CW skill for some classes of operators. What percentage of those
> hams do you think could handle emergency traffic on CW under conditions where
> SSB could not be copied? If the percentage is high, you have made your point.
> If the percentage is low, the point is lost.
>

YOU lost the point, or more likely deliberately dumped it. The point has always
been that some code testing is necessary if any substantial numbers of hams are to
become qualified as CW operators. Without any test whatever, so few will ever do so
that CW as a mode is gone in the period of a generation or so. That is the future,
based on past history. Ignore it as you
wish, but no whitewash will alter it.

1352. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 14:37:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C88C517.E2705894@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37397

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
> >Gee, bozo...
>
> You're winning, Bill; Val has devolved to petty insult.
>

Insult? Naw, that's merely calling a clown by his first name.

1353. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 14:37:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C88C820.A692FD2B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37398

Bill Sohl wrote:

> >
> > Read it again, Bill. This time concentrate and try to comprehend.
> >
> > What I said was "Those who REFUSE to learn CPR deserve to be overlooked
> > just as hams who refuse to learn Morse code deserve (the same)".
>
> Think it again... Those that refuse to learn CPR include just
> about every adult who is capable but hasn't done
> so. That IS hundreds of millions of people. CPR classes are
> offered in hundreds of venues: Red Cross, Adult Ed programs,
> eompany education, etc.

So, in your view every adult who has not undergone training in CPR has "refused" it.
That's very novel, and a window to your thought process.
A great many adults have not been afforded the opportunity to have that training, and you state that places them in the "refused" column because the training is available in many venues. Wrong. The cagtegory of persons who have been offered the opportunity to take the training and rejected the opportunity are those who have refused it. One has to have a choice to refuse. No opportunity offered, no refusal. It's really not that complex, Bill.

1354. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 14:37:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C88CA7C.B14A53D8@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37399

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C88253E.C37E1DF7@worldnet.att.net...
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > Yes, but in PRACTICE..... the CW ID on a PSK31 signal makes it
> through under conditions
> > > > where the the phase shift keying cannot.
> > >
> > > At what power level? In what bandwidth? You are comparing apples
> > > and oranges. PSK31 operates lots closer to Shannon's limit than
> > > CW does.
> >
> > Theory does not equal practice. You theorize. I'll practice.
>
> If your practice disproves Shannon's limits I'm sure that
> would be news to the entire communications, data, and
> telecommunications industries as well as the science
> departments of most univercities.

So you're having comprehension problems too, still. No one said that anything "disproves" anything that Shannon did. What was said is that theory and practice don't always coincide and the example given was an instance of that very concept- where the more efficient mode fails under conditions in which the lesser efficient works. To insist on placing restraints on the working mode just to "level the playing field" for scientific comparison is not only poor practice, it is poor engineering. Engineering should have a useful point, and such a plan is not useful in the least.
Cecil wants us to forget that the communications channel in the case presented was fixed at a certain bandwidth. Under that set of conditions, CW was the working mode and PSK31 was not.
Shannon stated what was the maximum efficiency possible, not what one finds in everyday practice.

1355. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 14:37:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C88CC09.ED98D41A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37400

W1RFI wrote:

>, the big reason that Dick offers that it is not possible to change

> bands is that the emergency is a strorm and static levels are high. There is
> nothing WORSE than slow CW in high static.

Ed, the worsened level of static would be found on 75 meters, the band to which the frequency change would be made. It commonly happens that static levels are not so bad on 40 when they are wiping out 75/80, making communications possible if a bit difficult on 40 but impossible on 75/80 meters.

> Either one has to go about 40 wpm to
> get bursts of information through in between the crashes, or one has to go
> about 150 wpm and use voice. Either way, fills will be required, but the 5 wpm
> CW will probably have a static crash on every character, on average

My personal experience tells me that given the choices and conditions noted that I would have a better chance of passing traffic on 40 meter CW than on 75 meter SSB.

1356. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 14:37:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C88CC73.D0DCDE61@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37401

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > All well and good, but what will you do when new hams *have no* CW skills?
>
> Tell them why the mode has value and why code is worth learning.
>
> When new hams have no CW skills, will you keep telling them that it is not
> worth learning because there is no test?

Maybe you can persuade the touchy-feely New Agers with that spiel, but I
seriously doubt it.

1357. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 15:20:16 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0203130720.7acc73b1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 37402

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020313062108.07180.00001297@mb-cr.aol.com>...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >All depends on the conditions. How many dB advantage would you say CW
> >has over SSB, given decent equipment for each mode?
>
> Depends on a few factors, Jim. The first is bandwidth. The necessary bandwidth
> for slow CW is about 25 Hz. That would give a 20 dB advantage over 2500 Hz.
> But not many hams have 25 Hz filtering in their rigs. Let's take 500 Hz. That
> will give 10log(2500/500) dB advantage over SSB, or 7 dB.

"Decent equipment" will do at least a 250 Hz CW bandwidth, Ed.

> If the CW station is
> being received on equipment normally used for SSB, it may have a 2500 Hz
> bandwidth, giving it 0 dB advantage.

The boundary conditions were "decent equipment for each mode". Considering
the filtering available in even inexpensive QRP CW rigs (Elecraft K1, for
example), there's no reason to suffer with SSB selectivity on CW.
>
> Now, a skilled op can have "mental DSP" that can be might effective at
> filtering, but I think we can safely presume that this 5 wpm desparate ham will
> not have such capability.

Back when I was a would-be ham, and a Novice, I learned the code using receivers
with "AM" selectivity - typically 6-10 kHz or more. I learned to dig one CW
signal out of the mess even before I knew the code. So it's quite possible
that a slow speed operator can dig a signal out of the mess.

CW has some other advantages over SSB. For one thing, the CW signal is
"fully voiced" - a 100 W CW rig puts out 100 W when the key is down and
0 W when the key is up. An SSB rig of equivalent power is all over the place,
power-wise.

And the S/N necessary to copy CW is usually less than the S/N necessary to
copy SSB.

As for Dick's case of not changing bands because of static level, I think you
misunderstand.

Changing bands to get better propagation is a good move, and may be better than
changing modes. The big "IF", though, is whether better propagation can be had
on another frequency. If 40 is noisy, 75 will often be even noisier. 20 will
probably be quieter, but may not have propagation to cover the desired area.

Wasn't propagation one of the reasons given for amateurs needing a 60 meter band?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1358. Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 15:37:46 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8urhdn0mvng0a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37403

Hello, all!

Ham Radio is almost unique in that a government agency
is involved in its regulation AND a series of qualifying tests
is required. The only other avocation that is in this class
would be, I believe, sport flying.

As far as the public interest is concerned the primary policy
issues revolve around the best- and most-orderly use of the
public airwaves by amateur operators, interference with
other users of adjacent frequencies or other electronic
equipment, and safety, of both the operator and passers by.

The size and cost of the regulatory apparatus varies with
the entry level cost of the avocation, and the importance
of vetting entrants into the avocation. That is, getting into
general aviation is expensive and so that tends to self-limit
the potential candidates, even before any consideration of
skill and/or competence. The penatlies for bad flying go
far beyond the embarrassment of losing one's license.
Cratering into the landscape makes any such government
action moot, a fact which tends to focus attention and deflect
a lot of criticism of "government harrassment" where pilot
testing is concerned. Crashing airplanes are just bad for
everyone, even the people on whom they fall.

Yet even this does not stop people from drinking and flying,
or even deliberately piloting small planes into large buildings.
Surely, we know that the days of "Libertarianism" are about
over, what with the USA approaching 285 million people,
spread over about fifty ethnic groups. The thought of a
Libertarian Committee within every U.S. ethnic goup should
be a sobering thought for anyone. Experience is a hard teacher,
especially for those who refuse to learn.

There is no liberty without rules and freedom is meaningless
without a legal framework that is agreed upon and enforced.

Now, Ham Radio is not general aviation. You can't die
immediately from lousy operating. And the interference
and safety issues are, on a national level, small, though
they are important within the field. The main issues then
are the internal distribution of "air space" and the vetting
of new entrants. Not long ago the entry level cost was a
huge disincentive, long before the testing issue reared
its head. That tended to, er, we'll let that go. Today all of

this has changed and anyone, ANYONE, can get into the tent and, in the words of one poster here, start "pissing."

That is, it used to be expensive, one way or another, to even START to be a Ham. Thirty years ago the entry level cost, in 2002 dollars, was rather high, either in time or money. And you had to go take a GOVERNMENT TEST, administered by a GOVERNMENT employee, at a real live GOVERNMENT FACILITY. You REALLY got the idea that Ham Radio was SOMETHING! Last week, a friend of mine "got into Ham Radio" (in about ten minutes at the counter) for the princely sum of $119.95, at Radio Shack. And the test he had to take, and which I will take in just a few days, was administered locally and was pretty easy, particularly since the Q's and A's were, er, KNOWN!

How is this possible and what does it mean for the future of amateur radio?

Well, in ye olden days there weren't any repeaters, and those devices, invented and installed by the WWII gen-eration of Hams, out of a desire for effective mobile com-munications, took the responsibilty for big power and an expensive antenna away from the mobile operator and shifted it to the club. This, combined with imported solid-state gear that is mass-marketed, has served to drop the entry dollar-cost all the way down to what amounts to coffee money. That, combined with a vast decrease in the amount of regulatory trouble it takes to get a Ham Ticket, has REALLY changed everything.

On the one hand, what can be "wrong" with all of this? Isn't more ALWAYS better? Such is the American way, I guess. If one million cars are good, 200 million cars have to be 200 million times BETTER, unless they're all trying to park at once, OR are mainly burning petroleum we have to import from the volatile Middle East. But I digress. Surely, surely, making it possible for the maximum number of prospective candidates to actually get a Ham license HAS to be good? After all, growth is ALWAYS good, isn't it? And to remain static or, horror of horrors, to DECINE in numbers, well, that is surely DEATH, am I right, even when the base is in the HUNDREDS of THOUSNDS?

But no, all growth is NOT good. Check out the definition of cancer. The amateur radio bands are a "commons" that can only be maintained when the community of users can agree on a way to both exploit them, for communication, while at the same time preserving and protecting them. Efficient modes should be ENCOURAGED ACTIVELY, particularly when you are making vast efforts to increase

the total numbers of Hams. To do otherwise is surely suicide, slow or fast.

But, it doesn't matter anyway does it? As Keynes said so well: "In the long run we're all dead."

Val Germann
Columbia, Missouri

**

preserving and protecting them.

1359. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 16:06:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8F7901.33F5A5C7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37404

KC8PMX wrote:
>
> Is it ADD or is it just that some people can think of multiple things at the
> same time? Kinda like "multitasking" in a different form?

I can multitask certain things but CW takes my undivided attention.
On a related note, I cannot write on a chalk board and talk at
the same time. Apparently, writing takes my undivided attention.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1360. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 16:12:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8F7A5A.699B77D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37405

Dick Carroll wrote:
> The point has always
> been that some code testing is necessary if any substantial numbers of hams are to
> become qualified as CW operators. Without any test whatever, so few will ever do so
> that CW as a mode is gone in the period of a generation or so. That is the future,
> based on past history.

Wrong! During the only time in history that a code exam was not required,
amateur radio use of Morse code exploded. Besides that time, there is no
history of amateur radio without a code test requirment.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1361. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 16:19:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8F7C29.A11F5DFB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37406

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3C8EE19F.A8AAF1CA@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> All depends on the conditions. How many dB advantage would you say CW
> >> has over SSB, given decent equipment for each mode?
> >>
> >Around 10dB depending on CW speed.
>
> Which is the difference between 0 dB S/N and clear copy.

There is no doubt that CW has an advantage over SSB. But the atmosphere
has magnitudes more effect than that advantage. If the atmospheric
propagation is failing at 2dB per minute, one has about five minutes
of time (plus or minus) when CW gets through and SSB doesn't.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1362. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 16:21:24 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <b725b7595a2a343dee6a6be087b54824.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 37407

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3C73EEF2.EF8EC50@psu.edu...

> I've heard a lot about how the new ARS tests have been "dumbed down".
>
> Does anyone have any copies of the tests that prospective amateurs took
> before this happened? I think some comparison would be a great help.
>

I have my original ARRL license manual from 1955. The questions are
similar in difficulty to the questions on todays examinations, but
narrower in scope because the technology of the day was much less
advanced.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"Reality doesn't care what you believe."

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

1363. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 16:23:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8F7D0D.4DD44FD2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37408

N2EY wrote:
> "Decent equipment" will do at least a 250 Hz CW bandwidth, Ed.

That's where my 10 dB estimate came from.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1364. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 16:28:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8F7E3C.D8F29B8E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37409

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Refuse to help others and you shouldn't be too surprised to find others not
> to anxious to help you.

You would ask my 89 year old father if he knows CPR and then refuse to
perform the needed CPR on him when you found out he didn't know it.
That's why I said, "Nice guy".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1365. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 16:32:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8F7F22.EA87361@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37410

N2EY wrote:
> If you refine skunk juice enough, you can probably end up with plain water,
> which is a useful highly refined component. Does this mean that skunk juice
> is water? Nope.

If you refine it enough, you end up with quarks.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1366. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 16:35:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8F7FCE.9F733E15@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37411

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Cecil wants us to forget that the communications channel in the case
> presented was fixed at a certain bandwidth. Under that set of conditions,
> CW was the working mode and PSK31 was not.

You are so extremely wrong, Dick. The communications channel was fixed
at 31 Hz by the PSK31 software. You certainly cannot read CW in a 31 Hz
communications channel. You are making a fool of yourself by comparing
apples and oranges.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1367. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 16:36:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8F8020.D7791ED3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37412

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Why would a digital engineer know what AGC is, Dick?
>
> The person quoted is both an EE and an Extra, Cecil.

I know Extras who can't find the bathroom.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1368. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 16:42:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8F8167.12B9296C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37413

N2EY wrote:
> Q2: Describe the purpose, construction, operation and testing of a typical
> single impedance bond.

The General exam of the 50's, that I took, was multiple choice except for
drawing schematics. Did the Extra exam of the 50's contain essay questions?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1369. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 16:43:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8F81C2.BEF8113D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37414

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > Before April 15, 2000, going from General to Extra required taking two written
> > > tests, one of 50 questions (for the Advanced) and one of 40 questions (for the
> > > Extra). After that date, only a single 50 question test, based on the combined
> > > Q&A pools, was required.
> > >
> > > You be the judge.
> >
> > A random 50 question exam covering the identical Q&A as two random 50/40
> > question exams will average out to be the same difficulty.
>
> Yep,with all the questions and answers in hand well in advance, it's a matter of
> annoyance, not difficulty.

We notice that you have not annoyed yourself and learned that trivial set
of 1000 Russian words.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1370. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 16:46:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8F8279.3A2ED110@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37415

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > > All well and good, but what will you do when new hams *have no* CW skills?
> >
> > Tell them why the mode has value and why code is worth learning.
> >
> > When new hams have no CW skills, will you keep telling them that it is not
> > worth learning because there is no test?
>
> Maybe you can persuade the touchy-feely New Agers with that spiel, but I
> seriously doubt it.

Dick, you have told newcomers that they will not learn Morse code
without a test. After the test goes away, you must persuade them
not to learn Morse code or you will be proven wrong.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1371. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 16:48:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8F82D0.12F763C6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37416

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
> >W1RFI trolled, in reference to one of my more
> >scintillating UseNet posts:
>
> >>Do you think that your post is a valuable, relevant, clear,
> >>concise post that one should expect of UseNet's finest?
>
> >Two lines. Troll rating: 1 out of 10. Got to step it up.
>
> I take that as a "no." If all you can do is to call my post a "troll," I will
> assume correctly that you had nothing substantive to offer.
>
> Cec', you may be right after all. :-)

Ask yourself, would a man of Val's alleged statue call a near stranger
a "Bozo"? I seriously doubt it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1372. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 16:50:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8F8357.9B16E637@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37417

KC8PMX wrote:
> Yep Cecil.... you described the Good Ole USA pretty good there!

Naaaaah Ryan, in the USA we have 350 pound people standing in line
to buy gallons of ice cream with food stamps.

> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > Most of the third world hams I know about are of the rich elite class.
> > The average citizens are worrying about where their next meal is coming
> from.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1373. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 16:52:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8F83D9.A90FA8FC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37418

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
> >What kind of a LAME board IS this, anyway?
>
> Now, THAT has the classic signs of being a troll -- a gratuitous insult
> intended to stir up a reaction.

Remind you of anyone we know?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1374. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 17:47:23 UTC
From: N2EY@aol.com
Message-ID: <975b4ea9.0203130947.38361a9d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 37419

I just came across this..

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20020303022758.03606.00001648@mb-df.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> >From: "Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
> >Date: 3/3/2002 12:29 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3c81c4e6_1@newsa.ev1.net>
>
> >Quite frankly? I don't think there's really any way to avoid things such as
> >terrorist attacks. I really don't.

There is no way to guarantee prevention of all possible attacks. There is also
no way to make a ship that cannot sink. But there are ways to minimize the
danger and the loss of life and property to such disasters.

> > I also don't think you'll find many of
> >the proportion of the WTC.

If not, the ONLY reason will be because all practical measures have been taken
to prevent them. Measures taken by our government, our military, our
intelligence agencies, and our allies. And by ourselves.
>
> Now THIS scares me...it's defeatism.

Possibly, Steve. It could also be laziness, as in "I don't want to make
any effort or give anything up".

> >I truly, truly don't want to sound flippant here
> >but, for the sake of debate, didn't Osama bin Laden himself say that the
> >magnitude of destruction was more than they had realized would happen?

Sure. And didn't he and his buddies REJOICE at the destruction and loss of
life? Didn't they threaten to do more?
>
> And just because he didn't expect it to be that big means it's OK?
>
> >Terrorism is a way of life...like life in the big city.
>
> Then it's OK, huh?
>
> Got a 13 year old daughter I can molest? Isn't molestation a way of life
> for some? Must be, if we accept your logic. Drugs...Let's pass 'em out at the
> lunch counter at school with hotdogs and cokes (ooops! Freudian slip!)
>
> No...terrorism is NOT a way of life. It's an interruption of life.

Yup. Its prevention must become our way of life.
>
> >All we end up doing
> >by striking out to erradicate it, is probably putting ourselves into more of
> >a box. I don't particularly care to give in like that.

Then what should be done, Kim? Just sit back and wait for the next one? That's what permitted the bad guys to get enough resources in place.
>
> The Jews tried that...it was called apeasement. It didn't work for them,
> either.

I think you mean the Allied governments like Britain and France, who did not hold Germany to the letter of the Versailles treaty.
>
> >Truly? I'd rather ask those thousands of people.

Who? Millions of Jews and millions of non-Jews were systematically murdered by the Nazi regime simply for being who they were.

> >Myself? I'd be willing
> >to put my life on the line to allow more liberty, freedom, whatever we want
> >to call it. To do otherwise, in my opinion, is to let "them" win.

How, exactly, would you be willing to "put your life on the line", Kim? Are you going to enlist? Fly on airliners with no security measures? Refuse to pay taxes that support increased security measures?
>
> Then you can't have it both ways. We either decide that our way of life
> is righteous and worthy of defense, or we surrender. It's that simple.

And defense takes all kinds of forms. For example, this country is way too dependent on imported oil. What can be done to reduce and eliminate that dependence?
>
> >What if you and I "joke around" about something that raises suspicion? Next
> >thing you know, we're arrested, or at least detained, for questioning.
>
> I don't say "bomb" on an airliner and I don't stick my finger in my pocket
> at the 7-11 and say "give me the money. Ergo I have nothing to fear of the
> feds.

Exactly, Steve. Every freedom carries with it a responsibility. Free speech does not mean the right to yell "Fire" in a crowded theater when there is no fire, and you are just "joking around".

It used to be "funny" to "joke around" about people's race, religion, ancestry, and stuff like that. We have learned those things are not to be joked about. Same basic principle applies.
>
> >Next
> >thing you know, it's you and I that have to spend the bucks on attorneys to
> >get us out of perfectly innocent talk, letter writing, phone conversation,
> >emailing, chat room, take-your-pick.

>
> It's ben going on since J.Edgar's day. Other than the technology being
> different, what do you think is diffrent now?

What it really amounts to is being responsible for our actions. What a concept.
>
> >I don't think we have enough oversight any more. And, I think we'll have
> >less and less as time goes on. I may be wrong. I hope I am.
>
> Oversight is fine. But not when it lays our intelligence agencies and
> Armed Forces open to such public scrutiny that they can't function.
>
> Our "opponents" and even some of our Allies think it's really funny that we
> actually make a big deal about security, then lay that information out for all
> to see as if "the bad guys" are going to respect our privacy and not peek.
>
> Time to take off the gloves. I am sorry that some innocent people may
> come out of this with a bloody nose, but they will be able to bitch about it.

You got it, Steve.

One more point:

Most of us will never know how many attacks have been thwarted by the
vigilance of our security people. Indeed, the security folks themselves
may never know how many lives they saved by their actions to counter
terrorist activity.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1375. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 17:54:55 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <PnMj8.9344$Ex5.884663@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37433

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Clues? You're a complete and dismal failure as a "detective", Sir
> > Cecil.
>
> As a detective, I made a good engineer.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

It's a dark night in the city. But in a small office
up on the 12th floor of the Acme Building, one man
still ponders the vagaries of human nature.....

Cecil Noir, Private Eye.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1376. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 17:57:24 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <8qMj8.9347$Ex5.884793@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37431

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Clues? You're a complete and dismal failure as a "detective", Sir
> > Cecil.
>
> As a detective, I made a good engineer.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

It's a dark night in the city. But in a small office
up on the 12th floor of the Acme Building, one man
still ponders the vagaries of human nature.....

Cecil Noir, Private Eye.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1377. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 17:58:08 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <QqMj8.9351$Ex5.885093@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37432

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Clues? You're a complete and dismal failure as a "detective", Sir
> > Cecil.
>
> As a detective, I made a good engineer.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

It's a dark night in the city. But in a small office
up on the 12th floor of the Acme Building, one man
still ponders the vagaries of human nature.....

Cecil Noir, Private Eye.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1378. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 17:59:05 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <JrMj8.9352$Ex5.885167@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37430

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Clues? You're a complete and dismal failure as a "detective", Sir
> > Cecil.
>
> As a detective, I made a good engineer.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

It's a dark night in the city. But in a small office
up on the 12th floor of the Acme Building, one man
still ponders the vagaries of human nature.....

Cecil Noir, Private Eye.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1379. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 17:59:49 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <psMj8.9353$Ex5.884715@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37435

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Clues? You're a complete and dismal failure as a "detective", Sir
> > Cecil.
>
> As a detective, I made a good engineer.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

It's a dark night in the city. But in a small office
up on the 12th floor of the Acme Building, one man
still ponders the vagaries of human nature.....

Cecil Noir, Private Eye.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1380. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 18:01:10 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <GtMj8.9356$Ex5.885121@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37434

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Clues? You're a complete and dismal failure as a "detective", Sir
> > Cecil.
>
> As a detective, I made a good engineer.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

It's a dark night in the city. But in a small office
up on the 12th floor of the Acme Building, one man
still ponders the vagaries of human nature.....

Cecil Noir, Private Eye.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1381. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 18:14:59 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <DGMj8.9389$Ex5.886597@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37436

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Clues? You're a complete and dismal failure as a "detective", Sir
> > Cecil.
>
> As a detective, I made a good engineer.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

It's a dark night in the city. But in a small office
up on the 12th floor of the Acme Building, one man
still ponders the vagaries of human nature.....

Cecil Noir, Private Eye.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1382. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 18:18:09 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <BJMj8.9397$Ex5.887020@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37437

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Clues? You're a complete and dismal failure as a "detective", Sir
> > Cecil.
>
> As a detective, I made a good engineer.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

It's a dark night in the city. But in a small office
up on the 12th floor of the Acme Building, one man
still ponders the vagaries of human nature.....

Cecil Noir, Private Eye.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1383. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 18:26:50 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6o6jjctp1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37421

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C88C445.10E80A9F@worldnet.att.net...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > >> What is your estimate of the percentage of hams that could pass
> > >>emergency CW traffic under circumstances where conditions
> > >>were bad enough that SSB could not
> > >> be copied?
> >
> > >I see no reason to guess, do you? Why not just keep a learning level
test so
> > >that there will always be a modicum of CW skill within the ARS? I know,
that's
> > >asking far too much.
> >
> > I think that "guessing" is an important step to determining if Amateur
Radio
> > testing is meeting its present goals.
> >
> > All hams today were tested under a system that has a requirement to
demonstrate
> > a modicum of CW skill for some classes of operators. What percentage of
those
> > hams do you think could handle emergency traffic on CW under conditions
where
> > SSB could not be copied? If the percentage is high, you have made your
point.
> > If the percentage is low, the point is lost.
> >
>
> YOU lost the point, or more likely deliberately dumped it. The point has
always
> been that some code testing is necessary if any substantial numbers of
hams are to
> become qualified as CW operators.

DICK...you lose because your statement is nothing but wild
speculation. Additionally you still fail to provide anyone with what
YOU consider "substantial" to be. Is it some percentage of
licensed hams? Some percentage of active hams? Some
finite number (i.e. at least 50,ooo US hams, N number of
worldwide hams?)

> Without any test whatever, so few will ever do so
> that CW as a mode is gone in the period of a generation or so.

Just like there are no longer any archery enthusiasts,
just like there are no more drivers of manual gearbox
vehicles, just like there are no more (insert any
number of activities that survive based solely on
volunteers to keep the interests alive).

> That is the future,
> based on past history.

What past history? How about some examples to give you
claim at least a semblence of credibility?

> Ignore it as you wish, but no whitewash will alter it.

No whitewash is needed. Your "fear" is akin to crying
wolf when there is none.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

>
>
>
>

1384. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 18:31:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8F9AE9.C2BF7F10@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37420

Valentine Germann wrote:
> Ham Radio is almost unique in that a government agency
> is involved in its regulation AND a series of qualifying tests
> is required. The only other avocation that is in this class
> would be, I believe, sport flying.

Don't forget SCUBA diving. One must be certified in order
to get one's tank filled. There are probably other examples.

> There is no liberty without rules and freedom is meaningless
> without a legal framework that is agreed upon and enforced.

Some rules guarantee liberty, some rules destroy liberty.
A rational human being should be able to recognize the
difference.

> But no, all growth is NOT good.

The lack of widespread public interest and the entrance exams
have historically been pretty effective in defining the ham
population. IMO, the major problem facing the ARS in the
future will be in finding recruits, not in being overwhelmed
by masses of the unwashed. Not everyone likes to talk to
strangers.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1385. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 18:35:18 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <GZMj8.9423$Ex5.888149@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37439

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Clues? You're a complete and dismal failure as a "detective", Sir
> > Cecil.
>
> As a detective, I made a good engineer.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

It's a dark night in the city. But in a small office
up on the 12th floor of the Acme Building, one man
still ponders the vagaries of human nature.....

Cecil Noir, Private Eye.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1386. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 18:41:01 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6o6jlctp2@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37422

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0203130720.7acc73b1@posting.google.com...
> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020313062108.07180.00001297@mb-cr.aol.com>...
> > From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >
> > >All depends on the conditions. How many dB advantage would you say CW
> > >has over SSB, given decent equipment for each mode?
> >
> > Depends on a few factors, Jim. The first is bandwidth. The necessary
bandwidth
> > for slow CW is about 25 Hz. That would give a 20 dB advantage over 2500
Hz.
> > But not many hams have 25 Hz filtering in their rigs. Let's take 500
Hz. That
> > will give 10log(2500/500) dB advantage over SSB, or 7 dB.
>
> "Decent equipment" will do at least a 250 Hz CW bandwidth, Ed.

But I thought we had to rely on the fundamental
one transistor transmitter and the xtal set rcvr because
we couldn't trust all the planning that would include
decent quality equipment?
:-) :-) :-) :-)

> > If the CW station is
> > being received on equipment normally used for SSB, it may have a 2500 Hz
> > bandwidth, giving it 0 dB advantage.
>
> The boundary conditions were "decent equipment for each mode". Considering
> the filtering available in even inexpensive QRP CW rigs (Elecraft K1, for
> example), there's no reason to suffer with SSB selectivity on CW.

Availability of narrower (narrower than SSB) filtering
is usually an extra cost option.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1387. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 18:46:27 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <78Nj8.9445$Ex5.888635@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37438

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Clues? You're a complete and dismal failure as a "detective", Sir
> > Cecil.
>
> As a detective, I made a good engineer.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

It's a dark night in the city. But in a small office
up on the 12th floor of the Acme Building, one man
still ponders the vagaries of human nature.....

Cecil Noir, Private Eye.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1388. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 18:51:07 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6o785$a5g$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37423

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C88C820.A692FD2B@worldnet.att.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > >
> > > Read it again, Bill. This time concentrate and try to comprehend.
> > >
> > > What I said was "Those who REFUSE to learn CPR deserve to be
overlooked
> > > just as hams who refuse to learn Morse code deserve (the same)".
> >
> > Think it again... Those that refuse to learn CPR include just
> > about every adult who is capable but hasn't done
> > so. That IS hundreds of millions of people. CPR classes are
> > offered in hundreds of venues: Red Cross, Adult Ed programs,
> > eompany education, etc.
>
> So, in your view every adult who has not undergone training in CPR has
> "refused" it.

Isn't it YOUR (Dick) opinion that hams that don't learn morse
code have so refused to learn it?

> That's very novel, and a window to your thought process.
> A great many adults have not been afforded the opportunity to have that
> training, and you state that places them in the "refused" column because
the
> training is available in many venues. Wrong.

I would venture to say that just about any adult that "wanted to"
could get CPR training somewhere...often at no $$$ cost to themselves.

> The cagtegory of persons who have
> been offered the opportunity to take the training and rejected the
opportunity
> are those who have refused it. One has to have a choice to refuse.

The "choice" comes to just about every household that gets their
local adult education class offering catalog. Most are sent
to "RESIDENT" via bulk mailings.

> No opportunity offered, no refusal. It's really not that complex, Bill.

And I will state again that even using your "opportunity offered"
criteria, the vast majority of adults have, in fact,
had that offer. You're right, it isn't that complex.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1389. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 18:57:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6o7tn$kr7$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37424

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C88CA7C.B14A53D8@worldnet.att.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C88253E.C37E1DF7@worldnet.att.net...
> > > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > > Yes, but in PRACTICE..... the CW ID on a PSK31 signal makes it
> > through under conditions
> > > > > where the the phase shift keying cannot.
> > > >
> > > > At what power level? In what bandwidth? You are comparing apples
> > > > and oranges. PSK31 operates lots closer to Shannon's limit than
> > > > CW does.
> > >
> > > Theory does not equal practice. You theorize. I'll practice.
> >
> > If your practice disproves Shannon's limits I'm sure that
> > would be news to the entire communications, data, and
> > telecommunications industries as well as the science
> > departments of most univercities.
>
> So you're having comprehension problems too, still. No one said that
> anything "disproves" anything that Shannon did. What was said is that
> theory and practice don't always coincide and the example given was an
> instance of that very concept- where the more efficient mode fails under
> conditions in which the lesser efficient works. To insist on placing
> restraints on the working mode just to "level the playing field" for
> scientific comparison is not only poor practice, it is poor engineering.
> Engineering should have a useful point, and such a plan is not useful in
> the least.
> Cecil wants us to forget that the communications channel in the case
> presented was fixed at a certain bandwidth. Under that set of conditions,
> CW was the working mode and PSK31 was not.
> Shannon stated what was the maximum efficiency possible, not what one
> finds in everyday practice.

Today we come pretty darn close.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1390. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 19:00:38 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <qlNj8.9460$Ex5.890621@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37440

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Clues? You're a complete and dismal failure as a "detective", Sir
> > Cecil.
>
> As a detective, I made a good engineer.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

It's a dark night in the city. But in a small office
up on the 12th floor of the Acme Building, one man
still ponders the vagaries of human nature.....

Cecil Noir, Private Eye.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1391. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 19:11:53 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <ZvNj8.9476$Ex5.891827@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37441

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Clues? You're a complete and dismal failure as a "detective", Sir
> > Cecil.
>
> As a detective, I made a good engineer.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

It's a dark night in the city. But in a small office
up on the 12th floor of the Acme Building, one man
still ponders the vagaries of human nature.....

Cecil Noir, Private Eye.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1392. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 19:13:47 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6o8pqobm1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37425

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C8F9AE9.C2BF7F10@IEEE.org...
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > Ham Radio is almost unique in that a government agency
> > is involved in its regulation AND a series of qualifying tests
> > is required. The only other avocation that is in this class
> > would be, I believe, sport flying.
>
> Don't forget SCUBA diving. One must be certified in order
> to get one's tank filled. There are probably other examples.

Driving is also regulated...license IS required.

> > There is no liberty without rules and freedom is meaningless
> > without a legal framework that is agreed upon and enforced.
>
> Some rules guarantee liberty, some rules destroy liberty.
> A rational human being should be able to recognize the
> difference.
>
> > But no, all growth is NOT good.
>
> The lack of widespread public interest and the entrance exams
> have historically been pretty effective in defining the ham
> population. IMO, the major problem facing the ARS in the
> future will be in finding recruits, not in being overwhelmed
> by masses of the unwashed. Not everyone likes to talk to
> strangers.

I agree with Cecil on that point.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1393. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 19:28:51 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6o9iaplb1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37426

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u8urhdn0mvng0a@corp.supernews.com...
SNIP of history lesson.

>Today all of
> this has changed and anyone, ANYONE, can get into the
> tent and, in the words of one poster here, start "pissing."
>
> That is, it used to be expensive, one way or another, to
> even START to be a Ham. Thirty years ago the entry level
> cost, in 2002 dollars, was rather high, either in time or
> money.

Time: No more than today to memorize the General
stuff to pass as a teenager...and that was in 1958.

Money? My first rig cost about $100, all of which I
earned doing summer jobs.

> And you had to go take a GOVERNMENT TEST,

Still do.

> administered by a GOVERNMENT employee,

Not for all tests...novice never required that, neither
did Tech.

> at a real live GOVERNMENT FACILITY.

Not for the exceptions noted above. Also there were
other exceptions based on distances, etc.

> You REALLY got the idea
> that Ham Radio was SOMETHING!

In those days, compared to what other concumer/public
electrical/electronic wonders were about, ham radio was
indeed quite remarkable.

> Last week, a friend of
> mine "got into Ham Radio" (in about ten minutes at the
> counter) for the princely sum of $119.95, at Radio Shack.

So? Would you rather he had to spend hundreds more?

> And the test he had to take, and which I will take in just
> a few days, was administered locally and was pretty easy,
> particularly since the Q's and A's were, er, KNOWN!

The tech was locally adminsitered also back in 1950s.
The Q&A was only 16 pages of an ARRL license manual.

> How is this possible

What should be changed?

> and what does it mean for the future
> of amateur radio?

I await the response.

> Well, in ye olden days there weren't any repeaters, and
> those devices, invented and installed by the WWII gen-
> eration of Hams, out of a desire for effective mobile com-
> munications, took the responsibilty for big power and
> an expensive antenna away from the mobile operator
> and shifted it to the club.

Repeaters don't require big power or expensive antennas.

> This, combined with imported
> solid-state gear that is mass-marketed, has served to
> drop the entry dollar-cost all the way down to what
> amounts to coffee money.

And is that a problem in your view?

> That, combined with a vast
> decrease in the amount of regulatory trouble it takes to
> get a Ham Ticket, has REALLY changed everything.

It has? How? On what do you base your
conclusion?

> On the one hand, what can be "wrong" with all of this?

You haven't shown anything at all to base being right
or wrong about anything.

> Isn't more ALWAYS better? Such is the American way,
> I guess. If one million cars are good, 200 million cars
> have to be 200 million times BETTER, unless they're
> all trying to park at once, OR are mainly burning
> petroleum we have to import from the volatile Middle
> East. But I digress.

You surely do.

> Surely, surely, making it possible
> for the maximum number of prospective candidates to
> actually get a Ham license HAS to be good? After all,
> growth is ALWAYS good, isn't it? And to remain static
> or, horror of horrors, to DECINE in numbers, well, that
> is surely DEATH, am I right, even when the base is in
> the HUNDREDS of THOUSNDS?

Yawn!

> But no, all growth is NOT good. Check out the definition
> of cancer.

Wowsers! We are really into fantasy land. Amateur
growth might be considered akin to a cancer.

> The amateur radio bands are a "commons"
> that can only be maintained when the community of users
> can agree on a way to both exploit them, for communication,
> while at the same time preserving and protecting them.

And do you think that isn't happening?

> Efficient modes should be ENCOURAGED ACTIVELY,
> particularly when you are making vast efforts to increase
> the total numbers of Hams. To do otherwise is surely
> suicide, slow or fast.

What do you think led to SSB?

> But, it doesn't matter anyway does it?

Well, either you think it does or it doesn't.

> As Keynes said
> so well: "In the long run we're all dead."

True.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1394. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 19:29:39 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <DMNj8.9494$Ex5.892678@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37442

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Clues? You're a complete and dismal failure as a "detective", Sir
> > Cecil.
>
> As a detective, I made a good engineer.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

It's a dark night in the city. But in a small office
up on the 12th floor of the Acme Building, one man
still ponders the vagaries of human nature.....

Cecil Noir, Private Eye.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1395. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 20:03:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8FB07C.301586CC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37427

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote:
> > (test) administered by a GOVERNMENT employee,
>
> Not for all tests...novice never required that, neither
> did Tech.

If I remember correctly, when the Novice license was brand new, one had to live 150 miles from the nearest FCC testing office for it to be taken by mail. I took my Novice exam at the FCC office in Houston in 1951. Sometime later, they changed the mileage requirement to 75 miles and by 1957, the Novice license could only be taken by mail. I don't know the exact date of the changeover.

> > Last week, a friend of
> > mine "got into Ham Radio" (in about ten minutes at the
> > counter) for the princely sum of $119.95, at Radio Shack.
>
> So? Would you rather he had to spend hundreds more?

Wonder if a $1000 fee for a ham license would satisfy Val?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1396. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 20:34:38 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <yJOj8.7284$tP2.656973@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37429

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Clues? You're a complete and dismal failure as a "detective", Sir
> > Cecil.
>
> As a detective, I made a good engineer.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

It's a dark night in the city. But in a small office
up on the 12th floor of the Acme Building, one man
still ponders the vagaries of human nature.....

Cecil Noir, Private Eye.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1397. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 20:41:04 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8vda3sin3mu7e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37428

CAM wrote

> IMO, the major problem facing the ARS in the
>future will be in finding recruits, not in being
>overwhelmed by masses of the unwashed.

There have been hundreds of thousands of U.S. Hams for a very long time, even under the old regime. Concerns about its extinction seem bizarre, considering the size of the U.S. and the general level of education and interest in technical things here. Maintaining high standards would have many long-run benefits even if the total number of licensed operators declined.

Val

1398. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 20:53:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313155353.09600.00000220@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 37445

In article <20020312073250.14946.00000144@mb-fy.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <a6k3ptbbr1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
><billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
>>> Why do you think that regulation was formed in the first place?
>>
>>Maybe Jim N2EY has a historical answer for us.
>
>The regulation about "codes and ciphers" is meant to forbid
>any form of encryption that hides the true meaning of a message.
>Look at the entire rule and its meaning should be clear.

What is the specific regulation identifier in Part 97, Title 47 CFR?

>Note that the rule actually forbids concealing the meaning of radio
>messages transmitted by amateurs, by any means, not just encryption.
>For example, the message "Should everyone leave long envelopes? Not
>required or necessary." looks innocent enough until you look at just the
>first letter of each word.

"SELLENRON" looked perfectly innocent a year ago. :-)

Tsk, tsk, amateur steganogrphy and bad crypto procedure by not
including any null characters. Try the "should everyone leave
letters? Envelopes not required or necessary." The question mark
can be used as a null. That avoids confusion with the name of
Ronald Sellen versus a corporate name.

>These regulations originated early in the history of radio, and were driven by
>experiences with the hiding secret messages in telegrams, and the covert use
>of radio such as the Telefunken station in the USA during the early part of
>WW1.

Were they? "Covert use of radio during world war ONE?!?" Was
Telefunken using transistoried radios on UHF to "hide" all those
tall radio antennas in 1916?!? :-)

The use of "codes and ciphers" was well-established in landline
manual telegraphy for nearly a half-century before radio became
a communications medium of any sort. World-wide. Code books
were openly published and sold prior to 1900. "Bentley's
Commercial Codes" was one of the more popular of such books,
having many editions.

>Does any of this stop the bad guys from encrypting stuff and hiding messages?
>Probably not, but it gives the govt. something to prosecute with.

Reset the "wayback machine." Try 1957 and KGB Colonel Rudolph
Abel, supposed artist with a "hobby of ham radio." :-)

>The FCC does monitor hams to some extent, and is required by law to be able
>to monitor any amateur transmission.

Oh? It usurps duties of the NSA? "Monitor?" Is that part of
"regulation?"

Must be...the FCC still requires a complete record of all non-standard
mode transmissions by radio amateurs.

>73 de Jim "not an expert" N2EY

Oh? "Not an expert?!?" Is this a new change of heart or what? :-)

1399. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 20:53:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313155354.09600.00000221@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 37444

In article <3C8EE381.D2EB806F@earthlink.net>, Herr Robust <k8mn@earthlink.net>
stepped up on his feldherrnhugel and shouted:

>> The ISSUE is, and has been in THIS NEWSGROUP designed to
>> hold it, the retention or elimination of the code test for any
>> amateur radio license. Self-styled "leaders" (Heil pretends to be
>> one as well as judge-jury on radio "fun") insist on keeping the
>> code test. Others argue for the elimination of the code test,
>> entirely. The TEST, not the elimination of code use.
>
>That's AN ISSUE. Regardless of the original idea behind the formation
>of the newsgroup, the title includes the terms "radio amateur" and
>"policy". THIS NEWSGROUP seems to be about any amateur radio policy
>maters. The morse TEST is only a part of policy. I don't claim any
>leadership role here. I'm just a cast member.

"Cast?" [plaster?] "There's no business like show business..." :-)

"radio policy maters?" Is Herr Robust feeling injured about "alma maters?"
:-)

[perhaps his ample tummy had too many 'taters? :-)]

Hokay, Fearless Leader, let's look at the newsgroup content for those
postings of 13 March 2002: A forced "issue" about personal firearms,
regional permits and 'right to carry;' US Civil War tales supposedly
true about landline telegraphy jobs; a forced "issue" about licensing
which compares "sport flying" (private flying) to amateur radio; mentions
of automotive engineering and auto driving; cardio-pulmonary
resuscitation as somehow analagous to "emergency communication;"
a continuing insistence on one military service branch and a
government secretariat as a "goodness" example in communictions.
Of course there are all these "injured psyches" floating around wailing
about "wounds suffered in newsgroup wars" and that they are
"triumphant and expert" just because they say they are so and that
their own personal viewpoints MUST prevail. :-)

Hardly any cogent statements on any "policies" for anything except
that their personal preferences are "reasons" to apply to regulations
which will affect all who follow. A prime example of the self-styled
"leader" complex in any recreational activity. All must enjoy what
the "leader" enjoys whether they like it or not. The "leader" has
spoken. The "leader" can do no wrong...by his own admission. :-)

>What you've described sounds an awful lot like some of us see you,
>Anderson.

Tsk, tsk, Heil looks in a mirror and pretends it is a clear window... :-)

>Len, I don't have a great number of personal frustrations. Unlike you,
>a poseur in the world of amateur radio, I've been involved with and
>enjoying ham radio for decades.

...as a prideful, certificated, boastful self-styled "expert" by amateur tenure. No problem with that...it shines through load and clear with every chat-room round fired. :-)

1400. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 20:53:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313155355.09600.00000222@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 37443

In article <20020312200449.08722.00000972@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>Keep in mind that one is an aspiring ham, who cannot be expected to know all >the nuances.

Keep in mind that "aspiring" and "aspirating" are two different words.

>Be kind.

Impossible in this chat room. :-)

1401. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 20:56:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8FBD04.4176555D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37446

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> CAM wrote
>
> > IMO, the major problem facing the ARS in the
> >future will be in finding recruits, not in being
> >overwhelmed by masses of the unwashed.
>
> There have been hundreds of thousands of U.S.
> Hams for a very long time, even under the old
> regime. Concerns about its extinction seem
> bizarre, considering the size of the U.S. and
> the general level of education and interest in
> technical things here. Maintaining high standards
> would have many long-run benefits even if the
> total number of licensed operators declined.

Even if the total number of licensed operators declined
to one? At what point will the FCC declare that there are
too few amateur radio operators to matter?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1402. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 21:31:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C8FC52F.2989EF90@earthlink.net>
Source record: 37448

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3C8EE381.D2EB806F@earthlink.net>, Herr Robust <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> stepped up on his feldherrnhugel and shouted:
>
> >> The ISSUE is, and has been in THIS NEWSGROUP designed to
> >> hold it, the retention or elimination of the code test for any
> >> amateur radio license. Self-styled "leaders" (Heil pretends to be
> >> one as well as judge-jury on radio "fun") insist on keeping the
> >> code test. Others argue for the elimination of the code test,
> >> entirely. The TEST, not the elimination of code use.
> > >
> >That's AN ISSUE. Regardless of the original idea behind the formation
> >of the newsgroup, the title includes the terms "radio amateur" and
> >"policy". THIS NEWSGROUP seems to be about any amateur radio policy
> >maters. The morse TEST is only a part of policy. I don't claim any
> >leadership role here. I'm just a cast member.
>
> "Cast?" [plaster?] "There's no business like show business..." :-)
>
> "radio policy maters?" Is Herr Robust feeling injured about "alma maters?"
> :-)
>
> [perhaps his ample tummy had too many 'taters? :-)]

We eat lots of 'maters hereabouts--cut 'em with a 'mater knife.

> Hokay, Fearless Leader, let's look at the newsgroup content for those
> postings of 13 March 2002: A forced "issue" about personal firearms,
> regional permits and 'right to carry;' US Civil War tales supposedly
> true about landline telegraphy jobs; a forced "issue" about licensing
> which compares "sport flying" (private flying) to amateur radio; mentions
> of automotive engineering and auto driving; cardio-pulmonary
> resuscitation as somehow analagous to "emergency communication;"
> a continuing insistence on one military service branch and a
> government secretariat as a "goodness" example in communictions.
> Of course there are all these "injured psyches" floating around wailing
> about "wounds suffered in newsgroup wars" and that they are
> "triumphant and expert" just because they say they are so and that
> their own personal viewpoints MUST prevail. :-)

> Hardly any cogent statements on any "policies" for anything except
> that their personal preferences are "reasons" to apply to regulations
> which will affect all who follow. A prime example of the self-styled
> "leader" complex in any recreational activity. All must enjoy what

> the "leader" enjoys whether they like it or not. The "leader" has
> spoken. The "leader" can do no wrong...by his own admission. :-)

What you've managed to state in a couple of rather typically long and windy paragraphs is that not everything (including the post to which I now reply) is on topic. Take it up with the newsgroup police.

> >What you've described sounds an awful lot like some of us see you,
> >Anderson.
>
> Tsk, tsk, Heil looks in a mirror and pretends it is a clear window... :-)

Smiley discounted. I've already said as much to you, Anderson.

> >Len, I don't have a great number of personal frustrations. Unlike you,
> >a poseur in the world of amateur radio, I've been involved with and
> >enjoying ham radio for decades.
>
> ...as a prideful, certificated, boastful self-styled "expert" by amateur
> tenure. No problem with that...it shines through load and clear with
> every chat-room round fired. :-)

Those adjectives are terms used by you to deaden the apparent pain you suffer at being no more than a sidewalk superintendent to amateur radio. That's the case no matter how much baloney you slice. You can put ten antennas on your car. You can own a CB transceiver and several scanners. You can place an ARRL decal in your front window. You're still not a radio amateur. Does that come through "load" and clear? "Load" them 'maters on the truck, will you?

This isn't a chat room. I only point it out in case you've been damning your ISP for slow access during your "chats".

Dave K8MN

1403. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 21:31:21 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8vg8al65goib0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37447

Bill Sohl wrote:

>Time: No more than today to memorize the General
>stuff to pass as a teenager...and that was in 1958.

Perhaps. But there is wide disagreement.

>Money? My first rig cost about $100, all of which I
>earned doing summer jobs.

And in 2002 dollars how much was that? If you do
the implicit price deflator on that . . . ouch.

>Not for all tests...novice never required that, neither
>did Tech.

Correct. My apologies. I should have qualified that.

>Not for the exceptions noted above. Also there were
>other exceptions based on distances, etc.

Correct. I should have qualified those.

>In those days, compared to what other concumer/public
>electrical/electronic wonders were about, ham radio was
>indeed quite remarkable.

This is a subject for investigation right here. Grade
schools had a "Ham Presence" even in my small town
way back when. Not so today. What has happened?
That is, amateur radio is "no big thing" today and in
many respects seems satisifed with that. Very strange.

>So? Would you rather he had to spend hundreds more?
[for an introductory radio].

It's a lot more than that, isn't it? The whole process
hugely different, not as significant. What is too easily
attained lacks proper appreciation; what is cheap,
in both time and money, lacks value.

>The tech was locally adminsitered also back in 1950s.
>The Q&A was only 16 pages of an ARRL license manual.

True . . . but you didn't have the answer book.

>What should be changed?

Is Ham Radio important or isn't it? In my view, it is, and
it's important enough for serious attention from the FCC,
not the half-hearted effort we see now. As someone
who is returning to amateur radio, who was a "hanger-on"
in the long ago, I have been shocked to see what I feel
is a serious drop in status for Ham Radio, regardless of
the numbers, as well as serious internal divisions that
are at best ugly and at worst threatening to everyone.
I have been astonished by what I have been told directly
by technicans in the area here, people "inside the tent."
The whole "ethos" of amateur radio, as I understand it,
is simply non existant in these folks. It's scary, to me.
Whatever it is that brought THIS change on is, for me,
part of the problem, not the long-run solution.

>I await the response [as to what the recent changes
mean for amateur radio].

More and more folks like the above. Continued divisions,
growing over time. Continued loss of status. More and
more problems of various kinds (arguments over band
plans, fights over modes) leading to loss of "air space"
as the regulatory dinosaur clumsily "adjusts" things. In
short, a self-perpetuating downward spiral.

>Repeaters don't require big power or expensive antennas.

Sorry to have been unclear. This is part of the "entry-level"
argument. The H/T really IS all you need.

>And is that [flood of low-priced radios] a problem in your view?

It is when combined with the other factors.

>It [regulatory changes] has? How? On what do you base your
>conclusion?

See above.

>You haven't shown anything at all to base being right
>or wrong about anything.

C'est la vie, isn't it!

>Wowsers! We are really into fantasy land. Amateur
>growth might be considered akin to a cancer.

I put that in EXPRESSLY to generate this response.
Yes, it was a form of trolling!

>And do you think that [protection of "air space"] isn't
>happening?

In the largest sense, NO! It's every man for himself, in
some circles, and devil take the hindmost. It's a very
good thing that no commercial interest has any REAL

designs on Ham Frequencies. Divide and conquer tactics could work miracles for them now.

[concerning efficient modes being ACTIVELY ENCOURAGED]

> What do you think led to SSB?

Off the point. You know what I mean here.

Val

1404. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 22:25:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C88D049.D163E2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37449

>
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > One of the many wonderful aspects of CW traffic handling "done right"
> > > is the
> > > extremely high efficiency and economy of words used. Not a dit wasted.
> > >
> > > You oughta try it sometime, Cecil.

Not that long ago most all routine CW conversations included much of this economy of verbiage. Today it's not so common at all, seems everyone thinks it all needs to be spelled out.

"ge om ur 579 hr in stlouis mo stlouis mo rig is 100 w to a dipole ant es name hr is dick dick bt hw cpi?"

wouldn't make much sense to most new CW ops, it seems.

1405. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 22:25:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C88D103.959B26C2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37450

KC8PMX wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C881946.13FA0F07@worldnet.att.net...
> > W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > > I have been part of some of the
> >
> > > discussions on the QRP lists about why we need to work with the new hams
> who
> > > would like to improve their CW skills.
> >
> > All well and good, but what will you do when new hams *have no* CW
> skills?
>
> And what have you personally done in attempt to "turn those tables around?"
>
> Ryan KC8PMX

For one thing, been subject to lots of abuse from the code haters for my opinions, which were formed from lots of experience.

1406. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 23:03:46 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <mVQj8.13129$P4.1113615@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 37301

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

> Try to stay with the "important" RFI work and stop the ARRL
> apolgistic propaganda here.

Since Ed participates here in his personal time, there is no requirement that his participation on rrap be related in any way to his RFI work, and he is free to express his personal views of ARRL issues without any implication that those views bear any resemblance to the 'official' ARRL position on any matter whatsoever.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1407. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 23:09:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313180940.04915.00000165@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 37302

In article <qlNj8.9460$Ex5.890621@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> writes:

>It's a dark night in the city. But in a small office
>up on the 12th floor of the Acme Building, one man
>still ponders the vagaries of human nature.....

...stroking his chin reflectively, he leaned against the xerox machine again and again and again, lost in thought...

1408. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 23:17:02 UTC
From: N2EY@aol.com
Message-ID: <975b4ea9.0203131517.3bc764e6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 37303

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote :

(W1RFI wrote):
> > > If the CW station is
> > > being received on equipment normally used for SSB, it may have a 2500 Hz
> > > bandwidth, giving it 0 dB advantage.
> >
(N2EY wrote):
> > The boundary conditions were "decent equipment for each mode". Considering
> > the filtering available in even inexpensive QRP CW rigs (Elecraft K1, for
> > example), there's no reason to suffer with SSB selectivity on CW.
>
> Availability of narrower (narrower than SSB) filtering
> is usually an extra cost option.

Only in some equipment made primarily for SSB. There are lots of low-cost CW rigs on the market today that have good CW filtering built-in as standard.

My Southgate Type 7 transceiver uses cascaded 8-pole filters. One is between the mixer and first IF amplifier stage, and a second one is between the first and second IF amplifier stages. These are backed up by a passive LC audio filter.

For the homebrewer, narrow filters may be found in the surplus market (I picked up a really nice one on eBay for $10 a few weeks ago) designed from scratch or obtained new from dealers. Inrad has an excellent selection of filters, plus a low-cost ($25) set of matched crystals and capacitors for the homebrewer. Design of ladder filters has been well-covered in amateur mags like QST for 20 years or so.

When required, an optional narrow filter is usually only a small percentage of the price of a new rig.

Also, many manufacturers are touting that their rigs have DSP, which permits many different filter characteristics to be realized for just the price of specifying the parameters.

So there's no reason to put up with less-than-optimum CW selectivity, except by choice or poor planning and preparation.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1409. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 23:21:15 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <a6omtb$1ug3$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 37304

Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
>Should I have to fully explain what the FCC has held as a given for long
>years, that
>no ham should be free to do anything he wishes on ham radio? And why?
>I can't be responble for your lack of knowledge of history. OR the present.

Dick,

While I actually agree with some of what you say, I think we could
use a level set about just how radically different a place the world
is with respect to global communications, both qualitatively and
quantitatively, than it was when the bulk of amateur regulations were
conceived, and guess from that how this change may have influenced
the FCC. If you look at

http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc1009.txt

you'll find an early standard for Internet "gateways" (an old term for
what are called "routers" now, the switches from which Internet infrastructure
is built). It was published in June, 1987, and has the following to
say about router performance. Note that "datagram" is a (slightly anal
retentive) near-synonym for "packet".

Gateways in the global-interconnect system generally require:
[...]
* High performance

Although long-haul lines in the Internet today are most
frequently 56 Kbps, DS1 lines (1.5 Mbps) are of increasing
importance, and even higher speeds are likely in the future.
Full-duplex operation is provided at any of these speeds.

The average size of Internet datagrams is rather small, of
the order of 100 bytes. At DS1 line speeds, the
per-datagram processing capability of the gateways, rather
than the line speed, is likely to be the bottleneck. To
fill a DS1 line with average-sized Internet datagrams, a
gateway would need to pass -- receive, route, and send --
2,000 datagrams per second per interface. That is, a
gateway which supported 3 DS1 lines and and Ethernet
interface would need to be able to pass a dazzling 2,000
datagrams per second in each direction on each of the
interfaces, or a aggregate throughput of 8,000 datagrams per
second, in order to fully utilize DS1 lines. This is beyond
the capability of current gateways.

(The use of the word "dazzling" in a standard is one reason why I really like Internet standards).

Note how this evaluation of the state-of-the-art 15 years ago considers switching 8,000 packets per second of traffic from 3 DS1s to be beyond what was achievable then. The state-of-the-art router now is a box which consumes about 36 inches of rack space which will switch 2 billion packets per second through aggregate bandwidth equivalent to more than 200,000 DS1s. The time I've been paying attention to this stuff has spanned an improvement in the high end of the technology by a factor of 10^6.

Essentially raw, uncontrolled communications capacity has just exploded. I personally know of about 40 Gbps of Internet undersea bandwidth leaving the US and going somewhere else, and there's probably lots more I don't know about. Long distance phone calls are cheap, so overseas phone usage is also far, far higher than it used to be. There's satellite services which hop directly out of the country. Extremely strong encryption is available to ordinary people, let alone the bad guys, despite the best effort of the NSA to prevent that, and the nature of (wired) Internet connectivity (perhaps due to the long-ago military design influence, but more likely because this is the best way to build digital networks in general) resists any attempt to limit what people do with that connectivity. Given these radical changes in technology, the job of protecting national security has become one of coping with a world where instantaneous global communication is a given, and I don't think there's any regulation that could put that genie back in the bottle. And while, even just two decades ago, amateur radio might have represented a significant fraction of (then-well-regulated) international communications, it has dwindled to insignificance compared to the scale of the advance of wired "spectrum".

And even if the post-9/11 world has changed enough that someone might be tempted to try the regulation approach anyway, there's also the consideration of what it is that "national security" is supposed to be securing, and how it is supposed to accomplish that? Americans can afford to give substantial resources to defense because they are quite wealthy, relatively speaking. Americans have a high standard of living, even though this makes Americans uncompetitive with parts of the rest of the world for many traditional economic activities, because Americans keep inventing new, high value, things to do instead. The reason the US is so well connected by communications networks to the rest of the world is that the technology which supports this is one of those American inventions. It is fundamentally American, developed from American experience of attempting to build stuff, and the prime reason that happened (and, in fact, the reason I live here, for whatever that's worth) is that the liberalization of the American telecommunications industry and policy which started with the breakup of AT&T in the middle 80's meant that for a period you could actually build stuff in the US which you could only theorize (or dream) about pretty much anywhere else in the world. You can only really learn about something if you make use of the opportunity to try it, and at one point in this field this opportunity was uniquely

American. You don't want to stifle this for future technology, you won't prevent the technology from being developed but what you may do is encourage the technology to be developed elsewhere and that is a worse outcome for both the US economy and US security (we know this since this is approximately the result of US restrictions on the export of encryption technology). Since regulating the use of technology doesn't work, the best thing for national security is to at least retain the secondary control benefits which accrue from having technology invented first in the US and having the expertise that develops around this activity resident in the US. This means providing people with as much support and as broad a freedom to invent as possible, and if long-term security is your concern this becomes even more important going forward.

Also note that FCC, as well as congressional (and even Al Gore's), policy had a significant role in the restructuring of US communicatons that led to this, and while everything they do has both positive and negative consequences I've got a feeling they view this as one of the things they managed to do mostly right. In fact I suspect this and similar success is in good measure responsible for the FCC's apparent current bias towards policies favouring innovation at the expense of maintaining strict order in spectrum allocation decisions, a bias which is causing the ARRL no small amount of grief defending what amateurs have now in the higher-frequency spectrum and which apparently wasn't envisioned when the Communications Act was written (as the ARRL is fond of pointing out to the FCC these days). Times change, priorities change and trying to un-change any of it is hopeless.

So my bet would be that, in keeping with current preferences, the FCC would likely prefer to err on the side of allowing amateurs anything that the FCC could somehow be convinced might conceivably promote "innovation". The additional security exposure this might cost is miniscule given the enormous, unconstrained-use bandwidth that exists already, and given the high value placed on useful new technology applications the off-chance that amateurs might find one or two of these probably more than offsets that minimal risk.

Despite this, however, and while I'm probably at the radical fringe concerning content regulations, even I don't see any particular value in relaxing the encryption, content-transparency and record-keeping regulations at HF where the channels are narrow bandwidth with international reach. The current regulations seem fine to me, it is only the mode stuff that is arcane. In the high UHF and SHF amateur bands I do have some difficulty with the encryption constraints due to the applications the big bandwidth short reach (i.e. both ends domestic) circuits possible there get put to, but at HF I think the current content constraints constrain very little and are hence perfectly appropriate. I didn't mean to imply anything else.

Dennis Ferguson

1410. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 23:31:55 UTC
From: N2EY@aol.com
Message-ID: <975b4ea9.0203131531.4f490254@posting.google.com>
Source record: 37305

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<a6o9iaplb1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> news:u8urhdn0mvng0a@corp.supernews.com...
> > And you had to go take a GOVERNMENT TEST,
>
> Still do.
>
> > administered by a GOVERNMENT employee,
>
> Not for all tests...novice never required that, neither
> did Tech.

Actually, that's not quite true. See below.
>
> > at a real live GOVERNMENT FACILITY.
>
> Not for the exceptions noted above. Also there were
> other exceptions based on distances, etc.

When the Novice and Technician were created in 1951, exams for those licenses were given at FCC offices just like the other license classes. The only exceptions were for people with permanent disabilities that precluded their going to a test session, or permanent residence at least 125 miles "air-line" from an FCC quarterly exam point.

In 1954, the Novice and Tech were made by-mail only, regardless of distance from an FCC office. The distance requirement was decreased from 125 miles to 75 miles in that year, too.

In 1963 the distance requirement was raised to 175 miles "air-line".

73 de Jim, N2EY

1411. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-13 23:40:15 UTC
From: N2EY@aol.com
Message-ID: <975b4ea9.0203131540.445960b0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 37306

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C8F7A5A.699B77D@IEEE.org>...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > The point has always
> > been that some code testing is necessary if any substantial numbers of hams are to
> > become qualified as CW operators. Without any test whatever, so few will ever do so
> > that CW as a mode is gone in the period of a generation or so. That is the future,
> > based on past history.
>
> Wrong! During the only time in history that a code exam was not required,
> amateur radio use of Morse code exploded. Besides that time, there is no
> history of amateur radio without a code test requirment.

Which times are you talking about, Cecil?

Before 1912, there was no mandatory licensing of amateur stations. Since 1991,
there has been a class of amateur license in the USA with no code test.

Has amateur radio use of Morse code "exploded" since 1991?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1412. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 00:21:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8FED03.54A0C9DE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37307

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Not that long ago most all routine CW conversations included much of this
> economy of verbiage. Today it's not so common at all, seems everyone thinks it
> all needs to be spelled out.
>
> "ge om ur 579 hr in stlouis mo stlouis mo rig is 100 w to a dipole ant es
> name hr is dick dick bt hw cpi?"
>
> wouldn't make much sense to most new CW ops, it seems.

And that's NOT an advantage, Dick.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1413. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 00:24:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8FEDB3.B5CA897@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37308

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C8F7A5A.699B77D@IEEE.org>...
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > The point has always
> > > been that some code testing is necessary if any substantial numbers of hams are to
> > > become qualified as CW operators. Without any test whatever, so few will ever do so
> > > that CW as a mode is gone in the period of a generation or so. That is the future,
> > > based on past history.
> >
> > Wrong! During the only time in history that a code exam was not required,
> > amateur radio use of Morse code exploded. Besides that time, there is no
> > history of amateur radio without a code test requirment.
>
> Which times are you talking about, Cecil?
>
> Before 1912, there was no mandatory licensing of amateur stations. Since 1991,
> there has been a class of amateur license in the USA with no code test.
>
> Has amateur radio use of Morse code "exploded" since 1991?

I should have said, "Besides that time, there is no history of HF amateur radio
without a code test requirement." I assumed that was understood.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1414. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 00:28:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8FEEC3.A9223265@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37309

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> KC8PMX wrote:
> > And what have you personally done in attempt to "turn those tables around?"
>
> For one thing, been subject to lots of abuse from the code haters for my
> opinions, which were formed from lots of experience.

The reason that you get so much "abuse", Dick, is because you make such
outrageous statements, devoid of any semblance of reality.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1415. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 00:29:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89434A.33CE9064@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37310

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Refuse to help others and you shouldn't be too surprised to find others not
> > to anxious to help you.
>
> You would ask my 89 year old father if he knows CPR and then refuse to
> perform the needed CPR on him when you found out he didn't know it.
> That's why I said, "Nice guy".

Cecil, you are truly out standing in your field. Outside the ballpark.

1416. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 00:29:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89440C.9F1C3F25@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37311

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > N2EY wrote:
> > > > Before April 15, 2000, going from General to Extra required taking two written
> > > > tests, one of 50 questions (for the Advanced) and one of 40 questions (for the
> > > > Extra). After that date, only a single 50 question test, based on the combined
> > > > Q&A pools, was required.
> > > >
> > > > You be the judge.
> > >
> > > A random 50 question exam covering the identical Q&A as two random 50/40
> > > question exams will average out to be the same difficulty.
> >
> > Yep,with all the questions and answers in hand well in advance, it's a matter of
> > annoyance, not difficulty.
>
> We notice that you have not annoyed yourself and learned that trivial set
> of 1000 Russian words.
>
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

--

Good. So you have noticed I avoid silly games.

1417. Re: SSB vs digital (was Re: CW vs. Digital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 00:29:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8952FE.F7ED66EB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37312

Good info, Dennis, and right to the point. Your reasoning on the issue looks right on target to me. I really see no reason why regulators would assume that because so many avenues of communication are open to abuse they should for that reason deregulate ham radio. Your point about different rules for short range bands sounds very reasonable, and I would hope you might pass these comments on to the FCC when the time comes they are needed.
Thanks for the excellent overview. Too many of you guys with lots of current knowledge are without the means to communicate it. You do it very well, and I appreciate it.

Dick

Dennis Ferguson wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
> >Should I have to fully explain what the FCC has held as a given for long
> >years, that
> >no ham should be free to do anything he wishes on ham radio? And why?
> >I can't be responble for your lack of knowledge of history. OR the present.
>
> Dick,
>
> While I actually agree with some of what you say, I think we could
> use a level set about just how radically different a place the world
> is with respect to global communications, both qualitatively and
> quantitatively, than it was when the bulk of amateur regulations were
> conceived, and guess from that how this change may have influenced
> the FCC. If you look at
>
> http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc1009.txt
>
> you'll find an early standard for Internet "gateways" (an old term for

1418. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 00:29:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89568C.F9ACBE05@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37314

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Cecil wants us to forget that the communications channel in the case
> > presented was fixed at a certain bandwidth. Under that set of conditions,
> > CW was the working mode and PSK31 was not.
>
> You are so extremely wrong, Dick. The communications channel was fixed
> at 31 Hz by the PSK31 software. You certainly cannot read CW in a 31 Hz
> communications channel. You are making a fool of yourself by comparing
> apples and oranges.
>

Tell ya what Cecil, you be the genius and I'll take whatever role is
left. I'll have far more fun.

But you are simply wrong. The parameters of the communications
channel were set by my equipment on that day, not by Shannon's theories.
Nor by the PSK31 signals I was copying.
Doncha feel a bit foolish, trying to force theory over practice when
it
refuses to fit?

1419. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 00:29:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C895703.E5F5B460@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37313

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > The point has always
> > been that some code testing is necessary if any substantial numbers of hams are to
> > become qualified as CW operators. Without any test whatever, so few will ever do so
> > that CW as a mode is gone in the period of a generation or so. That is the future,
> > based on past history.
>
> Wrong! During the only time in history that a code exam was not required,
> amateur radio use of Morse code exploded.

And you so conveniently fail to note that during that time there was NO
OTHER mode of radio in existence other than radiotelegraphy! Amazing how
selective your observations are!

> Besides that time, there is no
> history of amateur radio without a code test requirment.

Right, and in light of that, we look to history as recounted by most
hams as to whether or not they would have voluntarily learned Morse code
to
a useful level. Almost to a man, the answer is no, your alleged Cub
Scout
experience notwithstanding. I also learned Morse code before becoming a
ham, but strangely, I didn't learn it nearly well enough to pass the
Novice code test!
I figure your experience was no different.

1420. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 00:29:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89571B.A427760C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37315

CAM wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
> >
> > >W1RFI trolled, in reference to one of my more
> > >scintillating UseNet posts:
> >
> > >>Do you think that your post is a valuable, relevant, clear,
> > >>concise post that one should expect of UseNet's finest?
> >
> > >Two lines. Troll rating: 1 out of 10. Got to step it up.
> >
> > I take that as a "no." If all you can do is to call my post a "troll," I will
> > assume correctly that you had nothing substantive to offer.
> >
> > Cec', you may be right after all. :-)
>
> Ask yourself, would a man of Val's alleged statue call a near stranger
> a "Bozo"? I seriously doubt it.

I've asked my self many times why a man of your alleged stature do
numerous things that you routinely do. There's only one answer. You
already know it.

1421. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 00:29:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C895769.8BEB69E2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37316

Bill Sohl wrote:

>The point has

> always
> > been that some code testing is necessary if any substantial numbers of
> hams are to
> > become qualified as CW operators.
>
> DICK...you lose because your statement is nothing but wild
> speculation.

Just look at that....from a board member of No Code International, yet!
Amazing!

> Additionally you still fail to provide anyone with what
> YOU consider "substantial" to be. Is it some percentage of
> licensed hams? Some percentage of active hams? Some
> finite number (i.e. at least 50,ooo US hams, N number of
> worldwide hams?)
>

You'd like me to put some numbers up so you can pick away at them,
whatever
they are? And you say there might be some number you would agree with?
Right!

>
> > Without any test whatever, so few will ever do so
> > that CW as a mode is gone in the period of a generation or so.
>
> Just like there are no longer any archery enthusiasts,
> just like there are no more drivers of manual gearbox
> vehicles, just like there are no more (insert any
> number of activities that survive based solely on
> volunteers to keep the interests alive).
>

So your total viewpoint of radiotelegraphy is that it is nothing more
than a novelty, of no use whatever for actually communicating. No other
attitude could generate such an speil.

>
> > That is the future,
> > based on past history.
>
> What past history? How about some examples to give you

> claim at least a semblence of credibility?
>
> > Ignore it as you wish, but no whitewash will alter it.
>
> No whitewash is needed. Your "fear" is akin to crying
> wolf when there is none.

You live across the river from a big hole in the ground where not long ago there sat a pair of huge buildings, and you don't believe that similar acts could come from the use of unrestricted use of ham radio communications.
"Gee, they can already use the telephone system or the internet". So all is well, FCC will just let hams do whatever they want, wherever they decide to do it on their authorized frequencies. Rent a clue, would ya?

1422. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 00:29:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C895779.FBBBEA4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37317

CAM wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
> >
> > >W1RFI trolled, in reference to one of my more
> > >scintillating UseNet posts:
> >
> > >>Do you think that your post is a valuable, relevant, clear,
> > >>concise post that one should expect of UseNet's finest?
> >
> > >Two lines. Troll rating: 1 out of 10. Got to step it up.
> >
> > I take that as a "no." If all you can do is to call my post a "troll," I will
> > assume correctly that you had nothing substantive to offer.
> >
> > Cec', you may be right after all. :-)
>
> Ask yourself, would a man of Val's alleged statue call a near stranger
> a "Bozo"? I seriously doubt it.

I've asked my self many times why a man of your alleged stature do
numerous things that you routinely do. There's only one answer. You
already know it.

1423. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 00:33:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8FEFCA.12AED8F7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37318

Valentine Germann wrote:
> What is too easily
> attained lacks proper appreciation; what is cheap,
> in both time and money, lacks value.

Really? Cut off your oxygen supply for three minutes and
then get back to us.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1424. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 00:45:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8FF298.6007234B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37319

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > The point has always
> > > been that some code testing is necessary if any substantial numbers of hams are to
> > > become qualified as CW operators. Without any test whatever, so few will ever do so
> > > that CW as a mode is gone in the period of a generation or so. That is the future,
> > > based on past history.
> >
> > Wrong! During the only time in history that a code exam was not required,
> > amateur radio use of Morse code exploded.
>
> And you so conveniently fail to note that during that time there was NO
> OTHER mode of radio in existence other than radiotelegraphy! Amazing how
> selective your observations are!

I didn't fail to notice that, Dick. Do you want to outlaw all modes except CW?
If you had been head of the FCC, would you have outlawed AM?

> > Besides that time, there is no
> > history of amateur radio without a code test requirment.
>
> Right, and in light of that, we look to history as recounted by most
> hams as to whether or not they would have voluntarily learned Morse code
> to a useful level. Almost to a man, the answer is no, ...

That is simply unadulterated BS, Dick. It is true that "most" would not
have chosen to learn it just as "most" choose not to use it today. It is
completely untrue that "Almost to a man, the answer is no". The hams who
were attracted to CW would have learned Morse code. My estimate is that
is about 20% of all hams, certainly a not insignificant number. I certainly
would have used CW, test or no test. I'll bet Ed would have also. For hams
who love CW, the test is irrelevant. Too bad that doesn't include you.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1425. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 00:48:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8FF36A.67A1F670@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37320

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Refuse to help others and you shouldn't be too surprised to find others not
> > > to anxious to help you.
> >
> > You would ask my 89 year old father if he knows CPR and then refuse to
> > perform the needed CPR on him when you found out he didn't know it.
> > That's why I said, "Nice guy".
>
> Cecil, you are truly out standing in your field. Outside the ballpark.

If you didn't mean what you said, Dick, I suggest you retract your
statements. The meaning was clear. Anyone who disagrees with your
take on reality should die rather than expect help.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1426. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 00:51:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8FF41F.BBB8D79C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37322

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Cecil wants us to forget that the communications channel in the case
> > > presented was fixed at a certain bandwidth. Under that set of conditions,
> > > CW was the working mode and PSK31 was not.
> >
> > You are so extremely wrong, Dick. The communications channel was fixed
> > at 31 Hz by the PSK31 software. You certainly cannot read CW in a 31 Hz
> > communications channel. You are making a fool of yourself by comparing
> > apples and oranges.
> >
>
> Tell ya what Cecil, you be the genius and I'll take whatever role is
> left. I'll have far more fun.
>
> But you are simply wrong. The parameters of the communications
> channel were set by my equipment on that day, not by Shannon's theories.
> Nor by the PSK31 signals I was copying.
> Doncha feel a bit foolish, trying to force theory over practice when
> it refuses to fit?

You are the foolish one, Dick. You were esssentially listening to an IF
frequency. Your ignorance tells the world that you don't know how radios
or computers really work.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1427. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 00:53:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8FF472.68C61A59@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37323

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > We notice that you have not annoyed yourself and learned that trivial set
> > of 1000 Russian words.

> Good. So you have noticed I avoid silly games.

No, we notice that you avoid taking responsibility for your statements
like they were the plague.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1428. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 00:54:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8FF4D8.41DDE73D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37324

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I've asked my self many times why a man of your alleged stature do
> numerous things that you routinely do. There's only one answer. You
> already know it.

Yep, and you do too. I have told you many times that I treat people
the same way they treat me. I held out an olive branch to you, Dick,
and you chopped my arm off.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1429. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 00:57:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C8FF56C.B4513ED6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37325

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> CAM wrote, apropo of nothing:
> >Really? Cut off your oxygen supply for three minutes and
> >then get back to us.
>
> Tell you what, you do it for six minutes first and I'll see
> what I can be talked into.

Why should I do that? I'm not the one who lacks appreciation
for the valuable things in life that are free or cheap.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1430. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 01:07:14 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8vssundgcr07b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37321

CAM wrote, apropo of nothing:

>Really? Cut off your oxygen supply for three minutes and
>then get back to us.

Tell you what, you do it for six minutes first and I'll see
what I can be talked into.

Val

1431. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 01:19:58 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u8vtlgirfcr158@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37326

Hello, Mr. Carroll!

As you may have noticed, I've stopped responding
to most of these folks, at least within this thread. As
a general rule, anyone who puts up literally hundreds
of one- and two-line messges, over many months, is
in need of professional care, in my view. Total them
all up, content-wise, and then turn them all into gasoline.
Why, if you did that there wouldn't enough fuel to run a
piss-ant's motorcycle around the inside of a Cheerio.

Val

1432. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 01:55:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313205530.19718.00000282@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 37327

In article <mVQj8.13129$P4.1113615@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
<K0HB@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
>> Try to stay with the "important" RFI work and stop the ARRL
>> apolgistic propaganda here.
>
>Since Ed participates here in his personal time, there is no requirement
>that his participation on rrap be related in any way to his RFI work, and he
>is free to express his personal views of ARRL issues without any implication
>that those views bear any resemblance to the 'official' ARRL position on any
>matter whatsoever.
>
>With all kind wishes,

Now, now, Hans. Just because you had a bad staff meeting
today doesn't mean you have to jump in here and play
"manager" again. Learn to leave work at work and don't
drag it into this chat room, OK?

Are you saying that the League is somehow sacrosanct?
What are you trying to lay down on all for "policy?" :-)

1433. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 01:55:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313205530.19718.00000281@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 37328

In article <3C8FC52F.2989EF90@earthlink.net>, Herr Robust <k8mn@earthlink.net>
issued orders once more:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3C8EE381.D2EB806F@earthlink.net>, Herr Robust
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> stepped up on his feldherrnhugel and shouted:
>>
>> >> The ISSUE is, and has been in THIS NEWSGROUP designed to
>> >> hold it, the retention or elimination of the code test for any
>> >> amateur radio license. Self-styled "leaders" (Heil pretends to be
>> >> one as well as judge-jury on radio "fun") insist on keeping the
>> >> code test. Others argue for the elimination of the code test,
>> >> entirely. The TEST, not the elimination of code use.
>> >
>> >That's AN ISSUE. Regardless of the original idea behind the formation
>> >of the newsgroup, the title includes the terms "radio amateur" and
>> >"policy". THIS NEWSGROUP seems to be about any amateur radio policy
>> >maters. The morse TEST is only a part of policy. I don't claim any
>> >leadership role here. I'm just a cast member.
>>
>> "Cast?" [plaster?] "There's no business like show business..." :-)
>>
>> "radio policy maters?" Is Herr Robust feeling injured about "alma maters?"
>> :-)
>>
>> [perhaps his ample tummy had too many 'taters? :-)]
>
>We eat lots of 'maters hereabouts--cut 'em with a 'mater knife.

Tsk, tsk, Fearless Leader done struck out at the Comedy
Store once more... :-)

>What you've managed to state in a couple of rather typically long and
>windy paragraphs is that not everything (including the post to which I
>now reply) is on topic. Take it up with the newsgroup police.

Heh heh heh, that's what I did. The self-appointed "police" that
is.

Now quit rubbing your ceremonial dagger and the twin lightning
bolts on your collar...

>Smiley discounted. I've already said as much to you, Anderson.

Ah, the self-righteous are angered again. Tsk, tsk, there is no peace for them...poor souls. :-)

>Those adjectives are terms used by you to deaden the apparent pain you
>suffer at being no more than a sidewalk superintendent to amateur radio.
>That's the case no matter how much baloney you slice.

Your similes need a smiley. :-)

You do not cement anything with your words and your baloney is ersatz.

>You can put ten
>antennas on your car. You can own a CB transceiver and several
>scanners. You can place an ARRL decal in your front window. You're
>still not a radio amateur. Does that come through "load" and clear?

Oh, my, aren't you twirling your riot baton with your lil radio cop uniform starched and crisp. :-)

Tsk, tsk, Fearless Leader still doesn't understand. Sigh, once more as to children:

The morse code test for an amateur radio license applies only to those who are interested in becoming a radio amateur with below-30-MHz privileges. It does NOT affect those already licensed who already have those privileges...except in their lil warped "leadership" minds who seek to "rule" where they have NO authorization.

Fearless Leader does NOT rule. He attempts to intimidate, to bully others. Tsk, tsk, that cannot be done in a computer-modem environment-medium. Fearless Leader keeps on his quest just the same, trying to tilt the windmills of his mind. :-)

Presumably Fearless Leader thinks that morsemanship is ALL about amateur radio and that all must prove their "worth" to him. He cannot abide anyone not going through the same rituals and hazing he did.

>This isn't a chat room. I only point it out in case you've been damning
>your ISP for slow access during your "chats".

This newsgroup has become a de facto Chat Room...and part-time wind tunnel where the same vanity-callsign air bags wheezingly vent their personal frustrations against those who do not buy into their bullying tactics.

See your medical doctor for some medication that might make your attitudes more civilized and certainly for those delusions and hallucinations you are exhibiting.

There is no "damning my ISP" on account of "slow access." AOL was already well known for that. :-)

There are no multiple "antennas on my car." There is no "ARRL decal" on it, either, nor would there be one for any reason. Amateur radio is a hobby, an interesting, enjoyable hobby. Does Fearless Leader condemn all who engage in a hobby rather than his idea that it should become a lifestyle as He Does It?!? Yes, he does.

Fearless Leader does not allow anyone to be "interested" in something unless they embrace it totally for the major part of their life, to DO AS HE DID or be forever damned. Not a good attitude for a human being trying to coexist with others of his own species. That is, of course, being optimistic that FL is actually a part of all others' species.

1434. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 01:55:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313205532.19718.00000283@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 37329

In article <u8vg8al65goib0@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>Bill Sohl wrote:

>Is Ham Radio important or isn't it? In my view, it is, and
>it's important enough for serious attention from the FCC,
>not the half-hearted effort we see now. As someone
>who is returning to amateur radio, who was a "hanger-on"
>in the long ago, I have been shocked to see what I feel
>is a serious drop in status for Ham Radio, regardless of
>the numbers, as well as serious internal divisions that
>are at best ugly and at worst threatening to everyone.

That is a matter of perception, isn't it? :-)

Have you considered (ever) that the older ideas and the
self-descriptions of "glory and honor and importance" were
never really there? Why does an enjoyable, technologically-
fascinating hobby have to become a lifestyle? Have you ever
considered that those who make a hobby their lifestyle are not
automatically elevated to some superior god-like status for
their personal choices?

>I have been astonished by what I have been told directly
>by technicans in the area here, people "inside the tent."
>The whole "ethos" of amateur radio, as I understand it,
>is simply non existant in these folks.

Are you disturbed that amateur radio hobbyists are mere
mortals afterall? :-)

Note that such astounds some of the self-styled gods who
wish to "rule" over others. I'm sure that they are most
perplexed and outraged that they are not obeyed... :-)

>It's scary, to me.
>Whatever it is that brought THIS change on is, for me,
>part of the problem, not the long-run solution.

Teacher, educate yourself. "Solutions" are not obtained
by continually pissing about "things were different in the
old days!" :-)

>More and more folks like the above. Continued divisions,
>growing over time. Continued loss of status. More and
>more problems of various kinds (arguments over band

>plans, fights over modes) leading to loss of "air space"
>as the regulatory dinosaur clumsily "adjusts" things. In
>short, a self-perpetuating downward spiral.

"Loss of 'air space' (spectrum allocations)?" Amateur radio
allocations in the last half century have GAINED more
spectrum below 30 MHz than they ever had before you
were born. :-)

Some Europeans even gained "ham bands" below MF. The
USA has been very slow in that particular area.

>>You haven't shown anything at all to base being right
>>or wrong about anything.
>
>C'est la vie, isn't it!

No, you've taken up "c'est la guerre" but without troops,
munitions, or supplies in this newsgroup.

>In the largest sense, NO! It's every man for himself, in
>some circles, and devil take the hindmost. It's a very
>good thing that no commercial interest has any REAL
>designs on Ham Frequencies.

You cannot seriously use that little myth, can you?

Note: "Ham Frequencies" go right on up to the upper
allocation limit of 300 GHz.

>Divide and conquer
>tactics could work miracles for them now.

Sorry, but there are so many OTHER users of radio that
their sheer numbers of them as citizens make the FCC
listen to them.

Teacher, educate yourself. The communications environment
has grown much bigger than you could possibly imagine. It
isn't, never has been static since 1950.

Amateurs do not "own" spectral "land" and never did. Trying to
promote a hobby activity on vague, unsubstantiated mythos of
long-ago "glory and importance" is itself doomed to failure.

There is nothing wrong with promotion of a hobby that is just
fun...except to a few who live in a fantasyland of self-
promotion and self-importance, elevating themselves up
beyond all credulity. Many hobby activities have some form of
federal regulation and the government does really recognize
that recreation is important to its citizens. Why else would it
allocate treasury monies to maintenance of national parks,
using land that could otherwise be made profitable by sale,
trade, or commerce?

Some have a need to regulate Their version of "fun" as that which all "must enjoy." That's minority control. That's not a good thing. Dictatorship was never a good thing. Quit trying to dictate that the Old Ways were the "only" good ways.

1435. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 02:09:17 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <hDTj8.13534$P4.1168109@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 37330

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

> Are you saying that the League is somehow sacrosanct?
> What are you trying to lay down on all for "policy?" :-)

I said nothing at all about the League. I was defending Ed's
right to have personal opinions which might (or might not) be
the same as ARRL thoughts on a given subject.

I thought my message was clearly stated.

"Since Ed participates here in his personal time, there is no requirement
that his participation on rrap be related in any way to his RFI work, and he
is free to express his personal views of ARRL issues without any implication
that those views bear any resemblance to the 'official' ARRL position on any
matter whatsoever."

With all kind wishes for your progress towards understanding simple
declarative English.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1436. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 02:10:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020313211030.16305.00000547@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 37332

In article <3C8E30E8.DF6E7FAD@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Many people thought the slaves would quit working after they were freed
>but many of them worked even harder.

Yeah, up until the point where the Welfare State was established.
Then half of the former Slaves put their hands out, had have been getting
their palms greased ever since -- to the disgust of the other half, who
could clearly see the disadvantage of a life of dependency. There is
nothing about being a particular race or color that makes people dumb
or lazy -- but treating them like helpless children will definitely bring out
the worst in those inclined to *be* dumb and lazy. I believe in assuming
the best of people, not seeking out the worst in them in order to assuage
any guilt feelings over the way they had been treated in the past. The
Welfare State was a bad thing for former slaves; the elimination of code
testing will be a bad thing for the state of CW usage in the future of the
ARS. History repeats itself.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1437. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 02:10:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020313211031.16305.00000548@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 37331

In article <3C8E2FB4.83AD2D03@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Whatever the international community of Ham Radio
>wants it to hold. Just because the slaves were freed
>didn't mean they stopped working.

Cecil:

Sure they did. The guilty liberals even created a Welfare State so
they wouldn't have to. Slavery was a bad thing; the Welfare State
was worse, since it sent the message that former slaves wern't seen
as able to contribute to society on the basis of their human ingenuity
and integrity. We got that completely wrong, and pay a high social
price for this mistake. The same will happen in the ARS, once the
code testing requirements are gone.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1438. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 02:10:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020313211031.16305.00000549@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 37333

In article <u8s7ca8muuhu93@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>
>No big deal, I guess, except in my case I had hoped that
>this "international" aspect of the avocation would rermain
>very, very important into the far future. If the CW treaty
>requirements are removed won't amateur radio become
>more or less balkanized by language groups? I know
>this possibility is "down the road" but it is still, to me,
>a very disturbing prospect.
>
>Val Germann
>Columbia, Missouri

Val:

I believe you express some very valid concerns, and I have been
saying the same things for years. I find it interesting that Russia
is not going to eliminate code testing requirements from it's
amateur radio licensing system. The Russian people have always
been extremely ingenious and resourceful when it comes to
dealing with technology, yet they continue to demonstrate a
recognition of the value of amateur radio's simplest, most
effective, and easily implemented mode. However, the "handwriting
is on the wall" as far as code testing requirements are concerned
for the rest of the world, and only time will tell what the future of
on-the-air CW usage will be.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1439. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 02:17:13 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <JKTj8.10108$Ex5.943149@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37334

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message:
> "K7JEB" <k7jeb @ arrl.net> writes:
>
> >It's a dark night in the city. But in a small office
> >up on the 12th floor of the Acme Building, one man
> >still ponders the vagaries of human nature.....
>
> ...stroking his chin reflectively, he leaned against the
> xerox machine again and again and again, lost in
> thought...

AT&T's newserver was screwed up. I kept trying and trying
to post this supposedly humorous blivet and it kept telling
me it couldn't find itself in the dark, all the while
secretly posting every one of my attempts to everyone
but me.

My apologies to r.r.a.p. and W5DXP.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1440. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 02:43:49 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u902i6716gr924@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37335

Len-WAY-Over-21 wrote:

Nothing of consequence since he does not have a
amateur radio license and does not intend to get one.
Rather, he is contemptuous of amateur radio and its
valuable traditions. Therefore, I will have no comment
on anything this fellow may say. In fact, I erased his
current message with the mouse without reading it.

Did I miss anything?

Val

1441. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 03:03:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313220341.14946.00000210@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 37336

In article <3C8F82D0.12F763C6@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Ask yourself, would a man of Val's alleged statue call a near stranger
>a "Bozo"?

I think we're all Bozos on this bus.

Care to squeeze the wheeze? People like to.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1442. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 03:03:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313220341.14946.00000209@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 37340

In article <3C8F8167.12B9296C@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Q2: Describe the purpose, construction, operation and testing of a typical
>> single impedance bond.
>
>The General exam of the 50's, that I took, was multiple choice except for
>drawing schematics. Did the Extra exam of the 50's contain essay questions?

From the 1954 ARRL License Manual, Chapter 7, "The Amateur Extra Class License":

"The written examination consists of about 100 questions mostly on technical subjects but including several on regulations, and with numerous diagrams required. The questions are for the most part in the usual multiple-choice form.

The Federal Communications Commission has issued a study guide for the written examination consisting of 279 example questions. These questions appear on the following pages together with answers. It should again be emphasized that these are not necessarily the questions which appear on the actual examination, but are intended primarily to show the scope of knowledge required. In any event, persons intending to apply for the Amateur Extra Class license should use the material to follow in conjunction with thorough study of a standard text on radio such as The Radio Amateur's Handbook".

--

Looks like I stumped ya on those engineering questions, Cecil. They are very basic questions, btw.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1443. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 03:03:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313220342.14946.00000211@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 37337

In article <3C8F8020.D7791ED3@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >Why would a digital engineer know what AGC is, Dick?
>>
>> The person quoted is both an EE and an Extra, Cecil.
>
>I know Extras who can't find the bathroom.

Top of the stairs, first door on the right.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1444. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 03:03:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313220343.14946.00000212@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 37338

In article <qlNj8.9460$Ex5.890621@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> writes:

>CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>> Dick Carroll wrote:
>> > Clues? You're a complete and dismal failure as a "detective", Sir
>> > Cecil.
>>
>> As a detective, I made a good engineer.
>> --
>> cheers, CAM, W5DXP
>
>
>It's a dark night in the city. But in a small office
>up on the 12th floor of the Acme Building, one man
>still ponders the vagaries of human nature.....
>
>Cecil Noir, Private Eye.

He walks the street by night.
Out of the fog, into the smog.
At Fourth and Drucker he turns right.
At Drucker and Fourth he turns left.
Relentlessly...
Doggedly... (woof-woof)
Ruthlessly...("I wonder where Ruth is?")
He crosses the street and walks into a great sandstone building (OUCH! My nose!)
He's...

Nick Danger - Third Eye.

73 de Jim "Everything You Know Is Wrong" N2EY

1445. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 03:03:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020313220344.14946.00000213@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 37339

In article <3C88D049.D163E2@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>> > N2EY wrote:
>> > > One of the many wonderful aspects of CW traffic handling "done right"
>> > > is the
>> > > extremely high efficiency and economy of words used. Not a dit wasted.
>> > >
>> > > You oughta try it sometime, Cecil.
>
> Not that long ago most all routine CW conversations included much of this
>economy of verbiage. Today it's not so common at all, seems everyone thinks
>it
>all needs to be spelled out.
>
> "ge om ur 579 hr in stlouis mo stlouis mo rig is 100 w to a dipole ant es
>name hr is dick dick bt hw cpi?"
>
>wouldn't make much sense to most new CW ops, it seems.
>
Well, a typical first go-round in an N2EY CW QSO goes something like this:

".....DE N2EY R TU CL UR 579 579 IN WAYNE PA WAYNE PA NAME JIM JIM BT RIG
HOMEBREW CW XCVR 100 W OUT TO INV V AT 35 FT BT HW?..."

Almost everybody understands that. But the lack of abbreviations is not new.

Back about 1956 there was a QST article called "Your Novice Accent". It
was so popular that it was sent to all new hams (or at least new Novices) for
many years after it was first published. One of the subjects addressed is
proper use
of Q signals and abbreviations.

--

It's a good practice for people learning the code to spend at least some of
their study time listening to the use of Morse on the ham bands. Tapes,
software and
other training aids are fine, but often the experience of listening to "the
real thing"
is a big help.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1446. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 03:21:25 UTC
From: Steve Adell - KF2TI <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a6p4vn$bc0$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37341

In article <20020313220343.14946.00000212@mb-fy.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
says...
> In article <qlNj8.9460$Ex5.890621@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "K7JEB"
> <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> writes:
>
> >CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >> > Clues? You're a complete and dismal failure as a "detective", Sir
> >> > Cecil.
> >>
> >> As a detective, I made a good engineer.
> >> --
> >> cheers, CAM, W5DXP
> >>
> >
> >It's a dark night in the city. But in a small office
> >up on the 12th floor of the Acme Building, one man
> >still ponders the vagaries of human nature.....
> >
> >Cecil Noir, Private Eye.
>
>
> He again by night.
> Out of the fog, into the smog. hack hack cough cough
> Relentlessly...
> Doggedly... (woof-woof)
> Ruthlessly...("I wonder where Ruth is?")
> At Fourth and Drucker he turns right.
> At Drucker and Fourth he turns left.
> He crosses MacArthur Park and walks into a great sandstone building (OUCH! My
> nose!)
He climbs the 13 stairs
He's ready for action
He's ready for danger

He's......

> Nick Danger - Third Eye.
>
> 73 de Jim "Everything You Know Is Wrong" N2EY

Good afternoon Mr Danger
allow me to introduce myself

I am Rocky Anderson...errr Ricco

73 de Steve "How can you be in 2 places at once when you're not anywhere at all" KF2TI

If you're gonna do it do it right

Hey Pallo..he broke de president Uhh Jim!!!

1447. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 03:33:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C897AFC.3CF311CE@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37342

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > Refuse to help others and you shouldn't be too surprised to find others not
> > > > to anxious to help you.
> > >
> > > You would ask my 89 year old father if he knows CPR and then refuse to
> > > perform the needed CPR on him when you found out he didn't know it.
> > > That's why I said, "Nice guy".
> >
> > Cecil, you are truly out standing in your field. Outside the ballpark.
>
> If you didn't mean what you said, Dick, I suggest you retract your
> statements. The meaning was clear. Anyone who disagrees with your
> take on reality should die rather than expect help.
>

I suggest you read what is said and stop reading other things into it. Just because someone doesn't deserve help for whatever reason does not mean he won't get it. Only you would do that.

1448. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 03:33:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C897CF7.244BBCCC@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37343

Valentine Germann wrote:

> Hello, Mr. Carroll!
>
> As you may have noticed, I've stopped responding
> to most of these folks, at least within this thread. As
> a general rule, anyone who puts up literally hundreds
> of one- and two-line messges, over many months, is
> in need of professional care, in my view. Total them
> all up, content-wise, and then turn them all into gasoline.
> Why, if you did that there wouldn't enough fuel to run a
> piss-ant's motorcycle around the inside of a Cheerio.
>
> Val

Yeah, Val, it's all pretty well a waste of on-the-air time. Or study time maybe, for those going for a license. These anti-code people have some really strange twists to their tails, and they are of a permanent set. Don't try to confuse 'em with facts, their minds (or whatever) are made up.

1449. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 03:33:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C897EB1.A7DD6B3@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37344

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > KC8PMX wrote:
> > > And what have you personally done in attempt to "turn those tables around?"
> >
> > For one thing, been subject to lots of abuse from the code haters for my
> > opinions, which were formed from lots of experience.
>
> The reason that you get so much "abuse", Dick, is because you make such
> outrageous statements, devoid of any semblance of reality.

To you, any statement not in keeping with your worldview
is "outrageous".
If you think it's outrageous, it is probably just about
right.

1450. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 03:33:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C897EFB.1E0B063F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37345

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I've asked my self many times why a man of your alleged stature do
> > numerous things that you routinely do. There's only one answer. You
> > already know it.
>
> Yep, and you do too. I have told you many times that I treat people
> the same way they treat me.

That'll be the day. Anyone you can't control is fair game.

> I held out an olive branch to you, Dick,
> and you chopped my arm off.

If you did you sure disguised it well. Probably as hemlock,
knowing you,so you could criticize me for refusing it.

1451. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 03:33:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C897F36.8AD9AAC6@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37346

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > We notice that you have not annoyed yourself and learned that trivial set
> > > of 1000 Russian words.
>
> > Good. So you have noticed I avoid silly games.
>
> No, we notice that you avoid taking responsibility for your statements
> like they were the plague.

With stupid shits like you rewriting everything I say, and
if not, misrepresenting what I say to mean what I *didn't*
say, that would seem to be the absolute only way to go.

1452. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 03:33:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C897FF5.A55C65A9@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37347

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > Cecil wants us to forget that the communications channel in the case
> > > > presented was fixed at a certain bandwidth. Under that set of conditions,
> > > > CW was the working mode and PSK31 was not.
> > >
> > > You are so extremely wrong, Dick. The communications channel was fixed
> > > at 31 Hz by the PSK31 software. You certainly cannot read CW in a 31 Hz
> > > communications channel. You are making a fool of yourself by comparing
> > > apples and oranges.
> > >
> >
> > Tell ya what Cecil, you be the genius and I'll take whatever role is
> > left. I'll have far more fun.
> >
> > But you are simply wrong. The parameters of the communications
> > channel were set by my equipment on that day, not by Shannon's theories.
> > Nor by the PSK31 signals I was copying.
> > Doncha feel a bit foolish, trying to force theory over practice when
> > it refuses to fit?
>
> You are the foolish one, Dick. You were esssentially listening to an IF
> frequency.

Of course! What do you think set the parameters of my
receiver? I had
SOME control over the IF bandpass, but it sure didn't go so
far as to be able to
close it down to 31HZ. For that matter, why would I *want*
to close it down to 31 hz and lose my CW copy also?
You're an ignoramus and that seems to be where you intend
to stay. Have fun.

1453. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 03:33:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8980AA.6E475D66@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37348

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > Refuse to help others and you shouldn't be too surprised to find others not
> > > > to anxious to help you.
> > >
> > > You would ask my 89 year old father if he knows CPR and then refuse to
> > > perform the needed CPR on him when you found out he didn't know it.
> > > That's why I said, "Nice guy".
> >
> > Cecil, you are truly out standing in your field. Outside the ballpark.
>
> If you didn't mean what you said, Dick, I suggest you retract your
> statements. The meaning was clear. Anyone who disagrees with your
> take on reality should die rather than expect help.

You are totally out of touch. Just because one who
refused to take training
(not someone who never had the opportunity to receive the
training)
deserves to be refused help doesn't mean that is what will
happen to him. You're
the kind of person who would be more likely to do that.

1454. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 03:33:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C898150.CD9C74F7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37349

CAM wrote:

>The hams who
> were attracted to CW would have learned Morse code.

Uh-hunh. And exactly what was it that attracted them to the
code?
Answer: THE LICENSE! Darn few were attracted to the code
just for the code itself, and you SHOULD know it.

1455. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 03:33:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8981AB.B17EA8E9@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37350

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Not that long ago most all routine CW conversations included much of this
> > economy of verbiage. Today it's not so common at all, seems everyone thinks it
> > all needs to be spelled out.
> >
> > "ge om ur 579 hr in stlouis mo stlouis mo rig is 100 w to a dipole ant es
> > name hr is dick dick bt hw cpi?"
> >
> > wouldn't make much sense to most new CW ops, it seems.
>
> And that's NOT an advantage, Dick.
>

Tell us about it. Would it be a problem if new hams learned
to use CW well?

1456. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 03:33:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8981B5.E272A7E3@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37451

CAM wrote:

> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > What is too easily
> > attained lacks proper appreciation; what is cheap,
> > in both time and money, lacks value.
>
> Really? Cut off your oxygen supply for three minutes and
> then get back to us.
>

Clearly you have no understanding of human endeavor.

1457. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 03:33:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8981CA.8FE22630@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37452

Valentine Germann wrote:

> Len-WAY-Over-21 wrote:
>
> Nothing of consequence since he does not have a
> amateur radio license and does not intend to get one.
> Rather, he is contemptuous of amateur radio and its
> valuable traditions. Therefore, I will have no comment
> on anything this fellow may say. In fact, I erased his
> current message with the mouse without reading it.
>
> Did I miss anything?

I don't know since I never read anything he writes unless it shows up quoted by someone else whose post I did open. Then, I usually cancel it and go to the next entry. He's no more than a complete waste of time - his own, as well as ours.

Dick

1458. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 04:12:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C90234A.7FF0A9F8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37453

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Not that long ago most all routine CW conversations included much of this
> > > economy of verbiage. Today it's not so common at all, seems everyone thinks it
> > > all needs to be spelled out.
> > >
> > > "ge om ur 579 hr in stlouis mo stlouis mo rig is 100 w to a dipole ant es
> > > name hr is dick dick bt hw cpi?"
> > >
> > > wouldn't make much sense to most new CW ops, it seems.
> >
> > And that's NOT an advantage, Dick.
>
> Tell us about it. Would it be a problem if new hams learned
> to use CW well?

After 51 years as a ham, even I don't know all the CW abbreviations. How are
you going to force new hams to learn them?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1459. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 04:24:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9025EA.99BC97AC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37454

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> >The hams who
> > were attracted to CW would have learned Morse code.
>
> Uh-hunh. And exactly what was it that attracted them to the
> code?
> Answer: THE LICENSE! Darn few were attracted to the code
> just for the code itself, and you SHOULD know it.

Most of the Novices of my time were attracted to ham radio
because CW could be used as a *tool* for making radio
contacts. You seem to have allowed the means to an end to
become the end in itself, i.e. wagging the dog.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1460. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 04:25:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C902647.F54BE1F0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37455

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Just because
> someone doesn't deserve help for whatever reason does not mean he won't get it.

HUH?????????
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1461. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 04:35:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C902878.B689ECF2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37456

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > You are the foolish one, Dick. You were esssentially listening to an IF
> > frequency.
>
> Of course! What do you think set the parameters of my
> receiver? I had
> SOME control over the IF bandpass, but it sure didn't go so
> far as to be able to
> close it down to 31HZ. For that matter, why would I *want*
> to close it down to 31 hz and lose my CW copy also?

Then you were comparing apples and oranges. PSK31 was trying to work through
a 31 Hz filter. A fair comparison would have you trying to copy CW through
a 31 Hz filter. Why is that concept so hard to grasp? To directly compare
PSK to CW, you must use the same power and the same bandwidth.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1462. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 04:36:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9028CD.FDA66E8A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37457

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >I know Extras who can't find the bathroom.
>
> Top of the stairs, first door on the right.

I thought so. There's no door at the top of the stairs - just the attic.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1463. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 04:38:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C902949.1606506E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37458

N2EY wrote:
> Looks like I stumped ya on those engineering questions, Cecil.

Huh? I thought we were discussing question formats.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1464. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 04:41:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9029E6.8B0B4F59@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37459

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > No, we notice that you avoid taking responsibility for your statements
> > like they were the plague.
>
> With stupid shits like you rewriting everything I say, and
> if not, misrepresenting what I say to mean what I *didn't*
> say, that would seem to be the absolute only way to go.

The statement that I was referring to is that it is trivial to rote-
memorize 1000 Q&A. You have carefully avoided providing any proof of
that statement even though requested many times.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1465. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 04:44:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C902AC3.7D525B94@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37460

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > KC8PMX wrote:
> > > > And what have you personally done in attempt to "turn those tables around?"
> > >
> > > For one thing, been subject to lots of abuse from the code haters for my
> > > opinions, which were formed from lots of experience.
> >
> > The reason that you get so much "abuse", Dick, is because you make such
> > outrageous statements, devoid of any semblance of reality.
>
> To you, any statement not in keeping with your worldview
> is "outrageous".
> If you think it's outrageous, it is probably just about
> right.

I think your statement that CW falls through the cracks in Shannon's
theorem is outrageous. I think your statement that all the troublemakers
on HF cheated on their code exams is outrageous. I think your attempts
to encourage newcomers to try to rote-memorize 1000 Q&A is outrageous.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1466. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 04:47:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C902B6B.FCAEDF81@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37461

Dick Carroll wrote:
> These
> anti-code people have some really strange twists to their
> tails, and they are of a permanent set.

I would say that anyone who tells newcomers that they won't choose
to learn Morse code after the code requirement is dropped is no
friend of Morse code.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1467. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 04:52:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C902C8B.13EF5ED4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37462

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> The Welfare State was a bad thing for former slaves;

Larry, the slaves were freed in the 1860's. The Welfare State
started with the New Deal some 77 or so years later. Most
of the former slaves were dead by then.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1468. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 04:55:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C902D27.F24B4AC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37463

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Just because the slaves were freed didn't mean they stopped working.
>
> Sure they did. The guilty liberals even created a Welfare State so
> they wouldn't have to.

Uhhhhh Larry, the Welfare State started about 77 years after the
slaves were freed. How many former slaves lived to see the New Deal?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1469. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 04:57:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C902D9C.E9F58137@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37464

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Valentine Germann wrote:
> > > What is too easily
> > > attained lacks proper appreciation; what is cheap,
> > > in both time and money, lacks value.
> >
> > Really? Cut off your oxygen supply for three minutes and
> > then get back to us.
>
> Clearly you have no understanding of human endeavor.

Try going without oxygen for three minutes, Dick, and get
back to us.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1470. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 05:08:37 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6pbceiro1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37465

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C895769.8BEB69E2@worldnet.att.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:

> >Dick wrote"
> > > been that some code testing is necessary if any substantial
> > > numbers of hams are to become qualified as CW operators.
> >
> > DICK...you lose because your statement is nothing but wild
> > speculation.
>
> Just look at that....from a board member of No Code International, yet!
> Amazing!

The truth is always amazing.

> > Additionally you still fail to provide anyone with what
> > YOU consider "substantial" to be. Is it some percentage of
> > licensed hams? Some percentage of active hams? Some
> > finite number (i.e. at least 50,ooo US hams, N number of
> > worldwide hams?)
>
> You'd like me to put some numbers up so you can pick away at them,
> whatever
> they are? And you say there might be some number you would agree with?
> Right!

I don't care because there is no need for agreement. I'm just
curious because you toss out the "substantial" statement and
never wat to quantify what that means.

> > > Without any test whatever, so few will ever do so
> > > that CW as a mode is gone in the period of a generation or so.
> >
> > Just like there are no longer any archery enthusiasts,
> > just like there are no more drivers of manual gearbox
> > vehicles, just like there are no more (insert any
> > number of activities that survive based solely on
> > volunteers to keep the interests alive).
>
> So your total viewpoint of radiotelegraphy is that it is nothing more
> than a novelty, of no use whatever for actually communicating.

Huh? Your conclusion is based on what logic? Is CW of use
to those that want to use it? Sure it is...BUT that doesn't
mandate a morse test requirement. That's the issue you keep

missing.

> No other
> attitude could generate such an speil.

Nobody said you have to like it.

> > > That is the future,
> > > based on past history.
> >
> > What past history? How about some examples to give you
> > claim at least a semblence of credibility?
> >
> > > Ignore it as you wish, but no whitewash will alter it.
> >
> > No whitewash is needed. Your "fear" is akin to crying
> > wolf when there is none.
>
> You live across the river from a big hole in the ground where not
> long ago there sat a pair of huge buildings, and you don't believe that
> similar
> acts could come from the use of unrestricted use of ham radio
> communications.

It could be the result of lots of things. Ham radio isn't likly
to be the preferred method. You are free to disagree.

> "Gee, they can already use the telephone system or the internet". So all
> is
> well, FCC will just let hams do whatever they want, wherever they decide
> to do it on their authorized frequencies. Rent a clue, would ya?

The FCC already allows more than sufficient coding schemes that
clandistine communications would probably go undetected
even today.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1471. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 05:24:01 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a6ptir01qf@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 37475

I would have to agree that the morse code would also need 100% undivided attention from me also. There are alot of other things that I can do under the guise of "multi-tasking" though. Always have been that way.... parents thought I may have been ADD but it was just a matter of either I had alot going on in my mind or I just didn't give a shit about what they were necessarily were concerned with. Guess that goes for most teenagers eh? :)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C8F7901.33F5A5C7@IEEE.org...
> KC8PMX wrote:
> >
> > Is it ADD or is it just that some people can think of multiple things at
the
> > same time? Kinda like "multitasking" in a different form?
>
> I can multitask certain things but CW takes my undivided attention.
> On a related note, I cannot write on a chalk board and talk at
> the same time. Apparently, writing takes my undivided attention.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1472. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 05:40:25 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C9037C9.524376D8@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 37466

Dick Carroll wrote:

> I was once called by the owner of a 100kwERP FM small market station who couldn't
> get it to turn on. His regular "last resort emergency call" person was out of town
> and had given him my name to call if he had to have some technical help. Though I
> had never seen this transmitter before, I quickly determined that a thermal time
> delay relay was not closing, and confirmed this with a wire jumper. I asked the
> owner if he had a spare relay (it was a plug-in unit). He said, "Oh, I already
> replaced that with a new, that's not the problem".
> I asked him if he had another spare. He did, I plugged it in, and the transmitter
> came on properly. He was amazed that a new relay could be defective. And all he
> lost this day was a few hours of expensive air time.
>

I would guess if he didn't have that extra spare relay, he would have
insisted you just leave that wire jumper in long term.... I suppose the
time delay relay was to protect the tube finals from getting their cathodes
stripped by B+ before the heaters got them warmed up. Or so I've
heard.

>
> When I last did broadcast engineering, solid state transmitters were not yet in
> widespread use.
> If their use changed broadcasting as much as they have changed ham radio operations
> in areas such as thermal stability and reliability, there will be considerable
> differences. But there still remains antenna systems, and not that much seems to
> change in that area.

I seem to live in a null of a local AM station WSNR 620KHz. Sounds like
not enough carrier to properly demodulate with an envelope detector. The
carrier must be getting canceled out, they have 8 or 12 towers. Don't know
if they have it adjusted right or not... I may live outside the area they care about.

1473. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 05:40:59 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a6ptiu11qf@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 37476

Welcome to reality Dick, that's simply part of life! You are gonna find that in almost any organized group in some form or another. Should I be bitching and whining that I as a recent graduate of the fire academy, that I have had to go through 3 TIMES the amount of training that others in the fire service have had to go through when they went through the training 20 years ago? Hell no, I just grin and bear it and move on with my life. If the tables were turned that I was receiving less training that others years ago, you bet I would find a positive EFFECTIVE outlet to attempt change. Anyone can sit around and complain about "how things used to be," but that means absolutely nothing to the rest of normal society unless positive and usefull action is behind those words. i.e. have you ever written to the FCC or the ARRL or your senators or congresspersons about your feelings on the issue of ham radio??? Ever started a petition drive to elicit change? Do you help to teach others in the benefits of ham radio? Do you teach morse code skills? Ever worked with the media (print, or broadcast media) to promote ham radio in a positive light?

If you have done some or all of those things mentioned, then you probably have some or alot of the right to bitch. And your participation in those activities are GREAT.

Even though I am one of those low-life tech-cb'ers as I have seen us referred to as in these newsgroups and elsewhere, I have done all of those things except for the teaching of the code, since I am not fluent enough to teach others, at least not the way it should be taught, so I illicit the help of others.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

> All well and good, but what will you do when new hams *have no* CW
> > skills?
> >
> > And what have you personally done in attempt to "turn those tables
around?"
> >
> > Ryan KC8PMX
>
> For one thing, been subject to lots of abuse from the code haters for my
> opinions, which were formed from lots of experience.
>
>
>

1474. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 05:42:42 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a6ptj021qf@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 37473

Now you have gone and done it. Using a small part of society to represent
the whole. Doesn't this sound like someone else we know? :)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C8F8357.9B16E637@IEEE.org...
> KC8PMX wrote:
> > Yep Cecil.... you described the Good Ole USA pretty good there!
>
> Naaaaah Ryan, in the USA we have 350 pound people standing in line
> to buy gallons of ice cream with food stamps.
>
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > > Most of the third world hams I know about are of the rich elite class.
> > > The average citizens are worrying about where their next meal is
coming
> > from.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1475. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 05:48:31 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C9039AF.FCF25A23@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 37467

> >
> >I know Extras who can't find the bathroom.
>
> Top of the stairs, first door on the right.
>

No! That's the hall closet. 2nd door on the right
is the bathroom.

1476. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 05:51:38 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C903A69.D8563CCA@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 37468

> > The Extra Class license was never even close to being the equivalent of a
> > degree in electronics, Dick. I bet you walked 5 miles to school, too.

I'd estimate the extra as being worth maybe equal to a 5 credit hour college class. Say twice that if you're an English major.

1477. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 05:55:24 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C903B4C.126DA178@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 37469

N2EY wrote:

>
> Consider these simple facts:
>
> Before April 15, 2000, going from General to Extra required taking two written
> tests, one of 50 questions (for the Advanced) and one of 40 questions (for the
> Extra). After that date, only a single 50 question test, based on the combined
> Q&A pools, was required.

Doesn't mean anything. A test with a hundred easy questions is easier to pass
than
a test with 20 hard questions.

1478. Hi everyone, Re: Fwd: Metals Sunglasses for Free

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 06:40:50 UTC
From: janetpitts@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <be9c09eb.0203132240.4ec6688e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 37470

Yup, is Free, but valid for U.S. residents only.

Get it while stock last!

matthew1977a@yahoo.com (matthew) wrote:
> US only. Regards Kent.
>
> > Got this in an email this morning. Maybe its true :os
> >
> > Neil
> >
> > One of the world largest Sunglasses company is clearing stock.
> > > Get a pair of Sexy Metals Sunglasses model 2002 for free
> > > while stock last. Limited offer on first come first serve only.
> > > http://track.floppybank.com/click-21919-80574
> >
> >
> > --

1479. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 10:44:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314054459.29995.00001317@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 37471

From: "K0HB" K0HB@earthlink.net

>Since Ed participates here in his personal time, there is no requirement
>that his participation on rrap be related in any way to his RFI work, and he
>is free to express his personal views of ARRL issues without any implication
>that those views bear any resemblance to the 'official' ARRL position on any
>matter whatsoever.

It is funny how some of those with whom I disagree end up saying that I only say what I say because I am an ARRL employee. The other version of the theme is that they will blame ARRL for what I say. In either case, it speaks volumes to the weakness of their arguments, because if they could say something more effective to counter my positions, they would. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1480. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 10:48:01 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314054801.29995.00001318@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 37472

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> "ge om ur 579 hr in stlouis mo stlouis mo rig is 100 w to a dipole ant es
>name hr is dick dick bt hw cpi?"
>
>wouldn't make much sense to most new CW ops, it seems.

I have used the Phillips code in CW conversations for the entire time I have been a ham. I have never had a single person tell me that my sending didn't make sense or respond in a way that led me to believe they didn't know what I was saying.

Your imagining the worst about these new hams has taken on a new extreme.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1481. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 10:54:15 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314055415.29995.00001319@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 37474

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> For one thing, been subject to lots of abuse from the code haters for my
>opinions, which were formed from lots of experience.

Dick, I think that most abuse you suffer is due to the abuse you dole out, not your opinions on the issues. After all, there may be others who feel they have to "defend themselves" by calling you names. There might even be a few poor souls who feel they have to "defend themselves" against one person by calling another person names.

Sound familiar?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1482. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 10:58:21 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314055821.29995.00001320@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 37477

>> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>> >What kind of a LAME board IS this, anyway?

>> Now, THAT has the classic signs of being a troll -- a gratuitous insult
>> intended to stir up a reaction.

>Remind you of anyone we know?

Val was closer to Bruce than Dick with that one, Cecil, offering an insult that appears to have little intended use other than stirring up miscontent.

In other areas, Val is a bit more focused and organized than Dick.

I think you are wrong that they are the same individual. The differences are becoming more and more apparent.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1483. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 11:00:10 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314060010.29995.00001321@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 37478

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

> However, the "handwriting
>is on the wall" as far as code testing requirements are concerned
>for the rest of the world, and only time will tell what the future of
>on-the-air CW usage will be.

The things that experienced ops say about the value and use of Morse code will tell a lot more than time about what the future use of on-the-air CW will be.

If hte handwriting is indeed on the wall, maybe the time to start is now.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1484. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 11:01:44 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314060144.29995.00001322@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 37479

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Ask yourself, would a man of Val's alleged statue call a near stranger
>a "Bozo"? I seriously doubt it.

It does rank right up there in social usefulness with "go soak your head" and
"twit."

When Carl called a near-stranger a twit, he apologized.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1485. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 11:06:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314060627.29995.00001323@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 37480

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>IMO, the major problem facing the ARS in the
>future will be in finding recruits, not in being overwhelmed
>by masses of the unwashed. Not everyone likes to talk to
>strangers.

Through all of the changes in ham radio over the decades, Cecil, its ranks have consitently grown in the long run. When is this "finding recruits" problem expected to start?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1486. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 11:13:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314061340.29995.00001324@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 37481

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Tell them why the mode has value and why code is worth learning.
>>
>> When new hams have no CW skills, will you keep telling them that it is not
>> worth learning because there is no test?
>
> Maybe you can persuade the touchy-feely New Agers with that spiel, but I
>seriously doubt it.

How will you persuade new hams to learn and use Morse code if there is no test, Dick? By telling them that they won't find it worth learning because there is no test or by pronouncing tha all new hams are touchy-feely New Agers?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1487. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 11:16:50 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314061650.29995.00001325@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 37482

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> My personal experience tells me that given the choices and conditions noted
>that
>I would have a better chance of passing traffic on 40 meter CW than on 75
>meter
>SSB.

You and I would, Dick, but we chose to develop our Morse code skills to that point.

Most hams could not handle formal CW traffic under conditions where static or a failing band had made SSB unintelligible. The CW testing that the FCC has done to date has not resulted in most hams being skilled enough on CW to be able to use it reliably under the conditions that you claim justify its continued testing.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1488. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 11:19:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314061925.29995.00001326@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 37483

From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)

>"Decent equipment" will do at least a 250 Hz CW bandwidth, Ed.

I wonder how many hams have 250 Hz filters in their rigs? I have a 500 Hz filter; is my equipment indecent?

>Wasn't propagation one of the reasons given for amateurs needing a 60 meter >band?

Yes, which will make it an even better choice to change frequency instead of change mode as the first choice most of the time under failing conditions.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1489. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 11:21:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314062148.29995.00001327@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 37484

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> We notice that you have not annoyed yourself and learned that trivial set
>> of 1000 Russian words.

>Good. So you have noticed I avoid silly games.

I would think that you would do it just to annoy Cecil -- if you really believe that memorizing 1000 things without understanding is trivial. The choice of Russian was to demonstrate to everyone that there is no understanding involved.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1490. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 11:27:52 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314062752.29995.00001330@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 37485

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> YOU lost the point, or more likely deliberately dumped it. The point has
>always
>been that some code testing is necessary if any substantial numbers of hams
>are to
>become qualified as CW operators. Without any test whatever, so few will ever
>do so
>that CW as a mode is gone in the period of a generation or so.

You keep saying that. Will you continue to say that after the test is dropped?
Don't you think that new hams reading an old-time CW op telling them that very
few new hams will find CW useful enough to learn it will discourage them from
doing so?

>That is the future, based on past history.
What past history about the removal of code testing are you basing your opinion
on?

>Ignore it as you wish, but no whitewash will alter it

Whitewash won't alter it, Dick, but the things that old-time CW ops say about
CW will.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1491. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 11:35:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314063556.29995.00001331@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 37486

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>You certainly cannot read CW in a 31 Hz
>communications channel.

The EME guys do it all the time, Cecil, in real time. I have listened to some of the EME enthusiast .wav files of CW in a 25 Hz bandwidth -- strangely hollow, but deciperhable by ear.

>You are making a fool of yourself by comparing
>apples and oranges.

There are plenty of opportunities to make a fool of one's self, but this wasn't one of them.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1492. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 11:37:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314063756.29995.00001332@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 37487

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>For that matter, why would I *want*
>to close it down to 31 hz and lose my CW copy also?

Why would reducing the receiver bandwidth to 31 Hz cause you to lose CW copy?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1493. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 12:06:08 UTC
From: "Glenn D. Roberson" <kg5uc1@charter.net>
Message-ID: <3C909230.4000101@charter.net>
Source record: 37488
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

N4IXT wrote:

>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:a5hp6o$em7$3@slb1.atl.mindspring.net...
>
>>"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
>>news:WWDe8.48860$2v1.1626491@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
>>
>>>I'm told by a local Radio Shack manager that it is a policy of Radio
>>>
>Shack
>
>>>(Tandy, Inc.) not
>>>to sell amateur equipment to unlicensed persons.
>>>
>>When did that policy go into effect?
>>
>>How is it checked?
>>
>
>>...snip
>>
>
>>I've purchased from RS and never been asked for a ham
>>license. 2m amp was bought on sale about 2 yrs ago. No
>>questions asked.
>>
>
>I'm curious about this "policy" myself. My wife bought me a 10 m rig from
>them in 2000 for Christmas (she's a nonham). Plus, I've never been asked for
>my license when buying stuff there.
>
>There's another sticky issue I haven't seen mentioned either, the secondary
>market. If I resell a radio, do *I* now have to check for licenses? What a
>pain that would be. Would put a crimp in many a hamfest.
>
> Robert / N4IXT
>
>
I really don't understand what is so hard to grasp about this concept.

If you read Part 97, it is not illegal to buy, own, build, or use Ham
equipment to receive Ham radio communication. The only thing that
requires a Ham license is to TRANSMITTING on Ham frequencies, same as

any other service.

No, if you resell a radio, you don't have to check if the buyer is licensed. It would be wise to inform the buyer that a Ham license is required to transmit on those frequencies, but it is up to the buyer to get the required license or to refrain from transmitting.

Now, I haven't read Part 97 recently, so if I am wrong, I would be most interested in the part of Part 97 or any of the FCC R&Rs that proves that I am wrong.

--

73 from Glenn - KG5UC

1494. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 12:59:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89830D.B26EA81E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37489

N2EY wrote:

> In article <3C8F8020.D7791ED3@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >> >Why would a digital engineer know what AGC is, Dick?
> >>
> >> The person quoted is both an EE and an Extra, Cecil.
> >
> >I know Extras who can't find the bathroom.
>
> Top of the stairs, first door on the right.

Haw Haw Haw!!!

1495. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 12:59:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89E448.4DFE1512@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37490

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > Not that long ago most all routine CW conversations included much of this
> > > > economy of verbiage. Today it's not so common at all, seems everyone thinks it
> > > > all needs to be spelled out.
> > > >
> > > > "ge om ur 579 hr in stlouis mo stlouis mo rig is 100 w to a dipole ant es
> > > > name hr is dick dick bt hw cpi?"
> > > >
> > > > wouldn't make much sense to most new CW ops, it seems.
> > >
> > > And that's NOT an advantage, Dick.
> >
> > Tell us about it. Would it be a problem if new hams learned
> > to use CW well?
>
> After 51 years as a ham, even I don't know all the CW abbreviations.

>

After 51 years you, particularly, don't know the CW abbreviations. Most CW ops of long tenure do. Many of them don't use many of them so as not to confuse the newer ops. I think they should, as a training thing.

> How are
> you going to force new hams to learn them?

And where did I say I was, Sir Troll? But even through your fog you should be able to discern that it would be helpful in the pursuit of CW.

1496. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 12:59:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89E51C.9FBFB72B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37492

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > >The hams who
> > > were attracted to CW would have learned Morse code.
> >
> > Uh-hunh. And exactly what was it that attracted them to the
> > code?
> > Answer: THE LICENSE! Darn few were attracted to the code
> > just for the code itself, and you SHOULD know it.
>
> Most of the Novices of my time were attracted to ham radio
> because CW could be used as a *tool* for making radio
> contacts. You seem to have allowed the means to an end to
> become the end in itself, i.e. wagging the dog.

You prefer to dump the dog onto a busy freeway. Cw is a valid,
useful communications mode
which was necessary for Novices to learn because it was their only
authorized HF mode, deliberately made that way by the FCC so that
they WOULD learn it. Nice job of ignoring reality.

1497. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 12:59:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89E5D9.B0E11F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37491

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Just because
> > someone doesn't deserve help for whatever reason does not mean he won't get it.
>
> HUH?????????

" HUH?" Still with comprehension problems? Even a child killer gets a trial. An ailing
murderer gets medical treatment. People who refuse to bother themselves to help others get help themselves from other people. Most of us are that way. Sorry you see it differently.

1498. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 12:59:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89E6D6.78D823C7@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37493

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > You are the foolish one, Dick. You were esssentially listening to an IF
> > > frequency.
> >
> > Of course! What do you think set the parameters of my
> > receiver? I had
> > SOME control over the IF bandpass, but it sure didn't go so
> > far as to be able to
> > close it down to 31HZ. For that matter, why would I *want*
> > to close it down to 31 hz and lose my CW copy also?
>
> Then you were comparing apples and oranges. PSK31 was trying to work through
> a 31 Hz filter. A fair comparison would have you trying to copy CW through
> a 31 Hz filter. Why is that concept so hard to grasp? To directly compare
> PSK to CW, you must use the same power and the same bandwidth.
> --

No, I don't "must", YOU Must. I'm the practical guy, and you're the theorist,
remember?
I use what works, while you carp about it.
While you do the comparisons, and cancel the working mode in favor of the one
which can't find a way to make it through, I'll be on the air. You'll be sitting
contemplating mode failure.

1499. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 12:59:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89E700.33A05628@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37494

CAM wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >I know Extras who can't find the bathroom.
> >
> > Top of the stairs, first door on the right.
>
> I thought so. There's no door at the top of the stairs - just the attic.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Any port in a storm. Maybe you had too much Port.

1500. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 12:59:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89E8AD.D7837212@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37495

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > KC8PMX wrote:
> > > > > And what have you personally done in attempt to "turn those tables around?"
> > > > >
> > > > > For one thing, been subject to lots of abuse from the code haters for my
> > > > > opinions, which were formed from lots of experience.
> > > >
> > > > The reason that you get so much "abuse", Dick, is because you make such
> > > > outrageous statements, devoid of any semblance of reality.
> > >
> > > To you, any statement not in keeping with your worldview
> > > is "outrageous".
> > > If you think it's outrageous, it is probably just about
> > > right.
> >
> > I think your statement that CW falls through the cracks in Shannon's
> > theorem is outrageous.

But that's not what I said, of course. I said "maybe" it does.

> I think your statement that all the troublemakers
> on HF cheated on their code exams is outrageous.

Again, that's not what I said.I said I was rather sure that "some of them" did.

> I think your attempts
> to encourage newcomers to try to rote-memorize 1000 Q&A is outrageous.

Still lying about what I say or said. I stated what learned, from some of them, they were doing. Val Germann comes along and confirms that most students who are not technically trained find it easier to do just that, and you ignore it.

It's pretty clear, Cecil. There is nothing on RRAP nearly as outrageous as you. Not even your dear buddy W5TIT.

1501. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 12:59:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89E9BA.A7E2BEDA@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37496

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > These
> > anti-code people have some really strange twists to their
> > tails, and they are of a permanent set.
>
> I would say that anyone who tells newcomers that they won't choose
> to learn Morse code after the code requirement is dropped is no
> friend of Morse code.
>

So what's so strange about stating the facts? Facts proven clearly by history and personal experience? Did NCI appear out of the mist for no reason? Did the no-coded tech just happen along out of mid air? Dream all you want. When code testing is no longer in the picture, the vast majority of newcomers will skip it. Fact. They "dont have time" to learn "a ancient useless mode" now, what causes you to think that will change because the test no longer requires it?

1502. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 12:59:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89EA8F.B218AFB8@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37497

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C895769.8BEB69E2@worldnet.att.net...
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > >Dick wrote"
> > > > been that some code testing is necessary if any substantial
> > > > numbers of hams are to become qualified as CW operators.
> > >
> > > DICK...you lose because your statement is nothing but wild
> > > speculation.
> >
> > Just look at that....from a board member of No Code International, yet!
> > Amazing!
> >
> The truth is always amazing.

To you it sure seems to always be.

>
>
> > > Additionally you still fail to provide anyone with what
> > > YOU consider "substantial" to be. Is it some percentage of
> > > licensed hams? Some percentage of active hams? Some
> > > finite number (i.e. at least 50,ooo US hams, N number of
> > > worldwide hams?)
> >
> > You'd like me to put some numbers up so you can pick away at them,
> > whatever
> > they are? And you say there might be some number you would agree with?
> > Right!
> >
> I don't care because there is no need for agreement. I'm just
> curious because you toss out the "substantial" statement and
> never wat to quantify what that means.
>
> > > > Without any test whatever, so few will ever do so
> > > > that CW as a mode is gone in the period of a generation or so.
> > >
> > > Just like there are no longer any archery enthusiasts,
> > > just like there are no more drivers of manual gearbox
> > > vehicles, just like there are no more (insert any
> > > number of activities that survive based solely on
> > > volunteers to keep the interests alive).

> >
> > So your total viewpoint of radiotelegraphy is that it is nothing more
> > than a novelty, of no use whatever for actually communicating.
>
> Huh? Your conclusion is based on what logic? Is CW of use
> to those that want to use it? Sure it is...BUT that doesn't
> mandate a morse test requirement. That's the issue you keep
> missing.
>
> > No other
> > attitude could generate such an speil.
>
> Nobody said you have to like it.
>
> > > > That is the future,
> > > > based on past history.
> > >
> > > What past history? How about some examples to give you
> > > claim at least a semblence of credibility?
> > >
> > > > Ignore it as you wish, but no whitewash will alter it.
> > >
> > > No whitewash is needed. Your "fear" is akin to crying
> > > wolf when there is none.
> >
> > You live across the river from a big hole in the ground where not
> > long ago there sat a pair of huge buildings, and you don't believe that
> > similar
> > acts could come from the use of unrestricted use of ham radio
> > communications.
>
> It could be the result of lots of things. Ham radio isn't likly
> to be the preferred method. You are free to disagree.
>
> > "Gee, they can already use the telephone system or the internet". So all
> > is
> > well, FCC will just let hams do whatever they want, wherever they decide
> > to do it on their authorized frequencies. Rent a clue, would ya?
>
> The FCC already allows more than sufficient coding schemes that
> clandistine communications would probably go undetected
> even today.
>

And that means, to you, they should just go ahead and drop all such
regulation, since they are violated anyway. CB at its finest.

1503. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 12:59:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89EBAD.69B6C508@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37498

Robert Casey wrote:

> > >
> > >I know Extras who can't find the bathroom.
> >
> > Top of the stairs, first door on the right.
> >
>
> No! That's the hall closet. 2nd door on the right
> is the bathroom.

Hall closet will do for Cecil.

1504. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 12:59:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89ECFF.8DE07999@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37499

Robert Casey wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
>
> >
> > Consider these simple facts:
> >
> > Before April 15, 2000, going from General to Extra required taking two written
> > tests, one of 50 questions (for the Advanced) and one of 40 questions (for the
> > Extra). After that date, only a single 50 question test, based on the combined
> > Q&A pools, was required.
>
> Doesn't mean anything. A test with a hundred easy questions is easier to pass
> than
> a test with 20 hard questions.

Problem is, the hundred question test was the hard one. It had no nonsense VE questions and other fluff. What you got was all real test questions.

I think becoming a VE should require a separate test over nothing but VE subject matter, administered by the VE's without any FCC involvement. It would require no further action by FCC and thus no added burden. Would be easy to implement

1505. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 12:59:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89EBEC.30BF2C97@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37500

Robert Casey wrote:

> > > The Extra Class license was never even close to being the equivalent of a
> > > degree in electronics, Dick. I bet you walked 5 miles to school, too.
>
> I'd estimate the extra as being worth maybe equal to a 5 credit hour college
> class. Say twice that if you're an English major.

That's being a bit liberal with today's tests.

1506. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 12:59:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89F154.21366A3B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37501

Robert Casey wrote:

>I quickly determined that a thermal time

> > delay relay was not closing, and confirmed this with a wire jumper. I asked the
> > owner if he had a spare relay (it was a plug-in unit). He said, "Oh, I already
> > replaced that with a new, that's not the problem".
> > I asked him if he had another spare. He did, I plugged it in, and the transmitter
> > came on properly. He was amazed that a new relay could be defective. And all he
> > lost this day was a few hours of expensive air time.
> >
>
> I would guess if he didn't have that extra spare relay, he would have
> insisted you just leave that wire jumper in long term....

That could have worked out, he could have had a relay sent by fast shipping for next morning arrival. The transmitter could have been turned on with the jumper in place, but whoever turned it on would need to wait the amount of time the relay normally took to time down before punching the HV on switch.

> I suppose the
> time delay relay was to protect the tube finals from getting their cathodes
> stripped by B+ before the heaters got them warmed up. Or so I've
> heard.

That's the reason for the time delay, to protect that expensive tube.

>
>
> >
>
> I seem to live in a null of a local AM station WSNR 620KHz. Sounds like
> not enough carrier to properly demodulate with an envelope detector. The
> carrier must be getting canceled out, they have 8 or 12 towers. Don't know
> if they have it adjusted right or not... I may live outside the area they care about.

If you happen to be located in a deep null that would explain it. It would be like you were almost out of range of the station. An array with that many elements would produce some deep nulls.
I rarely listen to AM these days, but for a time after the licensing change there were some real cruddy sounding stations out there. Particularly modulation problems, both over and undermodulating. And hum problems. As noted earlier, some of it may have been intended, for some particular "effect".

1507. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 12:59:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89F375.7A785E8D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37502

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > "ge om ur 579 hr in stlouis mo stlouis mo rig is 100 w to a dipole ant es
> >name hr is dick dick bt hw cpi?"
> >
> >wouldn't make much sense to most new CW ops, it seems.
>
> I have used the Phillips code in CW conversations for the entire time I have
> been a ham. I have never had a single person tell me that my sending didn't
> make sense or respond in a way that led me to believe they didn't know what I
> was saying.
>
> Your imagining the worst about these new hams has taken on a new extreme.

Your mischaracterization of what I say has certainly reached a new low, right along with Cecil's. Read it again, Ed. I said I hear lots of plain language CW QSO's these days with few newcomers using abbreviations. I conclude that because they're not being used, they are not known by newcomers, and some not-so-newcomers. Even here on rrap, a relatively new Extra class ham didn't know know many of them, and wanted me to send him a copy of an old list of abbreviations I told him that I had been given by an OT friend from many years ago. I scanned it and emailed it to him.

So all that equated to me "imagining the worst" about new hams. That one is right up there with Cecil's trolling "conclusions".

1508. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 12:59:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89F4AE.D14813C3@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37504

W1RFI wrote:

>
> How will you persuade new hams to learn and use Morse code if there is no test,
> Dick

The answer to that seems crystal clear, from the experience of the last decade-

YOU WON'T!

1509. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 12:59:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89F558.60B94785@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37503

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > My personal experience tells me that given the choices and conditions noted
> >that
> >I would have a better chance of passing traffic on 40 meter CW than on 75
> >meter
> >SSB.
>
> You and I would, Dick, but we chose to develop our Morse code skills to that
> point.
>
> Most hams could not handle formal CW traffic under conditions where static or a
> failing band had made SSB unintelligible. The CW testing that the FCC has done
> to date has not resulted in most hams being skilled enough on CW to be able to
> use it reliably under the conditions that you claim justify its continued
> testing.

Ah, the "perfection" test. If FCC testing doesn't do a perfect job, abandon it. I see.

1510. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 12:59:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89F5D4.133D448@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37505

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> We notice that you have not annoyed yourself and learned that trivial set
> >> of 1000 Russian words.
>
> >Good. So you have noticed I avoid silly games.
>
> I would think that you would do it just to annoy Cecil -- if you really believe
> that memorizing 1000 things without understanding is trivial. The choice of
> Russian was to demonstrate to everyone that there is no understanding involved.

Memorizing word associations in English is quite different than memorizing a
foreign language, but you already know that.

1511. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 12:59:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89F657.3643AEE9@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37506

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "K0HB" K0HB@earthlink.net
>
> >Since Ed participates here in his personal time, there is no requirement
> >that his participation on rrap be related in any way to his RFI work, and he
> >is free to express his personal views of ARRL issues without any implication
> >that those views bear any resemblance to the 'official' ARRL position on any
> >matter whatsoever.
>
> It is funny how some of those with whom I disagree end up saying that I only
> say what I say because I am an ARRL employee

But Ed, you said long ago that your employers know that you wouldn't say anything that is against ARRL policy. Whatever that meant to you, it's clear to us that you aren't exactly independent of the League in your posting here.

1512. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 13:00:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89F76F.C7E88843@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37507

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > For one thing, been subject to lots of abuse from the code haters for my
> >opinions, which were formed from lots of experience.
>
> Dick, I think that most abuse you suffer is due to the abuse you dole out, not
> your opinions on the issues

Yeah, I really abused Cecil before he started his crap. Right.

1513. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 13:00:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C89FA9B.A0A9BB33@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37508

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >For that matter, why would I *want*
> >to close it down to 31 hz and lose my CW copy also?
>
> Why would reducing the receiver bandwidth to 31 Hz cause you to lose CW copy?

Unless Cecil is obfuscating again it surely will, since the PSK31 couldn't make it in its 31hz channel, in those conditions at the time. CW couldn't either, according to Cecil. He's leaning on Shannon, of course.

1514. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 13:02:23 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6q7ul$h2l$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37512

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C903A69.D8563CCA@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
>
> > > The Extra Class license was never even close to being the equivalent
of a
> > > degree in electronics, Dick. I bet you walked 5 miles to school, too.
>
> I'd estimate the extra as being worth maybe equal to a 5 credit hour
college
> class. Say twice that if you're an English major.

I'd agree too. Not all in one class, but the Extra material of the
1950s/60s
fell into a handful of different classes (DC, AC, RF, etc.) from a two year
associate program.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1515. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 13:04:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203140504.584b361a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 37509

Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv) <kf2ti@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:<a6p4vn$bc0$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> In article <20020313220343.14946.00000212@mb-fy.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> says...
> > In article <qlNj8.9460$Ex5.890621@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "K7JEB"
> > <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> writes:
> >
> > >CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > >> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >> > Clues? You're a complete and dismal failure as a "detective", Sir
> > >> > Cecil.
> > >>
> > >> As a detective, I made a good engineer.
> > >> --
> > >> cheers, CAM, W5DXP
> > >
> > >
> > >It's a dark night in the city. But in a small office
> > >up on the 12th floor of the Acme Building, one man
> > >still ponders the vagaries of human nature.....
> > >
> > >Cecil Noir, Private Eye.

> > He walks again by night.
> > Out of the fog, into the smog. hack hack cough cough
> > Relentlessly...
> > Doggedly... (woof-woof)
> > Ruthlessly...("I wonder where Ruth is?")
> > At Fourth and Drucker he turns right.
> > At Drucker and Fourth he turns left.
> > He crosses MacArthur Park and walks into a great sandstone building (OUCH! My
> > nose!)
> He climbs the 13 stairs
> He's ready for action
> He's ready for danger
>
> He's......
>
> > Nick Danger - Third Eye.
> >
> > 73 de Jim "Everything You Know Is Wrong" N2EY
>
> Good afternoon Mr Danger
> allow me to introduce myself

>
> I am Rocky Anderson...errr Ricco

Rocky Rococo, I presume

(everyone knew her as Nancy)
>
> 73 de Steve "How can you be in 2 places at once when you're not anywhere
> at all" KF2TI
>
>
> If you're gonna do it do it right

Too many BWB's ("It's in the water!") followed by a demonstration of
Fudd's first law of opposition..
>
> Hey Pallo..he broke de president Uhh Jim!!!

This is Worker speaking..

"Why does the porridge bird lay her egg in the air?"

73 de Jim "Forty Two" N2EY

1516. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 13:09:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314080946.23205.00000270@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 37511

In article <20020308080039.06044.00000385@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
>> I merely
>>state what I know to be factual, and as you can see it is once again backed
>>up by
>>
>>authoritative sources.
>
>Ultimately, it is an authorative source that arbitrates all of this, Dick --
>the only authorative source in Amateur Radio.
>
>Would you like to bring up what that source has to say about the question
>pools
>and need for code exams, or are you selective in your "authorative sources?"
>
Does a "definitive expert" qualify as an "authoritative source"?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1517. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 13:10:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203140510.3d8da1a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 37510

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C8FEDB3.B5CA897@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C8F7A5A.699B77D@IEEE.org>...
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > The point has always
> > > > been that some code testing is necessary if any substantial numbers of hams are to
> > > > become qualified as CW operators. Without any test whatever, so few will ever do so
> > > > that CW as a mode is gone in the period of a generation or so. That is the future,
> > > > based on past history.
> > >
> > > Wrong! During the only time in history that a code exam was not required,
> > > amateur radio use of Morse code exploded. Besides that time, there is no
> > > history of amateur radio without a code test requirment.
> >
> > Which times are you talking about, Cecil?
> >
> > Before 1912, there was no mandatory licensing of amateur stations. Since 1991,
> > there has been a class of amateur license in the USA with no code test.
> >
> > Has amateur radio use of Morse code "exploded" since 1991?
>
> I should have said, "Besides that time, there is no history of HF amateur radio
> without a code test requirement."

Again you are mistaken.

Before 1912, the frequencies we now call "HF" were considered all but
useless.
Pre-1912 "amateur" radio was done on wavelengths we would call "MF"
today. The hams of those days were mostly using wavelengths of 500 to
200 meters (600-1500
kHz).

> I assumed that was understood.

Doesn't matter - you're still mistaken.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1518. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 13:16:10 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6q7um$h2l$2@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37513
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Glenn D. Roberson" <kg5uc1@charter.net> wrote in message
news:3C909230.4000101@charter.net...
> N4IXT wrote:
>
> >"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >
> >>"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> >>>I'm told by a local Radio Shack manager that it is a policy of Radio
> >>>Radio Shack.
> >
> >>>(Tandy, Inc.) not
> >>>to sell amateur equipment to unlicensed persons.
> >>>
> >>When did that policy go into effect?
> >>How is it checked?
> >
> >>...snip
> >
> >>I've purchased from RS and never been asked for a ham
> >>license. 2m amp was bought on sale about 2 yrs ago. No
> >>questions asked.
> >
> >I'm curious about this "policy" myself. My wife bought me a 10 m rig from
> >them in 2000 for Christmas (she's a nonham). Plus, I've never been asked
for
> >my license when buying stuff there.
> >
> >There's another sticky issue I haven't seen mentioned, the secondary
> >market. If I resell a radio, do *I* now have to check for licenses?
> >What a pain that would be. Would put a crimp in many a hamfest.
> > Robert / N4IXT
>
> I really don't understand what is so hard to grasp about this concept.
>
> If you read Part 97, it is not illegal to buy, own, build, or use Ham
> equipment to receive Ham radio communication. The only thing that
> requires a Ham license is to TRANSMITTING on Ham frequencies, same as
> any other service.

100% Correct.

> No, if you resell a radio, you don't have to check if the buyer is
> licensed. It would be wise to inform the buyer that a Ham license is
> required to transmit on those frequencies, but it is up to the buyer to

> get the required license or to refrain from transmitting.

100% Correct

> Now, I haven't read Part 97 recently, so if I am wrong, I would be most
> interested in the part of Part 97 or any of the FCC R&Rs that proves
> that I am wrong.
> 73 from Glenn - KG5UC

You are 100% correct. The discussion centered on the
supposed Radio Shack policy to not sell ham equipment
(HTs/transmitters/transcievers) to non-hams. No one ever
provided any validation that RS was not sellling to
anyone...licensed or not...as my example and others
stipulated above..

Additionally, this discussion periodically pops up when
someone suggest that it should be illegal to sell to
non-hams or for non-hams to purchase or possess
ham HTs/transmitters/transcievers.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1519. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 13:32:31 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6q8t9$2i1$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37514

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C89ECFF.8DE07999@worldnet.att.net...
> ...
> I think becoming a VE should require a separate test over nothing but VE
subject
> matter, administered by the VE's without any FCC involvement. It would
require no
> further action by FCC and thus no added burden. Would be easy to implement

I fully agree with that.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1520. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 13:48:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6q9qn$ic2$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37515

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C89E9BA.A7E2BEDA@worldnet.att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > These anti-code people have some really strange twists to
> > > their tails, and they are of a permanent set.
> >
> > I would say that anyone who tells newcomers that they won't choose
> > to learn Morse code after the code requirement is dropped is no
> > friend of Morse code.
>
> So what's so strange about stating the facts? Facts proven clearly by
> history and personal experience?

Let's look at YOUR facts that you believe supports your
statement above.

> Did NCI appear out of the mist for no reason?

The reason for NCI in NO way, except your own fantacies,
can be construed to inhibit, prevent, or discourage newcomers
from learning code. NCI exists to end code testing as
a requirement...NCI does NOT oppose code use or
learning code by newcomers. To learn or not should be
the choice of the individual ham.

> Did the no-coded tech just happen along out of mid air?

It has existed for over 10 years. So what? Was the nocode
tech created to inhibit, prevent, or discourage newcomers
from learning code? That was never part of the discussion,
comments, etc....except for the "sky-is-falling" code advocates
that demanded code testing rather as a souce of new code
users to avoid taking on the challenge themselves to recruit,
encourage and promote new hams to learn and use code.

> Dream all you want.

Dick's favorite line when he hasn't a shred of evidence
to support his fantasy.

> When code testing is no longer in the picture, the vast
> majority of newcomers will skip it.

Probably so...just as the majority (how much is vast anyway?)
skips it today. That doesn't mean there won't be a

following of new morse advocates...of course that number
of new advocates will likly be smaller given Dick's attitude
toward being a positive morse advocate and role model.

> Fact. They "dont have time" to
> learn "a ancient useless mode" now, what causes you to think that will
> change because the test no longer requires it?

Your problem...once again, is you are the lazy one who
wants government subsidies via a morse test requirement
to bring in future code advocates rather than doing
it yourself by example, marketing and recruiting for morse.

No cheers today,
Bill K2UNK

1521. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 14:46:42 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u91ctf7piq7qdc@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37516

N2EY wrote:

>I think we're all Bozos on this bus.

I want to apologize for calling Mr. Sohl a "bozo."
That was wrong of me. One strength of these
newsgroups is that the relative distance it pro-
vides leads to plain speaking. A weakness is
that this same distance can lead to rudeness.

I plead guilty to crossing over the line at times.

Val

1522. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 14:52:13 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u91d7pbqmmuq31@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37517

K7JEB wrote, MANY times yesterday:

>It's a dark night in the city. But in a small office
>up on the 12th floor of the Acme Building, one man
>still ponders the vagaries of human nature.....
>
>Cecil Noir, Private Eye.

I thought it was funny as hell repeated about twenty
times. It mimicked CAM perfectly!

Val

1523. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 14:57:59 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u91dimr1k27q77@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37518

Dick Carroll wrote

>That's the reason for the time delay, to protect that expensive tube.

Way back in the 1960s, when was a high school student with
a Third Class Radiotelephone license, it was my job on occasion
to turn on and off a 10,000 watt FM transmitter that sat right in
front of our board, behind a double pane of glass. The First Class
explained to me the general procedures and why they existed.
And most importantly there was a delay between firing up what
I guess was the driver stage and the "punching of High Voltage."
That thing had tubes in it a foot high and God knows what they cost!
Scary for a kid!

Val

1524. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 15:01:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8A1175.4D192A80@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37519

Dick Carroll wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > > "ge om ur 579 hr in stlouis mo stlouis mo rig is 100 w to a dipole ant es
> > >name hr is dick dick bt hw cpi?"
> > >
> > >wouldn't make much sense to most new CW ops, it seems.
> >
> > I have used the Phillips code in CW conversations for the entire time I have
> > been a ham. I have never had a single person tell me that my sending didn't
> > make sense or respond in a way that led me to believe they didn't know what I
> > was saying.
> >
> > Your imagining the worst about these new hams has taken on a new extreme.
>
> Your mischaracterization of what I say has certainly reached a new low, right
> along with Cecil's. Read it again, Ed. I said I hear lots of plain language CW
> QSO's these days with few newcomers using abbreviations. I conclude that because
> they're not being used, they are not known by newcomers, and some
> not-so-newcomers. Even here on rrap, a relatively new Extra class ham didn't know
> know many of them, and wanted me to send him a copy of an old list of
> abbreviations I told him that I had been given by an OT friend from many years
> ago. I scanned it and emailed it to him.
>
> So all that equated to me "imagining the worst" about new hams. That one is
> right up there with Cecil's trolling "conclusions".

BTW, it's also right in line with your other "conclusions" regarding my attitude
toward new hams.

1525. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 15:02:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8A2386.9D7DF069@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37520

Valentine Germann wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote
>
> >That's the reason for the time delay, to protect that expensive tube.
>
> Way back in the 1960s, when was a high school student with
> a Third Class Radiotelephone license, it was my job on occasion
> to turn on and off a 10,000 watt FM transmitter that sat right in
> front of our board, behind a double pane of glass. The First Class
> explained to me the general procedures and why they existed.
> And most importantly there was a delay between firing up what
> I guess was the driver stage and the "punching of High Voltage."
> That thing had tubes in it a foot high and God knows what they cost!
> Scary for a kid!
>
> Val

Evidently not ever lad in that position learned his lessons so well, so they began putting the delay timing into the power circuitry so that you couldn't jump the gun. It would be easy for a sleepy youth to do.

Dick

1526. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 15:03:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C90BBBE.DD957F54@earthlink.net>
Source record: 37521

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3C8FC52F.2989EF90@earthlink.net>, Herr Robust <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> issued orders once more:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3C8EE381.D2EB806F@earthlink.net>, Herr Robust
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> stepped up on his feldherrnhugel and shouted:

>
> >What you've managed to state in a couple of rather typically long and
> >windy paragraphs is that not everything (including the post to which I
> >now reply) is on topic. Take it up with the newsgroup police.
>
> Heh heh heh, that's what I did. The self-appointed "police" that
> is.

> Now quit rubbing your ceremonial dagger and the twin lightning
> bolts on your collar...

Going into your lame "those who disagree with me are Nazis" routine
again?

> >Smiley discounted. I've already said as much to you, Anderson.
>
> Ah, the self-righteous are angered again. Tsk, tsk, there is no
> peace for them...poor souls. :-)

Where did you get the goofy idea that I'm angry, Leonard H.?

> >Those adjectives are terms used by you to deaden the apparent pain you
> >suffer at being no more than a sidewalk superintendent to amateur radio.
> >That's the case no matter how much baloney you slice.
>
> Your similes need a smiley. :-)
>
> You do not cement anything with your words and your baloney is
> ersatz.

I believe the words I wrote were a truthful representations of your
feeling of being slighted or totally ignored by the amateur radio
community.

> >You can put ten
> >antennas on your car. You can own a CB transceiver and several

> >scanners. You can place an ARRL decal in your front window. You're
> >still not a radio amateur. Does that come through "load" and clear?
>
> Oh, my, aren't you twirling your riot baton with your lil radio cop
> uniform starched and crisp. :-)

...only in your mind, Leon.

> Tsk, tsk, Fearless Leader still doesn't understand. Sigh, once more
> as to children:
>
> The morse code test for an amateur radio license applies only to
> those who are interested in becoming a radio amateur with below-
> 30-MHz privileges. It does NOT affect those already licensed
> who already have those privileges...except in their lil warped
> "leadership" minds who seek to "rule" where they have NO
> authorization.

Any change in the rules for entry into amateur radio; any change which redefines the space available for the modes radio amateurs use effects every radio amateur now matter how long licensed.

> Fearless Leader does NOT rule. He attempts to intimidate, to
> bully others. Tsk, tsk, that cannot be done in a computer-modem
> environment-medium. Fearless Leader keeps on his quest just
> the same, trying to tilt the windmills of his mind. :-)

Do you mean that you don't care to have it pointed out that you are not a radio amateur but only a bystander?

> Presumably Fearless Leader thinks that morsemanship is ALL
> about amateur radio and that all must prove their "worth" to
> him. He cannot abide anyone not going through the same
> rituals and hazing he did.

Nobody going through current licensing procedures takes the same exams which I took so there goes that portion of your rant. I didn't undergo *any* rituals and hazing unless you'd like to consider the ROWF initiation.

> >This isn't a chat room. I only point it out in case you've been damning
> >your ISP for slow access during your "chats".
>
> This newsgroup has become a de facto Chat Room...and part-time
> wind tunnel where the same vanity-callsign air bags wheezingly
> vent their personal frustrations against those who do not buy into
> their bullying tactics.

This is absolutely, with no room for argument, a chat room.
Some of the biggest wind here comes from an individual who has no callsign, vanity or otherwise in the ARS. Now quit making an ARS of yourself.

> See your medical doctor for some medication that might make your
> attitudes more civilized and certainly for those delusions and
> hallucinations you are exhibiting.

Are you addressing me or one of you?

> There is no "damning my ISP" on account of "slow access." AOL
> was already well known for that. :-)

So you've done the same thing about your ISP that you've done about becoming a ham--nuttin'.

> There are no multiple "antennas on my car." There is no "ARRL
> decal" on it, either, nor would there be one for any reason. Amateur
> radio is a hobby, an interesting, enjoyable hobby. Does Fearless
> Leader condemn all who engage in a hobby rather than his idea
> that it should become a lifestyle as He Does It?!? Yes, he does.

Why are you telling me what amateur radio is, Len? I'm already a ham. I know what an interesting and enjoyable hobby it is. You only know what you've heard.

> Fearless Leader does not allow anyone to be "interested" in
> something unless they embrace it totally for the major part of
> their life, to DO AS HE DID or be forever damned. Not a good
> attitude for a human being trying to coexist with others of his
> own species. That is, of course, being optimistic that FL is
> actually a part of all others' species.

There are folks who obtain licenses when they are in their eighties. They are hams. There are folks who obtain a license at fourteen as I did. They are hams. There are folks who have told us about a decades-long interest in amateur radio but who have done zip about obtaining an amateur license. They are not hams. Oh yeah--I don't Florida is a part of all other's species.

Dave K8MN

1527. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 15:05:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8A24C6.49B71B13@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37522

Valentine Germann wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote
>
> >That's the reason for the time delay, to protect that expensive tube.
>
> Way back in the 1960s, when was a high school student with
> a Third Class Radiotelephone license, it was my job on occasion
> to turn on and off a 10,000 watt FM transmitter that sat right in
> front of our board, behind a double pane of glass. The First Class
> explained to me the general procedures and why they existed.
> And most importantly there was a delay between firing up what
> I guess was the driver stage and the "punching of High Voltage."
> That thing had tubes in it a foot high and God knows what they cost!
> Scary for a kid!
>
> Val

Evidently not ever lad in that position learned his lessons
so well, so some
mfgrs. began putting the delay timing into the power
circuitry so that you
couldn't jump the gun. It would be easy for a sleepy youth
to do.

Dick

1528. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 15:22:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C90C026.F8AACD77@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37523

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > How are you going to force new hams to learn them? (CW abbreviations)
>
> And where did I say I was, Sir Troll?

How can asking a question be considered to be a troll?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1529. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 15:28:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C90C19D.D14262AB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37525

Dick Carroll wrote:
> BTW, it's also right in line with your other "conclusions" regarding my attitude
> toward new hams.

Dick, you tell newcomers that rote-memorizing 1000 Q&A is the easy way to pass
a ham exam. After your testimony, why would they do it any other way? Is
that really what you want?

You tell newcomers that CW will die without a code requirement. Why would
newcomers choose to learn a dying mode? If you can get enough newcomers
to believe your prediction, it may come true. Is that really what you
want?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1530. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 15:31:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C90C23E.5DCAFE16@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37526

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > I should have said, "Besides that time, there is no history of HF amateur radio
> > without a code test requirement."
>
> Again you are mistaken.

If so, it is in the direction of proving that there is no history of amateur
HF radio without a code test requirement. Thanks.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1531. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 15:38:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C90C3DD.91935878@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37527

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Most of the Novices of my time were attracted to ham radio
> > because CW could be used as a *tool* for making radio
> > contacts. You seem to have allowed the means to an end to
> > become the end in itself, i.e. wagging the dog.
>
> You prefer to dump the dog onto a busy freeway. Cw is a valid,
> useful communications mode
> which was necessary for Novices to learn because it was their only
> authorized HF mode, deliberately made that way by the FCC so that
> they WOULD learn it. Nice job of ignoring reality.

Reality is that CW is a *tool* of radio communications, Dick. It is
not a religion, creed, or way of life as you seem to believe. You
want the tail (CW) to wag the dog (amateur radio).
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1532. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 15:40:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C90C45E.DF3D6D4B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37529

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > The FCC already allows more than sufficient coding schemes that
> > clandistine communications would probably go undetected
> > even today.
>
> And that means, to you, they should just go ahead and drop all such
> regulation, since they are violated anyway. CB at its finest.

Dick, do you wear a turban while performing your mind reading act?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1533. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 15:44:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C90C547.A768EE01@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37530

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >Without any test whatever, so few will ever
> >do sothat CW as a mode is gone in the period of a generation or so.
>
> You keep saying that. Will you continue to say that after the test is dropped?
> Don't you think that new hams reading an old-time CW op telling them that very
> few new hams will find CW useful enough to learn it will discourage them from
> doing so?

If Dick is correct, CW is a dying mode. Why would any newcomer, listening to
what Dick is saying, choose to expend the effort to learn a dying mode?
Dick obviously wants CW to die as quickly as possible so he will be proven
right. Why else would he tell newcomers that CW is a dying mode?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1534. A View from Across the Fence!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 15:45:10 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u91gb3dmqc897e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37524

Hello, all!

From the Pirate Radio newsgroup, always an interesting
place for an occasional visit, the following:

(The protagonists are "Dr. Slick" and "Blarg".
I've done some slight editing for line length.)

--

On 10 Mar 2002, Dr. Slick wrote:

>Hey!
>There is a loop hole in the FCC's rules. It is legal to broadcast
>without a license when the country is at war or during other emergency
>situations. All you have to do is show that you are in the process of
>applying for a license. An application with a pen on it on your desk is
>sufficient to show due process.
>
>Check out Title 47, sec 73.3542

And I quote, from CFR Title 47 Section 73.3542:

"Authority may be granted, on a temporary basis, in extraordinary
circumstances requiring emergency operation to serve the public
interest."

Also required is...

"Statement of facts which, in the opinion of the applicant,
constitute an emergency to be found by the FCC for the purpose of
this section. This statement must also include the estimated duration
of the emergency and if during an emergency or war declared by the
President or Congress, why such action, without formal application,
is necessary for the national defense or security or in furtherance of
the war effort."

So this transmission MUST have a DIRECT impact on the safety of
the people of the United States of America AND be in the interest of
public defense.

If, for instance, you had an emergency system, a communications
system, or whatnot which was destroyed, you may rebuild without
going through full process. If there is no emergency service available
in an area (such as a rural area), then one may be set up.

"Emergency operating authority issued under this section may be
cancelled or modified by the FCC without prior notice or right to

hearing. See also Sec. 73.1250, Broadcasting Emergency Information, for situations in which emergency operation may be conducted without prior authorization, and Sec. 73.1635, Special Temporary Authorization (STA), for temporary operating authorizations necessitated by circumstances not within the ambit of this section."

Sec 73.1250 states...

"(a) Emergency situations in which the broadcasting of information is considered as furthering the safety of life and property include, but are not limited to the following: Tornadoes, hurricanes, floods, tidal waves, earthquakes, icing conditions, heavy snows, widespread fires, discharge of toxic gasses, widspread power failures, industrial explosions, civil disorders and school closing and changes in school bus schedules resulting from such conditions. See also Sec. 73.3542, Application for Emergency Authorization, for requirements involving emergency situations not covered by this section for which prior operating authority must be requested.

(b) If requested by responsible public officials, a station may, at its discretion, and without further FCC authority, transmit emergency point-to-point messages for the purpose of requesting or dispatching aid and assisting in rescue operations.

(c) If the Emergency Alert System (EAS) is activated for a national emergency while a Local Area or State emergency operation isin progress, the national level EAS operation must take precedence. If, during the broadcasting of Local Area or State emergency information, the EAS codes or Attention Signal described in Sec. 11.12 of this chapter are used, the broadcasts are considered as being carried out under a Local Area or State EAS plan..."

So you see, this does NOT cover a commercial or noncommercial entertainment service.

I'd like to know the names, addresses and telephone numbers of the six attorneys your friend said agreed "that it would be defendable in court".

Your stance that pirates would WANT to be used by the FCC is out of line in your discussion. In that instance, portable EMERGENCY services as you are citing WOULD be covered, however anything other than emergency communications would not be tolerated.

Amateur Radio Operators have authority during emergency services for many reasons. Please see http://www.arrl.org/ and Karen's phenominal site at http://www.ares.org for more information. Here is a link to an article about the Virginia ARES folks ending their services at the Pentagon on 11/19: http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2001/09/19/1/

Citing the above article: "Amateur Radio performed exactly as it was supposed to," [Virginia ARES Section Emergency Coordinator Tom] Gregory said. "We responded to the need to provide communications

where none were available." He said the Virginia ARES organization stands ready to jump in again "at a moment's notice" if the need arises.

I don't feel that your original message has the intention of discussing emergency services. The tone is that you believe the FCC will allow unlicensed radio stations in the guise of national security to be on the air, broadcasting music, chatter, or whatnot.

This is not the case, and any attorney who has an understanding of communications law would tell you the same.

Sorry to burst your bubble, bud.

Blarg!

1535. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 15:46:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C90C5E8.4F0A7733@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37531

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>
> >"Decent equipment" will do at least a 250 Hz CW bandwidth, Ed.
>
> I wonder how many hams have 250 Hz filters in their rigs?

Anyone with an IC-756pro. :-) But I usually use 500 Hz.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1536. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 15:48:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C90C65B.7EED6FAB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37532

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Just because
> > > someone doesn't deserve help for whatever reason does not mean he won't get it.
> > >
> > > HUH?????????
>
> " HUH?" Still with comprehension problems? Even a child killer gets a trial. An
> ailing
> murderer gets medical treatment. People who refuse to bother themselves to help
> others get help themselves from other people. Most of us are that way. Sorry you see
> it differently.

If whether a person deserves help or not doesn't matter to what happens in reality,
why even mention it?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1537. sex now

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 15:49:31 UTC
From: u.s.a@mail.com
Message-ID: <ec0f12fd.0203140749.75ff59b2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 37533

*** *** *** *** FUCK SOMEBODY'S WIFE TONIGHT *** *** *** ***

SEX2GO.COM - The only site by 100% Real Women Just For Men!
CLICK HERE TO GET LAID - http://all.at/free-nude
****

Find your lady tonight. Choose from thousands of REAL WOMEN
looking to give you what you want! They're all AMATEURS and
all HORNY AS HELL!
*** Bored Housewives ***
*** Lonely Neighbors ***
*** Subservient Secretaries ***
*** Horny Teachers ***

THEY'RE ALL REAL!

Read their PROFILES, see their PHOTOS, check out their
PUSSY PICS and FUCK THEM TONIGHT!
CLICK HERE TO GET LAID - http://all.at/free-nude

They're all waiting to give you what you want, so contact them now!

WANT SEX? FIND A WOMAN NOW AT SEX2GO
CLICK HERE TO GET LAID - http://all.at/free-nude
****
Here's what some of our satisfied members have to say about Sex2go
****

"I never believed sex was so easy to get! From the day I joined
Sex2go I haven't stopped fucking! The girls are totally easy and
there are so many in my area. Sex2go is the best place to find a
sure thing!"
Greg M., 27 years old from Hillsboro, Oregon

****

"I found a secret lover on the site and it totally changed my life!
My husband is out of town a lot and I needed some company, and
someone who wouldn't mind going down on me. Now I feel so good
about myself! I tell all my girlfriends that if they need to find
someone to make them feel good, Sex2go is the place. Thank you,
Sex2go. The women who run this site know exactly what a woman needs!"
Allison G., 31 years old from Orlando, Florida

****

SEX2GO.COM - WHERE YOUR MIND AND BODY PLAY AND YOUR IMAGINATION GOES WILD!
http://all.at/free-nude

1538. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 15:55:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C90C80D.5A50585C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37534

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Then you were comparing apples and oranges. PSK31 was trying to work through
> > a 31 Hz filter. A fair comparison would have you trying to copy CW through
> > a 31 Hz filter. Why is that concept so hard to grasp? To directly compare
> > PSK to CW, you must use the same power and the same bandwidth.
>
> No, I don't "must", ...

You must if you want your observations to be scientifically valid.
Otherwise, your observations are worthless, like what I hear over
on r.r.a.a. "My 75m Hamstick works great."
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1539. Re: A View from Across the Fence!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 15:56:09 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u91gvo6p93avf6@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37528

Blarg be educated since he said:

>Sorry to burst your bubble, bud.

and not, "Sorry to bust your bubble, bud."
That sort of capped off the whole thing!

Val

1540. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 16:21:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C90CE26.F5E37F23@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37535

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > >For that matter, why would I *want*
> > >to close it down to 31 hz and lose my CW copy also?
> >
> > Why would reducing the receiver bandwidth to 31 Hz cause you to lose CW copy?
>
> Unless Cecil is obfuscating again it surely will, since the PSK31 couldn't make
> it in its 31hz channel, in those conditions at the time. CW couldn't either,
> according to Cecil. He's leaning on Shannon, of course.

You don't know why normal CW won't pass through a 31 Hz filter? Human hearing
needs at least the fifth harmonic of the CW square wave audio modulation to be
preserved. At reasonable CW speeds, that fifth harmonic won't pass through a
31 Hz filter and the result is extreme ringing rendering the CW uncopyable
by humans at normal CW speeds.

If you allow PSK to occupy the same bandwidth as CW, then redundancy can be
built into the PSK signal that will make it superior to CW. On a level playing
field, PSK has an advantage over OOK.

What you are doing, Dick, is bragging that your Ford will beat my Chevy in a
drag race. When I say I think my Chevy will beat your Ford, you retort,
"Not if I flatten your tires first."
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1541. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 16:23:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C90CE96.15073887@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37536

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >You certainly cannot read CW in a 31 Hz
> >communications channel.
>
> The EME guys do it all the time, Cecil, in real time. I have listened to some
> of the EME enthusiast .wav files of CW in a 25 Hz bandwidth -- strangely
> hollow, but deciperhable by ear.

I was talking about normal CW speeds, Ed. 20wpm just won't make it through
a 31 Hz filter.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1542. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 16:26:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C90CF24.83075ED2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37537

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Robert Casey wrote:
>
> > > > The Extra Class license was never even close to being the equivalent of a
> > > > degree in electronics, Dick. I bet you walked 5 miles to school, too.
> >
> > I'd estimate the extra as being worth maybe equal to a 5 credit hour college
> > class. Say twice that if you're an English major.
>
> That's being a bit liberal with today's tests.

Yep, Dick thinks todays tests are like a GED while the tests he took
were equivalent to a PhD degree. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1543. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 16:27:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C90CF66.D06EDD4C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37538

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > >> We notice that you have not annoyed yourself and learned that trivial set
> > >> of 1000 Russian words.
> >
> > >Good. So you have noticed I avoid silly games.
> >
> > I would think that you would do it just to annoy Cecil -- if you really believe
> > that memorizing 1000 things without understanding is trivial. The choice of
> > Russian was to demonstrate to everyone that there is no understanding involved.
>
> Memorizing word associations in English is quite different than memorizing a
> foreign language, but you already know that.

You mean, you mean there may be some understanding involved using English?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1544. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 16:32:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C90D0A8.878CD053@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37539

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > I think your statement that all the troublemakers
> > on HF cheated on their code exams is outrageous.
>
> Again, that's not what I said.I said I was rather sure that "some of them" did.

Aha, so you admit that some of the troublemakers are coded hams. You never
would admit that before.

> > I think your attempts
> > to encourage newcomers to try to rote-memorize 1000 Q&A is outrageous.
>
> Still lying about what I say or said.

You said rote-memorizing 1000 Q&A is the easiest way to pass the exam.
Newcomers will tend to do it the easy way. That's encouragement.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1545. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 16:37:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C90D1E2.5C22453E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37540

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > > For one thing, been subject to lots of abuse from the code haters for my
> > >opinions, which were formed from lots of experience.
> >
> > Dick, I think that most abuse you suffer is due to the abuse you dole out, not
> > your opinions on the issues
>
> Yeah, I really abused Cecil before he started his crap. Right.

You certainly did, Dick. You have an abusive personality. I merely
defended myself against your onslaughts. I'm willing to smoke the
peace pipe anytime you are.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1546. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 16:43:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C90D318.6FD04AB3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37541

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > I would say that anyone who tells newcomers that they won't choose
> > to learn Morse code after the code requirement is dropped is no
> > friend of Morse code.
>
> So what's so strange about stating the facts?

There is no history upon which to base the facts, Dick. The future
is programmable depending upon what we choose to do with it. If
CW users promote the mode better than presently, it will increase
in popularity. It is certainly not going to increase in popularity
if hams like you keep discouraging its use by telling newcomers that
they won't choose to learn it without a code test.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1547. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 16:46:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C90D3E5.CAFBAA1C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37542

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >IMO, the major problem facing the ARS in the
> >future will be in finding recruits, not in being overwhelmed
> >by masses of the unwashed. Not everyone likes to talk to
> >strangers.
>
> Through all of the changes in ham radio over the decades, Cecil, its ranks have
> consitently grown in the long run. When is this "finding recruits" problem
> expected to start?

What would the ham population be without the nocode techs?
If the FCC had done nothing, the ARS would be in decline.
The problem will get worse in the future, IMO.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1548. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 17:13:41 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <Ad5k8.74128$Nn6.3735374@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 37544

Didn't FCC preempt rules against outside receiving antennas? Or am I
confused?
I didn't think the LL could prevent you from having a satellite dish.

Jerry
K4KWH
KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:a6md1j8k38@enews1.newsguy.com...
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020308215104.08730.00000316@mb-mk.aol.com...
> > From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net
> >
> > >Depends on how old he is.... if he is in his thirties, he may be
working
> > >many more years. I haven't a clue as to how old Ed is.
> >
> > Ed is young enough to have fun and old enough to know how. His wife
says
> he is
> > old enough to know better.
> >
> > I am 51 right now, FWIW.
>
> Hell Ed, your a youngster by ham standards..... Plenty of good years left
in
> ya.
>
> >
> > >By the way Ed, I was speaking with John, WB8RCR a local friend of mine
> and
> > >he said he had a QSO with ya in the past. Thought that was kinda neat.
> >
> > That was a QSO with me operating the original Tuna Tin 2, if memory
> serves. He
> > probably told you about the Certifi-cat?
> >
>
> Basically yes.... John is a great person who I admire alot. Not only does
> he take the time to help others, he really is a patient, and has a really
> upbeat personality. He is the kind of person I aspire to be like. In
other
> words I have the utmost respect for him.
>

> > >Hopefully sometime in the future we may have a QSO in some form or
> another
> > >over the radio.
> >
> > I haven't been on much of late, but look for me near 7040 kHz when I do
> get on.
> >
>
> Maybe if I eventually get a HF mobile rig setup. Cannot operate at my
> residence whatsoever and PRB-1 does absolutely nothing to help me. Cannot
> even put up a TV antenna or even one of those Dish Network satellite
dishes.
> This landlord must have some type of kick-back coming from the cable
> company. Hopefully I will be moving in 3 years, and will be on the
> begginnings of home ownership. Until then, mobile or portable operation
is
> the only way I can go.
>
>
> Ryan KC8PMX
>
>
>
>

1549. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 17:22:34 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <u%4k8.19102$Vx1.1603031@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 37543

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote

> No big deal, I guess, except in my case I had hoped that
> this "international" aspect of the avocation would rermain
> very, very important into the far future. If the CW treaty
> requirements are removed won't amateur radio become
> more or less balkanized by language groups? I know
> this possibility is "down the road" but it is still, to me,
> a very disturbing prospect.

Hi Val,

First, welcome to amateur radio, and especially to the community
of Morse lovers.

In my estimation, the use of Morse is little affected by the "CW
treaty". Use of Morse is a lot like recreational horseback riding.
We do it because it's fun, not because it's a particularly rapid or
effective means of communications.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1550. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 17:47:27 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <Pm5k8.11001$Ex5.1034769@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37545

Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net> wrote:

> I thought it was funny as hell repeated about twenty
> times. It mimicked CAM perfectly!

> Val

Yeah, well, thanks to AT&T, I have about twenty eggs
all over my face.

Just be thankful it wasn't my 256K "History of Spark
Gaps".

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1551. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 18:07:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C90E6D5.2A7B152F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37546

K0HB wrote:
> In my estimation, the use of Morse is little affected by the "CW
> treaty". Use of Morse is a lot like recreational horseback riding.
> We do it because it's fun, not because it's a particularly rapid or
> effective means of communications.

Hear ye, hear ye! Hans speaketh the gospel truth. CW has enough
merits to merit learning and using it. After all, AM is still
going strong and 1kw modulation transformers are always in
short supply.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1552. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 18:30:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203141030.20ea59e4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 37547

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020314061925.29995.00001326@mb-cq.aol.com>...
> From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>
> >"Decent equipment" will do at least a 250 Hz CW bandwidth, Ed.
>
> I wonder how many hams have 250 Hz filters in their rigs?

My Southgate Type 7 has that effective bandwidth from a combination of
xtal
and audio filters. My K2 has 250 as one of the programmed xtal
bandwidths, and
also has the audio filter.

Way back about 1971, when I was in high school, I had a Southgate Type
4 receiver, which had an IF filter using FT-241A xtals. Three for $2
from JAN
Crystals in Florida. Two versions of the Type 4 still exist, but the
original
1971 version is long gone.

> I have a 500 Hz filter; is my equipment indecent?

I dunno, what will it do if asked nicely?

You want a really nice 8 pole xtal filter to fool with? Center
frequency 440
kHz, bandwidth 400 Hz (I think), really nice skirt selectivity. One of
a kind,
tho.

Point is, nobody has to put up with poor CW receiver selectivity.
>
> >Wasn't propagation one of the reasons given for amateurs needing a 60 meter
> >band?
>
> Yes, which will make it an even better choice to change frequency instead of
> change mode as the first choice most of the time under failing conditions.

Sure - if/when we get the band. The fact that a case can be made for a
new band
at 60 meters because there are times when none of the others can be
expected to
do the job shows that changing frequencies may not always be the best
option.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1553. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 19:48:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314144834.03210.00000236@mb-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 37548

In article <hDTj8.13534$P4.1168109@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
<K0HB@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
>> Are you saying that the League is somehow sacrosanct?
>> What are you trying to lay down on all for "policy?" :-)
>
>I said nothing at all about the League. I was defending Ed's
>right to have personal opinions which might (or might not) be
>the same as ARRL thoughts on a given subject.
>
>I thought my message was clearly stated.

Does Ed Hare need "defending?" I don't think so. He does an
adequate job for himself.

Brakob's "message" was in the usual vein of double-duty digging
based on past encounters in here. Nothing new. And the "reply"
is feigned irritation. Again, that is nothing new. :-)

>With all kind wishes for your progress towards understanding simple
>declarative English.

Don't lose your day job, Hans. Quit trying to use manager's phrases
(straight out of the charm school manual) to make your
pronouncements high, lofty, and noble. This ain't your company
and no one here works for you. :-)

Go back to fishing with your iceholes. You are trying to use a hook,
line, and stinker here. No work. :-)

>
>73, de Hans, K0HB

1554. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 19:48:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314144835.03210.00000237@mb-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 37549

In article <975b4ea9.0203131540.445960b0@posting.google.com>, N2EY@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>news:<3C8F7A5A.699B77D@IEEE.org>...
>> Dick Carroll wrote:
>> > The point has always
>> > been that some code testing is necessary if any substantial numbers of
>hams are to
>> > become qualified as CW operators. Without any test whatever, so few will
>ever do so
>> > that CW as a mode is gone in the period of a generation or so. That is
>the future,
>> > based on past history.
>>
>> Wrong! During the only time in history that a code exam was not required,
>> amateur radio use of Morse code exploded. Besides that time, there is no
>> history of amateur radio without a code test requirment.
>
>Which times are you talking about, Cecil?
>
>Before 1912, there was no mandatory licensing of amateur stations. Since 1991,
>there has been a class of amateur license in the USA with no code test.

Before 1912 there was NO USA RADIO REGULATORY AGENCY.

>Has amateur radio use of Morse code "exploded" since 1991?

If the no-code-test Technician class license had not been created,
the number of US amateur radio licensees would have DECREASED
rather dramatically in the last decade. NEGATIVE GROWTH RATE.

1555. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 19:48:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314144836.03210.00000239@mb-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 37550

In article <u902i6716gr924@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>Len-WAY-Over-21 wrote:
>
>Nothing of consequence since he does not have a
>amateur radio license and does not intend to get one.

Maybe, maybe not. :-)

>Rather, he is contemptuous of amateur radio and its
>valuable traditions.

No. As a professional in radio I am only "contemptuous" of
self-styled experts who know very little of the radio arts and
reward themselves with certificates of tall-tale-telling and the
promulgation of legends of long-past-their-life-experience
"glory, honor, and nobility" of an activity that is a recreation.

>Therefore, I will have no comment
>on anything this fellow may say.

Another German person in here should be denigrating and
chastizing you for NOT HAVING AN AMATEUR RADIO
LICENSE and daring to comment in this sacred chat room!
:-)

>In fact, I erased his
>current message with the mouse without reading it.

Heh heh heh, another one whose newsreader has ESP.

>Did I miss anything?

Yes. You seem to need Anger Management counseling for
trying to jump in a war zone with insufficient armament or
ammunition, then cry and whine about being "wounded."
Poor baby.

Go back to whining about all those spoiled students who
don't "understand you" or your moral preachment. That's not
on topic here but it seems your style.

1556. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 19:48:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314144836.03210.00000238@mb-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 37552

In article <20020314060627.29995.00001323@mb-cq.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
>>IMO, the major problem facing the ARS in the
>>future will be in finding recruits, not in being overwhelmed
>>by masses of the unwashed. Not everyone likes to talk to
>>strangers.
>
>Through all of the changes in ham radio over the decades, Cecil, its ranks have
>consitently grown in the long run. When is this "finding recruits" problem
>expected to start?

If the no-code-test Technician class had not been created, the number of US amateur radio licensees would have decreased in the last decade.

You may argue that the no-code-test Technician class is "the entry class for amateur radio" but that is a concept of the ARRL machine of only a couple years back. The Novice class licensee was "the entry point" for decades before that, the ARRL ignoring the continuing decline of Novices.

The membership of the ARRL is still less than a quarter of all US amateur radio licensees.

How is the ARRL going to "lead" US amateur radio or even "represent" anything close to a majority of US ham licensees when it chooses to push Technician class licensees into the virtual "back of the bus" as second-class amateurs?

1557. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 19:48:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314144837.03210.00000240@mb-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 37553

In article <3C90BBBE.DD957F54@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Now quit rubbing your ceremonial dagger and the twin lightning
>> bolts on your collar...
>
>Going into your lame "those who disagree with me are Nazis" routine
>again?

You were born to the SchutzStaffel mould. "If it goose-steps to the
march..." :-)

>> Ah, the self-righteous are angered again. Tsk, tsk, there is no
>> peace for them...poor souls. :-)
>
>Where did you get the goofy idea that I'm angry, Leonard H.?

It shines through 599 on anyone's S-meter... :-)

>> You do not cement anything with your words and your baloney is
>> ersatz.
>
>I believe the words I wrote were a truthful representations of your
>feeling of being slighted or totally ignored by the amateur radio
>community.

Can the baloney and get another pair of jack boots...those are
obviously causing you great discomfort.

>Any change in the rules for entry into amateur radio; any change which
>redefines the space available for the modes radio amateurs use effects
>every radio amateur now matter how long licensed.

Ah, yes, the PRIDE Defense! :-)

The long-timers went through the Hazing Ritual, therefore ALL OTHERS
have to endure the same Hazing Ritual! :-)

Change NOTHING, preserve the Status Quo! Keep everything the
same so you can crow and cackle about your magnificent
achievements under the beloved Old Standards!

Whenever long-timers' Pride is codified into Part 97, your words will
have some meaning. Not now. You are just blowing smoke and
you know that smoking is bad for you. Your words are just Injured-
Pride Bullshit.

1558. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 19:48:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314144838.03210.00000241@mb-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 37551

In article <3C90BBBE.DD957F54@earthlink.net>, Fearless Leader
<k8mn@earthlink.net> exhorts:

>Do you mean that you don't care to have it pointed out that you are not
>a radio amateur but only a bystander?

So is the FCC a "bystander" and they MAKE THE REGULATIONS
you must obey.

>Nobody going through current licensing procedures takes the same exams
>which I took so there goes that portion of your rant.

Aha...now begins a new tack into the wind...and a mighty wind he has.

Since no one can now go through the same tests that Herr Robust
took, they are therefore the "lesser" and "inferior." :-)

>I didn't undergo
>*any* rituals and hazing unless you'd like to consider the ROWF
>initiation.

Of course, Herr Robust was already "born to the manor," mighty,
noble, and so very Proud. :-)

>This is absolutely, with no room for argument, a chat room.
>Some of the biggest wind here comes from an individual who has no
>callsign, vanity or otherwise in the ARS. Now quit making an ARS of
>yourself.

Ah, yes, the old ploy "no one 'belongs here' that doesn't already
have a license!"

Oh my, such an old geas attempting to ward a spell. Herr Robust
behaves as an old witch badly in need of a spell-checker. :-)

Please take your whining to the FCC and demand that all
Commissioners and Staff take the amateur radio license test
before you "allow them" to make regulations that affect YOU.
:-)

Suggestion: Do not wear your shiny uniform when making such
an ex-parte presentation. I know it makes you look so very good
and authoritative in here, but it is DUMB when you have no real
authority.

Fearless Leader might consider trying to join the ranks of the
citizenry and becoming a human being. There's no real "test"
for that which can be hung on the wall and pointed to with ten

kinds of pride. It's a tough thing to go through, dumbing yourself down from the gods of Olympus. Persevere and you might make it...takes a lot of work, though, and I have no optimism that you will make it.

Let us know how your ex parte FCC presentation goes.

1559. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 20:01:51 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C9101B0.B38D7FE7@psu.edu>
Source record: 37554

When I tried to copy CW while studying for my license, I ran across this problem. I got pretty frustrated when trying to make sense out it all. If a person is learning Morse Code, it really helps to have it be in the language they are using, not a new language (Morse code) with a second new language buried in it (cwspeak)

- mike -

Dick Carroll wrote:

> Not that long ago most all routine CW conversations included much of this
> economy of verbiage. Today it's not so common at all, seems everyone thinks it
> all needs to be spelled out.
>
> "ge om ur 579 hr in stlouis mo stlouis mo rig is 100 w to a dipole ant es
> name hr is dick dick bt hw cpi?"
>
> wouldn't make much sense to most new CW ops, it seems.

1560. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 20:32:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203141232.6f449542@posting.google.com>
Source record: 37555

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C90C23E.5DCAFE16@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > I should have said, "Besides that time, there is no history of HF amateur radio
> > > without a code test requirement."
> >
> > Again you are mistaken.
>
> If so, it is in the direction of proving that there is no history of amateur
> HF radio without a code test requirement.

Yet another mistake, Cecil.

Did you forget Japan?

Or the very few other countries that allow amateurs to get HF licenses
without code tests?

Looks like it. Just like those two EE questions I posed stumped you.

> Thanks.

You're welcome.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1561. ATTN: ED HARE -PLEASE READ THIS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 20:40:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8A7358.5AF16C21@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37556

mike coslo wrote:

> When I tried to copy CW while studying for my license, I ran across
> this problem. I got pretty frustrated when trying to make sense out it
> all. If a person is learning Morse Code, it really helps to have it be
> in the language they are using, not a new language (Morse code) with a
> second new language buried in it (cwspeak)
>
> - mike -
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> > Not that long ago most all routine CW conversations included much of this
> > economy of verbiage. Today it's not so common at all, seems everyone thinks it
> > all needs to be spelled out.
> >
> > "ge om ur 579 hr in stlouis mo stlouis mo rig is 100 w to a dipole ant es
> > name hr is dick dick bt hw cpi?"
> >
> > wouldn't make much sense to most new CW ops, it seems.

1562. Re: ATTN: ED HARE -PLEASE READ THIS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 20:47:09 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C910C4D.2CBA8E56@psu.edu>
Source record: 37557

What gives here, Dick?

- mike -

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> mike coslo wrote:
>
> > When I tried to copy CW while studying for my license, I ran across
> > this problem. I got pretty frustrated when trying to make sense out it
> > all. If a person is learning Morse Code, it really helps to have it be
> > in the language they are using, not a new language (Morse code) with a
> > second new language buried in it (cwspeak)
> >
> > - mike -
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > > Not that long ago most all routine CW conversations included much of this
> > > economy of verbiage. Today it's not so common at all, seems everyone thinks it
> > > all needs to be spelled out.
> > >
> > > "ge om ur 579 hr in stlouis mo stlouis mo rig is 100 w to a dipole ant es
> > > name hr is dick dick bt hw cpi?"
> > >
> > > wouldn't make much sense to most new CW ops, it seems.

1563. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 21:07:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C911101.E94FE859@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37558

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > If so, it is in the direction of proving that there is no history of amateur
> > HF radio without a code test requirement.
>
> Yet another mistake, Cecil.
>
> Did you forget Japan?

Good Lord, Jim, We've been discussing ham radio testing in the USA.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1564. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 21:22:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314162227.16195.00001802@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 37559

Subject: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing
From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
Date: 3/13/2002 9:37 AM Central Standard Time
Message-id: <u8urhdn0mvng0a@corp.supernews.com>

There is no liberty without rules and freedom is meaningless
without a legal framework that is agreed upon and enforced.

There is no true "freedom". Even in the most tribal of civilizations,
there are rules to be followed, even if they are not codified in writing.

Now, Ham Radio is not general aviation. You can't die
immediately from lousy operating.

You may not, but someone else might. That's the reason behind a great
number of our regulations...to ensure OUR operating does not hazard someone
else's life.

And the interference
and safety issues are, on a national level, small, though
they are important within the field. The main issues then
are the internal distribution of "air space" and the vetting
of new entrants. Not long ago the entry level cost was a
huge disincentive, long before the testing issue reared
its head. That tended to, er, we'll let that go. Today all of
this has changed and anyone, ANYONE, can get into the
tent and, in the words of one poster here, start "pissing."

A point to be made?

That is, it used to be expensive, one way or another, to
even START to be a Ham. Thirty years ago the entry level
cost, in 2002 dollars, was rather high, either in time or
money. And you had to go take a GOVERNMENT TEST,
administered by a GOVERNMENT employee, at a real
live GOVERNMENT FACILITY. You REALLY got the idea
that Ham Radio was SOMETHING!

It still is. We just smoothed the way to get there.

Last week, a friend of
mine "got into Ham Radio" (in about ten minutes at the
counter) for the princely sum of $119.95, at Radio Shack.
And the test he had to take, and which I will take in just
a few days, was administered locally and was pretty easy,
particularly since the Q's and A's were, er, KNOWN!

Yep...Some say the "test" is dumbed down. Actually, the tests are fine.
It's the policy of open question pools that weakens the system.

How is this possible and what does it mean for the future
of amateur radio?

Not much, really. It's been this way for almost 20 years now and the
service has grown significantly. However people actually know LESS about
what's going on inside the box than 20 years ago. Go figure.

Well, in ye olden days there weren't any repeaters, and
those devices, invented and installed by the WWII gen-
eration of Hams, out of a desire for effective mobile com-
munications, took the responsibilty for big power and
an expensive antenna away from the mobile operator
and shifted it to the club. This, combined with imported
solid-state gear that is mass-marketed, has served to
drop the entry dollar-cost all the way down to what
amounts to coffee money. That, combined with a vast
decrease in the amount of regulatory trouble it takes to
get a Ham Ticket, has REALLY changed everything.

More verbiage for little content. What was the point?

On the one hand, what can be "wrong" with all of this?
Isn't more ALWAYS better? Such is the American way,
I guess. If one million cars are good, 200 million cars
have to be 200 million times BETTER, unless they're
all trying to park at once, OR are mainly burning
petroleum we have to import from the volatile Middle
East. But I digress. Surely, surely, making it possible
for the maximum number of prospective candidates to
actually get a Ham license HAS to be good? After all,
growth is ALWAYS good, isn't it? And to remain static
or, horror of horrors, to DECINE in numbers, well, that
is surely DEATH, am I right, even when the base is in
the HUNDREDS of THOUSNDS?

But no, all growth is NOT good. Check out the definition
of cancer. The amateur radio bands are a "commons"
that can only be maintained when the community of users
can agree on a way to both exploit them, for communication,
while at the same time preserving and protecting them.
Efficient modes should be ENCOURAGED ACTIVELY,
particularly when you are making vast efforts to increase
the total numbers of Hams. To do otherwise is surely
suicide, slow or fast.

The problem here is that we already have copious numbers of repeaters,
digipeaters and translators, yet most of them are dormant save for the hours of
7-9a and 5 to 7p.

We don't NEED to adopt those "more efficient" modes. We aren't getting
the full use of what we have now. Ergo the constant barrage of "Little LEO"

programs and Part 15 programs seeking "our" spectrum.

But, it doesn't matter anyway does it? As Keynes said so well: "In the long run we're all dead."

Speak for yourself. I intend to live forever.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1565. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 21:29:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314162935.16212.00001424@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 37560

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/14/02 14:48 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020314144835.03210.00000237@mb-fl.aol.com>

>If the no-code-test Technician class license had not been created,
>the number of US amateur radio licensees would have DECREASED
>rather dramatically in the last decade. NEGATIVE GROWTH RATE.

MIGHT have decreased. Unless you are now allowing that clairvoyance in
the NG is ALLOWABLE, you have no way of stating with any certainty that this
WOULD have occured.

Is that your assertion?

Steve, K4YZ

1566. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 21:42:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314164244.16212.00001426@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 37562

>Subject: Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/14/02 14:48 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020314144836.03210.00000238@mb-fl.aol.com>

>If the no-code-test Technician had not been created, the number
>of US amateur radio licensees would have decreased in the last
>decade.

You speak this as if it really happened. How do you KNOW for a CERTAINTY
that it would have? Is this your NG-clairvoyance speaking?

>You may argue that the no-code-test Technician class is "the entry
>class for amateur radio" but that is a concept of the ARRL machine
>of only a couple years back. The Novice class licensee was "the
>entry point" for decades before that, the ARRL ignoring the continuing
>decline of Novices.

"Ignoring" the decline of Novices? I don't think so. The ARRL's focus
has been on the NCT for years with little if any on the Novice.
>The membership of the ARRL is still less than a quarter of all US
>amateur radio licensees.

You keep repeating this as if it means something, Lennie. Your point is?

>How is the ARRL going to "lead" US amateur radio or even
>"represent" anything close to a majority of US ham licensees
>when it chooses to push Technician class licensees into the
>virtual "back of the bus" as second-class amateurs?

In as much as a great number of NCT's are ARRL appointees and fill a great
number of club officer positions in numerous organizations, I can only assume
this is but ONE MORE "Lennie doesn't have a clue-isms".

Perhaps...JUST perhaps, If Lennie were an active licensee and participated
in some organized Amateur events, he'd know just how stupid he looks making
such assertions.

However he never will take that step, and will continue on making stupid
assertions that FACTS tend to disprove.

To Arms, Don Quiotxe, To Arms!~

73

Steve, K4YZ

1567. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 21:43:10 UTC
From: Steve Adell - KF2TI <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a6r5hm$nk7$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37563

In article <9f4bfe89.0203140504.584b361a@posting.google.com>,
n2ey@aol.com says...
> Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv) <kf2ti@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:<a6p4vn$bc0$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > In article <20020313220343.14946.00000212@mb-fy.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> > > He walks again by night.
> > > Out of the fog, into the smog. hack hack cough cough
> > > Relentlessly...
> > > Doggedly... (woof-woof)
> > > Ruthlessly...("I wonder where Ruth is?")
> > > At Fourth and Drucker he turns right.
> > > At Drucker and Fourth he turns left.
> > > He crosses MacArthur Park and walks into a great sandstone building (OUCH! My
> > > nose!)
> > He climbs the 13 stairs
> > He's ready for action
> > He's ready for danger
> >
> > He's......
> >
> > > Nick Danger - Third Eye.
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim "Everything You Know Is Wrong" N2EY
> >
> > Good afternoon Mr Danger
> > allow me to introduce myself
> >
> > I am Rocky Anderson...errr Ricco
>
> Rocky Rococo, I presume
>
> (everyone knew her as Nancy)
> >
> > 73 de Steve "How can you be in 2 places at once when you're not anywhere
> > at all" KF2TI
> >
> >
> > If you're gonna do it do it right
>
> Too many BWB's ("It's in the water!") followed by a demonstration of
> Fudd's first law of opposition..

If you push something hard enough it will fall over. Followed up by
Testicular deviant to Fudd's Law If it goes in, it must come out.

> >
> > Hey Pallo..he broke de president Uhh Jim!!!
>
> This is Worker speaking..
>
> "Why does the porridge bird lay her egg in the air?"
>
> 73 de Jim "Forty Two" N2EY

Clem Clone, back to the shadows again uhhh Barney@!!
>

1568. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 21:48:16 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u925jsb85k5855@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37561

Dick Carroll wrote, about powering up a commercial
FM transmitter, in the 1960s, by a high school kid:

> Evidently not ever lad in that position learned his lessons
>so well, so they began putting the delay timing into the power
>circuitry so that you couldn't jump the gun. It would be easy
>for a sleepy youth to do.

I tell you what, whenever I went into that transmitter room
to do anything, even just to log the instrument readings, I was
very much WIDE AWAKE! Yikes!

In imitation of that facility I placed on my electronics van,
in Vietnam, several years later, the sign:

DANGER: HIGH IMPEDANCE!

That wowsered the visitors, big time!

Val

1569. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 21:52:21 UTC
From: Steve Adell - KF2TI <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a6r62t$nk7$2@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37564

In article <3C90BBBE.DD957F54@earthlink.net>, k8mn@earthlink.net says...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:

>
> > Now quit rubbing your ceremonial dagger and the twin lightning
> > bolts on your collar...
>
> Going into your lame "those who disagree with me are Nazis" routine
> again?

Ya gotta love it Dave. Remember now,Lennie's supposed 1st wife was Jewish and each time he does his little Naxi name calling routine he honors her memory and displays the great love and affliction he must have had for her. I'm sure when she departed this world, he had her cremated in keeping then dumped the ashes in some forest near his home. ;)

Actually Dave, this is as big a bullshit story as only Lennie can dish out. Someone so enamoured with the 3rd Reich marrying a Jewish person?? Never happened, not in 1000 years

1570. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 21:58:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314165821.16212.00001427@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 37565

>Subject: Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/14/02 14:48 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020314144836.03210.00000239@mb-fl.aol.com>

>No. As a professional in radio I am only "contemptuous" of
>self-styled experts who know very little of the radio arts and
>reward themselves with certificates of tall-tale-telling and the
>promulgation of legends of long-past-their-life-experience
>"glory, honor, and nobility" of an activity that is a recreation.

Then how do you shave in the morning without cutting your own throat?

In as much as you are as "self-styled" an expert as anyone (by counting
your numerous re-posting's of your CV) can we assume that this extends to you
too?

There is not one word in ANY periodical, paper or presentation that would
laud Leonard H. Anderson as any kind of expert, either. Unless we are to assume
that your few by-lines in a long-since defunct publication NOW qualify you as
said expert?

>Another German person in here should be denigrating and
>chastizing you for NOT HAVING AN AMATEUR RADIO
>LICENSE and daring to comment in this sacred chat room!

This is not a chat room. "Chat rooms" allow communication in real-time.
This does not.

And Val has indicated his intent to take the exam "shortly". We'll see.

>Yes. You seem to need Anger Management counseling for
>trying to jump in a war zone with insufficient armament or
>ammunition, then cry and whine about being "wounded."
>Poor baby.

Whew! Does THAT fill the Pot/Kettle/Black scenario or WHAT?

>Go back to whining about all those spoiled students who
>don't "understand you" or your moral preachment. That's not
>on topic here but it seems your style.

BAM! THAT certainly does!

Steve

1571. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 22:02:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314170237.16212.00001429@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 37566

>Subject: Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/14/02 14:48 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020314144834.03210.00000236@mb-fl.aol.com>

>And the "reply"
>is feigned irritation. Again, that is nothing new.

Pot/kettle/black. "Again, that is nothing new".

>Go back to fishing with your iceholes. You are trying to use a hook,
>line, and stinker here. No work.

Gee...Imagine LENNIE making such assertions...sheesh! What HAS this NG
come to?

SR

1572. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 22:10:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314171027.16212.00001430@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 37567

>Subject: Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/13/02 15:53 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020313155354.09600.00000221@mb-fp.aol.com>

>Hokay, Fearless Leader, let's look at the newsgroup content for those
>postings of 13 March 2002:...(snip)

And let's not forget the numerous analogies of Amateur Radio to the proceedings of the AMA, an organization of remote-control aeromodellers by one Leonard H. Anderson, a person unvested in Amateur radio matters.

>Hardly any cogent statements on any "policies" for anything except
>that their personal preferences are "reasons" to apply to regulations
>which will affect all who follow.

Such as YOUR "policies", Leonardo?

>...as a prideful, certificated, boastful self-styled "expert" by amateur
>tenure. No problem with that...it shines through load and clear with
>every chat-room round fired.

This is not a chat room.

And as for "prideful, certificated, boastful self styled "expert"...Well..all we can say is...

ONE MORE TIME ! ! !

POT~~KETTLE~~BLACK

73

Steve, K4YZ

1573. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 22:12:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314171256.16212.00001431@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 37568

>Subject: Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 03/14/02 10:03 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C90BBBE.DD957F54@earthlink.net>

>Going into your lame "those who disagree with me are Nazis" routine
>again?

What have I been saying..?!?!

Steve

1574. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 22:17:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314171729.16212.00001433@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 37569

>Subject: Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/14/02 14:48 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020314144838.03210.00000241@mb-fl.aol.com>

>Aha...now begins a new tack into the wind...and a mighty wind he has.
>
>Since no one can now go through the same tests that Herr Robust
>took, they are therefore the "lesser" and "inferior.

I love how the Pacific Coast Putz can put such words into others mouths,
all-the-while attempting to distance himself from his own verbal flailings.

It's a hoot!

>Of course, Herr Robust was already "born to the manor," mighty,
>noble, and so very Proud.

Cecil...What's that rule on analogizing to the Nazis any NG post becomes
null-and-void?

1575. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 22:19:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314171931.16212.00001434@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 37570

>Subject: Re: Question Pools and Such!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/13/02 15:53 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020313155355.09600.00000222@mb-fp.aol.com>

>Impossible in this chat room.

And since this is NOT a chat room, then what?

1576. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-14 22:55:17 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u929hhtfga58bc@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37571

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote

>There is no true "freedom". Even in the most tribal of civilizations,
>there are rules to be followed, even if they are not codified in writing.

I was, for a while, debating with a self-described Libertarian, who
has rather confused ideas about "freedom."

>You may not die from lousy operating] but someone else might.
>That's the reason behind a great number of our regulations...to
>ensure OUR operating does not hazard someone else's life.

Totally agree!

[concerning several matters, including a reference to an earlier
poster's contention that having people inside pissing, hopefully
out, was better than having them outside pissing in!]

>A point to be made?

It was made to the people it was intended for, I believe.

[Concerning my concerns about a loss of status for Ham
Radio within the general community due in part to the
ease of entry. I said Ham Radio used to be REALLY
SOMETHING and perhaps now isn't as much . . .]

> It still is. We just smoothed the way to get there.

Yes, it's a matter of degree, as is the impact of the
"smoothing." We all hope for the best.

> Yep...Some say the "test" is dumbed down. Actually,
>the tests are fine. It's the policy of open question pools
>that weakens the system.

Agree.

[What do recent, and some future, changes mean for Ham
Radio . . .]

> Not much, really. It's been this way for almost 20 years now
>and the service has grown significantly. However people
>actually know LESS about what's going on inside the box
>than 20 years ago. Go figure.

There's an article here somewhere for someone! I think
the changes have ALREADY been massive. Maybe in
a year or so I'll have sufficient background information to

write an authoritative piece.

[Concerning my comments that the repeaters and
very low-priced electronics have made the entry level
license much more effective at getting a lot of people
on the air and "into the tent, for better or for worse.]

> More verbiage for little content. What was the point?

I made my point.

[To my comments on growth and that it isn't always
a good thing, depending on what KIND of growth]

>The problem here is that we already have copious numbers
>of repeaters, digipeaters and translators, yet most of them
>are dormant save for the hours of 7-9a and 5 to 7p.

It's an "amateur" service so I think that's going to just be
the fact. Don't see this point at all. Piling up on the weekends
and weekdays is only going to get worse, isn't it, as the
service "grows"?

[To my comment that more efficient modes, like Morse, should
be ACTIVELY ENCOURAGED, by implication, by organizations
like ARRL.]

>We don't NEED to adopt those "more efficient" modes. We
>aren't getting the full use of what we have now. Ergo the constant
>barrage of "Little LEO" programs and Part 15 programs seeking
>"our" spectrum.

As an AMATEUR service there is no way that "full use" is going to
ever be achieved, in the sense that I assume you are intending.
People are at work.

[To my comment about Keynes and "living forever," which was
put in as a jibe at people who imply that things will take of them-
selves and all will somehow work out.]

>Speak for yourself. I intend to live forever.

Good luck with that!

Val

1577. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 00:26:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C913FAE.B0269453@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37572

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote
>
> >There is no true "freedom". Even in the most tribal of civilizations,
> >there are rules to be followed, even if they are not codified in writing.
>
> I was, for a while, debating with a self-described Libertarian, who
> has rather confused ideas about "freedom."

My ideas about freedom come from the freedoms guaranteed in
The Bill of Rights, freedom of speech, religion, press, assembly,
firearm ownership, speedy trials, probable cause, due process, etc.
Also freedom from unreasonable search and seizure, imprisonment
without cause, self incrimination, and excessive bail.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1578. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 01:26:39 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314202639.21415.00001473@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 37573

>From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>I thought it was funny as hell repeated about twenty
>times. It mimicked CAM perfectly!

What's this? A two sentence post? Uh, oh -- you had pronounced that as being indicative of someone needing professional help!

Is this one of those "do as I say, not do as I do" sort of things?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1579. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 01:30:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314203037.21415.00001474@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 37574

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>I think becoming a VE should require a separate test over nothing but VE
>subject
>matter, administered by the VE's without any FCC involvement.

I agree, in fact, such a test already exists, although it is open book.

There are many things that I think should be improved in the question pools,
from fixing the questionable questions to adding more questions on the
formula-based subjects.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1580. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 01:36:21 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314203621.21415.00001475@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 37575

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>I want to apologize for calling Mr. Sohl a "bozo."
>That was wrong of me

Good for you, Val. Most of us have had to take back some of our words on this forum. I know I sure have. You are now in good company!

Now, if we can only get Dick, Len and Steve in on this action, we will have enough people to form a club.

Steve could be writin' apology posts for some time, though... he has called Len a lot of names! :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1581. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 01:37:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314203748.21415.00001477@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 37576

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>How can asking a question be considered to be a troll?

C'mon, Cecil; I have seen plenty of trolls that were questions. If you are sincere and not trolling, just say so!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1582. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 01:40:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314204030.21415.00001478@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 37577

From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu

>If a person is learning Morse Code, it really helps to have it be
>in the language they are using, not a new language (Morse code) with a
>second new language buried in it (cwspeak)

I can go along with that on learning the letters, but for the most part, the abbreviations are obvious. Considering that the tests are given as a typical QSO, learning some of that jargon will help you pass the test and will serve you well when you try your CW skills on the air.

Sending abbreviations is not the worst CW faux pas you will run across. Calling CQ at 5 wpm and getting an answer at 15 wpm will REALLY throw you!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1583. Re: ATTN: ED HARE -PLEASE READ THIS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 01:42:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314204214.21415.00001479@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 37578

From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu

>What gives here, Dick?

He probably hit the send button or hot key before he typed his response. It happens to all of us from time to time. Most of the time, you will immediately see another reply from the same person, with a response. Sometimes they don't notice, and sometimes by the time they do, they either decided not to answer, or forgot what they wanted to say.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1584. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 01:45:10 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314204510.21382.00001685@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 37579

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>The same will happen in the ARS, once the
>code testing requirements are gone.

Are you telling me that someone will start giving me money once the code testing requirements are gone? No wonder there are so many who advocate an end to code testing!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1585. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 01:47:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314204718.21382.00001687@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 37580

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>Yep.The VERY LAST thing these "code supporters" would dare to do is to
>even gently nudge someone toward learning it.

So first you tell everyone that Morse code does not have enough value that people should learn it, and now you are telling code supporters that they shouldn't nudge people toward learing Morse code.

You are right; it is clearly NOT your favorite mode!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1586. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 01:48:51 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314204851.21382.00001688@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 37581

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>I think I've found out
>what I wanted to know here, about these folks, in about 48 hours.

Hmmm, this is starting to unravel a bit, Val. Wasn't the premise of your appearance here that you had been reading this group for about a year and just now decided to post?

There's somethin' fishy going on, I think! :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1587. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 01:51:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314205105.21382.00001689@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 37582

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> So all that equated to me "imagining the worst" about new hams. That one is
>right up there with Cecil's trolling "conclusions".

Is this one of those "what you said, what I heard" sort of things? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1588. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 01:54:34 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314205434.21382.00001690@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 37583

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> But Ed, you said long ago that your employers know that you wouldn't say
>anything
>that is against ARRL policy. Whatever that meant to you, it's clear to us
>that you
>aren't exactly independent of the League in your posting here.
>

Never said I was independent of the League in my postings here, Dick. Of course I will not use the notoriety that my being a visible HQ staffer to undermine ARRL policy.

What I have said is that I do not post on rrap or the reflectors I choose to receive at the behest of my employer, with the exeption of some of the professional ones.

What I have said is that if I say it, it is because I personally believe it and personally have chosen to say it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1589. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 01:59:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314205927.21382.00001693@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 37584

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Unless Cecil is obfuscating again it surely will, since the PSK31 couldn't
>make
>it in its 31hz channel, in those conditions at the time. CW couldn't either,
>according to Cecil. He's leaning on Shannon, of course.

There are a few factors that can contribute to hearing the CW signal well enough to decode it, but not being able to decode the PSK-31 signal. The major factor is that under some circumstances, PSK will simply not work. Polar paths under disturbed conditions, for example, can contain a lot of sudden phase shifts.

I think Cecil had it backwards a bit. The *necessary* bandwidth of slow CW is smaller than 31 Hz, so the PSK-31 signal, operating a higher data rate, requires more power per bit than the slower CW signal.

There are plenty of reports in both directions, with some saying that the PSK-31 signal was inaudible but decodable, and others, under other circumstances, report what you have reported.

"Leaning on Shannon" is a pretty reasonable thing to do because it tells you what the performance can be under an ideal implementation. Both Morse-encoded CW and other encodings are sub-ideal in most cases.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1590. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 02:02:09 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314210209.21382.00001694@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 37585

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>You don't know why normal CW won't pass through a 31 Hz filter? Human hearing
>
>needs at least the fifth harmonic of the CW square wave audio modulation to
>be
>preserved.

Cecil, I have personally listened to some of the EME .wav files posted on the
web of ~10 wpm CW sent through a 25 Hz filter. Sounded hollow and mushy, but I
could easily decode the Morse, at a S/N of about 3 to 6 dB, by my ear.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1591. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 02:02:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314210256.21382.00001695@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 37586

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>> The EME guys do it all the time, Cecil, in real time. I have listened to
>some
>> of the EME enthusiast .wav files of CW in a 25 Hz bandwidth -- strangely
>> hollow, but deciperhable by ear.

>I was talking about normal CW speeds, Ed. 20wpm just won't make it through
>a 31 Hz filter.

I don't consider 10 wpm to be abnormal.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1592. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 02:04:11 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314210411.21382.00001696@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 37587

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Memorizing word associations in English is quite different than memorizing a
>foreign language, but you already know that.

Okay, can I construct 300 word associations from the wording of the present
tests and have you show us how easy it is to memorize them?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1593. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 02:07:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314210740.21382.00001699@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 37588

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>> I wonder how many hams have 250 Hz filters in their rigs?
>
>Anyone with an IC-756pro. :-) But I usually use 500 Hz.

And I like 2500 Hz for CW reception, personally. My mental filtering is reasonably good. I like to know what is going on around me.

Most modern rigs have keying whose rise and fall times is faster than necessary. This means that there is information available in the wider bandwidth that helps to define the start and stop of the element. I think that my mental processing is adaptive, using the full bandwidth to detect start and stop thresholds and then narrowing up on the element to help define duration. When one method of decoding fails,the other often helps fill in the missing data.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1594. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 02:10:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314211040.21382.00001700@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 37589

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Most hams could not handle formal CW traffic under conditions where static
>or a
>> failing band had made SSB unintelligible. The CW testing that the FCC has
>done
>> to date has not resulted in most hams being skilled enough on CW to be able
>to
>> use it reliably under the conditions that you claim justify its continued
>> testing.
>
> Ah, the "perfection" test. If FCC testing doesn't do a perfect job, abandon
>it. I
>see.

No, you don't see at all, Dick, at least not this point.

I don't think that 50% of those who have passed a 13 wpm or higher code test cold handle formal traffic on CW under conditions where SSB at the same power level was audible but unintelligible. Not at 13 wpm, not at 20 wpm or at 5 wpm. The number of hams who could handle that traffic under those conditions is probably a lot smaller than 50%. We are not talking perfection here, Dick; we are talking usable results.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1595. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 02:12:36 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314211236.21382.00001701@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 37590

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> How will you persuade new hams to learn and use Morse code if there is no
>>test, Dick

> The answer to that seems crystal clear, from the experience of the last
>decade-

> YOU WON'T!

If you are right, then the whole discussion is moot.

And I don't think that you can be so certain that I won't persuade some new
hams to learn Morse code without code testing.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1596. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 02:17:31 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020314211731.21382.00001702@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 37591

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>If the no-code-test Technician class had not been created, the number
>of US amateur radio licensees would have decreased in the last
>decade.

Absolutely correct, and that may be a major reason that the FCC is continuing
to move in that direction.

>You may argue that the no-code-test Technician class is "the entry
>class for amateur radio" but that is a concept of the ARRL machine
>of only a couple years back.

I don't know about the "ARRL machine," Len, but I see the NCT as the entry
level license because that is the license most people get to enter ham radio.

>How is the ARRL going to "lead" US amateur radio or even
>"represent" anything close to a majority of US ham licensees
>when it chooses to push Technician class licensees into the
>virtual "back of the bus" as second-class amateurs?

It is not my characterization of the NCT that is pushing them to the back of
the bus, Len. Your words, not mine, makes "entry level" appear to mean more
than "enters ham radio."

In your zeal to triumph over the "ARRL machine," your brush is painting rather
broad strokes.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1597. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 02:30:41 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6rmh6cho1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37593

"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:Ad5k8.74128$Nn6.3735374@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
> Didn't FCC preempt rules against outside receiving antennas? Or am I
> confused?
> I didn't think the LL could prevent you from having a satellite dish.

I believe the difference is being a renter vs being an owner
in a development/subdividion that has CC&Rs. As a renter,
you are "stuck" with the landlord's rules.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

> Jerry
> K4KWH
> KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:a6md1j8k38@enews1.newsguy.com...
> >
> > "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20020308215104.08730.00000316@mb-mk.aol.com...
> > > From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net
> > >
> > > >Depends on how old he is.... if he is in his thirties, he may be
> working
> > > >many more years. I haven't a clue as to how old Ed is.
> > >
> > > Ed is young enough to have fun and old enough to know how. His wife
> says
> > he is
> > > old enough to know better.
> > >
> > > I am 51 right now, FWIW.
> >
> > Hell Ed, your a youngster by ham standards..... Plenty of good years
left
> in
> > ya.
> >
> > >
> > > >By the way Ed, I was speaking with John, WB8RCR a local friend of
mine
> > and
> > > >he said he had a QSO with ya in the past. Thought that was kinda
neat.
> > >

> > > That was a QSO with me operating the original Tuna Tin 2, if memory
> > serves. He
> > > probably told you about the Certifi-cat?
> > >
> >
> > Basically yes.... John is a great person who I admire alot. Not only
does
> > he take the time to help others, he really is a patient, and has a
really
> > upbeat personality. He is the kind of person I aspire to be like. In
> other
> > words I have the utmost respect for him.
> >
> > > >Hopefully sometime in the future we may have a QSO in some form or
> > another
> > > >over the radio.
> > >
> > > I haven't been on much of late, but look for me near 7040 kHz when I
do
> > get on.
> > >
> >
> > Maybe if I eventually get a HF mobile rig setup. Cannot operate at my
> > residence whatsoever and PRB-1 does absolutely nothing to help me.
Cannot
> > even put up a TV antenna or even one of those Dish Network satellite
> dishes.
> > This landlord must have some type of kick-back coming from the cable
> > company. Hopefully I will be moving in 3 years, and will be on the
> > begginnings of home ownership. Until then, mobile or portable operation
> is
> > the only way I can go.
> >
> >
> > Ryan KC8PMX
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
>
>

1598. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 02:32:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C915D35.D46B6077@adelphia.net>
Source record: 37592

Jim, I didn't expect you or most anybody here to know that line! Are you
an old Firesign theater fan?

- Mike -

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3C8F82D0.12F763C6@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Ask yourself, would a man of Val's alleged statue call a near stranger
> >a "Bozo"?
>
> I think we're all Bozos on this bus.
>
> Care to squeeze the wheeze? People like to.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

1599. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 02:39:16 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.16fafdca7884fa939896aa@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37594

In article <20020314204030.21415.00001478@mb-cv.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
says...

> Sending abbreviations is not the worst CW faux pas you will run across.

Sending abbreviations using CW is a faux pas??? Really???

So when the ARRL prints a list of commonly used abbreviations in morse
code, they're encouraging poor amateur practice?

Good golly...

joshua houk
ac7ri

1600. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 02:40:23 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6rn65$9rv$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37595

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u91ctf7piq7qdc@corp.supernews.com...
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >I think we're all Bozos on this bus.
>
> I want to apologize for calling Mr. Sohl a "bozo."
> That was wrong of me. One strength of these
> newsgroups is that the relative distance it pro-
> vides leads to plain speaking. A weakness is
> that this same distance can lead to rudeness.
>
> I plead guilty to crossing over the line at times.
>
> Val

Apology accepted. We all have moments of lapsed
judgement. Some (not you) have it on a regular basis :-)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1601. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 03:00:19 UTC
From: Steve Adell - KF2TI <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a6ro4dbdg1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37596

In article <3C915D35.D46B6077@adelphia.net>, mcoslo@adelphia.net says...
> Jim, I didn't expect you or most anybody here to know that line! Are you
> an old Firesign theater fan?
>
> - Mike -
>
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > In article <3C8F82D0.12F763C6@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >
> > >Ask yourself, would a man of Val's alleged statue call a near stranger
> > >a "Bozo"?
> >
> > I think we're all Bozos on this bus.
> >
> > Care to squeeze the wheeze? People like to.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Mike, there are many of us here that are graduates of More Science High.

As the Pooper once said.."Give them a light and they'll follow it
anywhere"

Shoes for industry compadre!!!

1602. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 04:05:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8A6A67.27DB5590@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37597

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > The FCC already allows more than sufficient coding schemes that
> > > clandistine communications would probably go undetected
> > > even today.
> >
> > And that means, to you, they should just go ahead and drop all such
> > regulation, since they are violated anyway. CB at its finest.
>
> Dick, do you wear a turban while performing your mind reading act?

No way-he said what he said, but it's clear that you, Bill and Ed do when reading my posts.

1603. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 04:05:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8A6E35.504438B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37598

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Then you were comparing apples and oranges. PSK31 was trying to work through
> > > a 31 Hz filter. A fair comparison would have you trying to copy CW through
> > > a 31 Hz filter. Why is that concept so hard to grasp? To directly compare
> > > PSK to CW, you must use the same power and the same bandwidth.
> >
> > No, I don't "must", ...
>
> You must if you want your observations to be scientifically valid.
> Otherwise, your observations are worthless,

And therein lies the gulf separating theory and practice. No wonder you come on so odd on the field of practice. In a specific setting when one mode works, and it happens to be the mode theoretically lesser in efficiency than the mode which won't work, you would just shut down the station and declare that Shannon decrees it isn't to be.

> like what I hear over
> on r.r.a.a. "My 75m Hamstick works great."

compared to what? A Heath Cantenna? My 75 meter hustler mobile antenna works well enough to allow me to check into the Missouri Emergency Operations Net on 75. I don't expect I could do that using a dummy load in its place. Does that make it "great"? Not to me, but maybe to someone who had been attempting to load a 'wet noodle'.
Another theoretical comparison that doesn't cover all the facts of a situation. I can see how some folks do believe their 75 meter Hamstick works great, even at single digit efficiency or less. "Great" is somewhat subjective, don't you think? As far as I'm concerned, there's no way a 75 meter Hamstick could be described as working great. But I have considerable experience using the B&W T2FD antennas (at work, not at my ham station) and one could easily describe them as "great", though I know they're not. But they allow quick frequency changes with no operator intervention and are certainly adequate for many circumstances.

1604. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 04:05:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8A6F88.DCC77850@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37599

CAM wrote:

>You don't know why normal CW won't pass through a 31 Hz filter?

Direct your comments to Ed Hare, he questioned why it wouldn't, not me.

>
> What you are doing, Dick, is bragging that your Ford will beat my Chevy in a
> drag race. When I say I think my Chevy will beat your Ford, you retort,
> "Not if I flatten your tires first."

No, that's YOUR argument. All I ever said was that CW worked in a set of identical circumstances where PSK31 wouldn't. I found that to be novel in view of your bragging about efficiencies of later digital modes. You, the theorist, would insist that the circumstances be altered, "flatten the tires" so that neither mode would work. I said nonsense. You use what works.

1605. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 04:05:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8A6FEF.FB949620@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37600

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> > >
> > > >> We notice that you have not annoyed yourself and learned that trivial set
> > > >> of 1000 Russian words.
> > >
> > > >Good. So you have noticed I avoid silly games.
> > >
> > > I would think that you would do it just to annoy Cecil -- if you really believe
> > > that memorizing 1000 things without understanding is trivial. The choice of
> > > Russian was to demonstrate to everyone that there is no understanding involved.
> >
> > Memorizing word associations in English is quite different than memorizing a
> > foreign language, but you already know that.
>
> You mean, you mean there may be some understanding involved using English?

Recognition of words without gaining insight into their meaning doesn't constitute learning.

1606. Re: ATTN: ED HARE -PLEASE READ THIS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 04:41:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8ADCEB.1C45DB95@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37651

mike coslo wrote:

> What gives here, Dick?
>
> - mike -
>

Disregard, I'm downloading NG postings and answering them offline for sending later. Tried to do some editing and Netscape burped. I think it's now under control. That message was already sent once but somehow hung in the system and went next time I uploaded.

>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > mike coslo wrote:
> >
> > > When I tried to copy CW while studying for my license, I ran across
> > > this problem. I got pretty frustrated when trying to make sense out it
> > > all. If a person is learning Morse Code, it really helps to have it be
> > > in the language they are using, not a new language (Morse code) with a
> > > second new language buried in it (cwspeak)
> > >
> > > - mike -
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > > Not that long ago most all routine CW conversations included much of this
> > > > economy of verbiage. Today it's not so common at all, seems everyone thinks it
> > > > all needs to be spelled out.
> > > >
> > > > "ge om ur 579 hr in stlouis mo stlouis mo rig is 100 w to a dipole ant es
> > > > name hr is dick dick bt hw cpi?"
> > > >
> > > > wouldn't make much sense to most new CW ops, it seems.

1607. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 04:41:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8ADF58.3603D616@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37652

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
> >I want to apologize for calling Mr. Sohl a "bozo."
> >That was wrong of me
>
> Good for you, Val. Most of us have had to take back some of our words on this
> forum. I know I sure have. You are now in good company!
>
> Now, if we can only get Dick, Len and Steve in on this action, we will have
> enough people to form a club.

Hey! I *did* apologize to you for suggesting you take a headbath!

> Steve could be writin' apology posts for some time, though... he has called Len
> a lot of names! :-)
>

You can probably forget that one. When one actually is a clown, Bozo it what fits.

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

1608. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 04:41:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8AE014.374C5EF8@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37653

W1RFI wrote:

> Sending abbreviations is not the worst CW faux pas you will run across.
> Calling CQ at 5 wpm and getting an answer at 15 wpm will REALLY throw you!

> But don't let it shake you! Copy what you can and ask for repeats on what you
> can't, with a PSE QRS thrown in for good measure. Should it still fail to work
> out, tell him SRI OM, I can't cpi that speed" sign off and go to the next
> thing.

1609. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 04:41:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8AE1D7.77B7E43A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37654

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Memorizing word associations in English is quite different than memorizing a
> >foreign language, but you already know that.
>
> Okay, can I construct 300 word associations from the wording of the present
> tests and have you show us how easy it is to memorize them?
>

No way, I already know too much about the material. It works much better the less technical knowledge you have, preferably very little or none.. Try it on a new applicant and see if he can pass the test using it.

1610. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 04:53:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C917E61.40D3F61@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37655

Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Dick, do you wear a turban while performing your mind reading act?
>
> No way-he said what he said, ...

Yes, and he didn't say what you said he said.

> ... but it's clear that you, Bill and Ed do when reading my posts.

We're treating you exactly the same way you treated us. How does it feel?
When you stop your mind-fornicating ways, I'll stop giving you a dose of
your own medicine. Deal?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1611. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 04:55:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C917EC9.2CB701D2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37656

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >> I wonder how many hams have 250 Hz filters in their rigs?
> >
> >Anyone with an IC-756pro. :-) But I usually use 500 Hz.
>
> And I like 2500 Hz for CW reception, personally. My mental filtering is
> reasonably good. I like to know what is going on around me.
>
> Most modern rigs have keying whose rise and fall times is faster than
> necessary. This means that there is information available in the wider
> bandwidth that helps to define the start and stop of the element. I think that
> my mental processing is adaptive, using the full bandwidth to detect start and
> stop thresholds and then narrowing up on the element to help define duration.
> When one method of decoding fails,the other often helps fill in the missing
> data.

Sounds like you were doing DSP in your head long before DSP was cool.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1612. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 04:55:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8AE5BD.E1B74E39@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37657

W1RFI wrote:

> So first you tell everyone that Morse code does not have enough value that
> people should learn it

> Ed, Ed, please repost any post I ever made with those words in it. Not
> *your* interpretation but that actual statement. You cannot do it for it
> never happened.

> and now you are telling code supporters that they
> shouldn't nudge people toward learing Morse code.
>

Welp, I gotta say it again. Please repost..... Can't do it......

>
> You are right; it is clearly NOT your favorite mode!

Sure is ON OF my favorites, though, and nothing else is quite like it. Too
bad that most people have to be shoved into it to ever have the experience.

1613. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 04:55:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8AE6B5.484FB128@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37658

W1RFI wrote:

> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
> >I think I've found out
> >what I wanted to know here, about these folks, in about 48 hours.
>
> Hmmm, this is starting to unravel a bit, Val. Wasn't the premise of your
> appearance here that you had been reading this group for about a year and just
> now decided to post?
>

Hey, there's nothing that will confirm the opinion one forms from merely reading others' posts like engaging them in dialog that brings out front what you have learned to strongly suspect from only reading!

>
> There's somethin' fishy going on, I think! :-)
>

I thought so too, but Cecil turned out to be too small to keep. Had to throw him back.

1614. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 05:01:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C918027.11E48811@earthlink.net>
Source record: 37659

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3C90BBBE.DD957F54@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Now quit rubbing your ceremonial dagger and the twin lightning
> >> bolts on your collar...
> >
> >Going into your lame "those who disagree with me are Nazis" routine
> >again?
>
> You were born to the SchutzStaffel mould. "If it goose-steps to the
> march..." :-)

Going into your lame "those who disagree with me are Nazis" routine
again?

> >> Ah, the self-righteous are angered again. Tsk, tsk, there is no
> >> peace for them...poor souls. :-)
> >
> >Where did you get the goofy idea that I'm angry, Leonard H.?
>
> It shines through 599 on anyone's S-meter... :-)

You mistake my satisfying amusement in poking fun at your windiness for
anger. Better get that meter calibrated.

> >> You do not cement anything with your words and your baloney is
> >> ersatz.
> >
> >I believe the words I wrote were a truthful representations of your
> >feeling of being slighted or totally ignored by the amateur radio
> >community.
>
> Can the baloney and get another pair of jack boots...those are
> obviously causing you great discomfort.

I'd say that the discomfort is thine.

> >Any change in the rules for entry into amateur radio; any change which
> >redefines the space available for the modes radio amateurs use effects
> >every radio amateur now matter how long licensed.
>
> Ah, yes, the PRIDE Defense! :-)

My comment had absolutely nothing to do with pride. It has become apparent you don't understand what you read.
>
> The long-timers went through the Hazing Ritual, therefore ALL OTHERS
> have to endure the same Hazing Ritual! :-)

As I mentioned, it has become apparent that you don't understand what you read. In my last post on this matter, I pointed that those entering amateur radio *do not* pass the same exam I passed. They cannot go through what you incorrectly call the same "hazing ritual". It blew by you since you were dead set in completing your rant.

> Change NOTHING, preserve the Status Quo! Keep everything the
> same so you can crow and cackle about your magnificent
> achievements under the beloved Old Standards!

Er....Len, changes have already taken place. You'll have to find a new topic to wail upon. It has never been easier to obtain an amateur radio license. At this point, even you could do it...but you likely won't.

> Whenever long-timers' Pride is codified into Part 97, your words will
> have some meaning. Not now. You are just blowing smoke and
> you know that smoking is bad for you. Your words are just Injured-
> Pride Bullshit.

You don't read what is written. I wrote nothing about pride. That stuff must have come from one of the several beings which dwell in your body.

Dave K8MN

1615. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 05:07:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C91817B.D4031D2C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37660

Dick Carroll wrote:
> In a specific setting when one mode works, and it
> happens to be the mode theoretically lesser in efficiency than the mode which won't
> work, you would just shut down the station and declare that Shannon decrees it isn't
> to be.

"Work" is not a scientific observation, Dick. "Work" is subjective. I see a lot of hams who say a 75m Hamstick "works" great. You say the CW ID works great compared to PSK31. That is not a scientific comparison. You must compensate the measurements for bandwidth, throughput, and power for it to be a scientific comparison. I have told you that if you take CW as close to Shannon's limit as PSK31 is, CW is likely to fail miserably.

> "Great" is somewhat subjective, don't you think?

You got it! Your CW ID Vs PSK31 comparison is very subjective because the CW ID on PSK31 has an extreme bandwidth advantage over PSK31. Someone said it has a power advantage over PSK31.

PACTOR II uses PSK and occupies approximately the same bandwidth as a fast CW signal. PACTOR II will run circles around CW even though PACTOR II is operated closer to Shannon's limit than fast CW. Please read this paragraph over until you understand it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1616. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 05:15:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C918356.EE4B9F5F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37661

Dick Carroll wrote:
> All I ever said was that CW worked in a set of identical
> circumstances where PSK31 wouldn't.

That's a falsehood, Dick. The circumstances were NOT identical. PSK31 was being squeezed through a 31 Hz filter and CW wasn't. What is it about that concept that you find so hard to comprehend?

> I found that to be novel in view of your bragging
> about efficiencies of later digital modes. You, the theorist, would insist that the
> circumstances be altered, "flatten the tires" so that neither mode would work. I said
> nonsense. You use what works.

Dick, The PSK31 31 Hz filter is akin to flattening the tires on the Chevy. Unlike PSK31, PACTOR II is a serious mode that uses QPSK through a 500 Hz filter and it will run circles around CW.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1617. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 05:18:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C91841B.7A98B5AB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37662

W1RFI wrote:
> I think Cecil had it backwards a bit. The *necessary* bandwidth of slow CW is
> smaller than 31 Hz, so the PSK-31 signal, operating a higher data rate,
> requires more power per bit than the slower CW signal.

In everything I've said, I have assumed 20wpm CW. I calculate the bandwidth
of a 20wpm CW signal to be considerably wider than 31 Hz.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1618. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 05:20:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9184B1.BD2661FA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37663

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >> The EME guys do it all the time, Cecil, in real time. I have listened to
> >some
> >> of the EME enthusiast .wav files of CW in a 25 Hz bandwidth -- strangely
> >> hollow, but deciperhable by ear.
>
> >I was talking about normal CW speeds, Ed. 20wpm just won't make it through
> >a 31 Hz filter.
>
> I don't consider 10 wpm to be abnormal.

I hear very little CW below 13wpm. In any case, everything I have said is
based on 20wpm CW. I have tried copying 10wpm CW through a 100 Hz filter
and it was impossible for me. The ringing from the last element had not
stopped before the next element started.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1619. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 05:23:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C91853F.D0734260@earthlink.net>
Source record: 37664

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3C90BBBE.DD957F54@earthlink.net>, Fearless Leader
> <k8mn@earthlink.net> exhorts:
>
> >Do you mean that you don't care to have it pointed out that you are not
> >a radio amateur but only a bystander?
>
> So is the FCC a "bystander" and they MAKE THE REGULATIONS
> you must obey.

No, Len. I did not state that the FCC is "a" bystander. I stated that *you* are a bystander. We all know what function the FCC serves. You do not serve that function. You aren't anything to amateur radio.

> >Nobody going through current licensing procedures takes the same exams
> >which I took so there goes that portion of your rant.
>
> Aha...now begins a new tack into the wind...and a mighty wind he has.
>
> Since no one can now go through the same tests that Herr Robust
> took, they are therefore the "lesser" and "inferior." :-)

That was not stated by me. I said: "Nobody going through current licensing procedures takes the same exams which I took so there goes that portion of your rant." It was in response to your absurd claim that I believe that all must do as I did. They don't and can't do as I did. I don't have a problem with that. You, on the other hand, will have to do as they did in order (this part breaks me up) for YOU to obtain an amateur radio license. Yep, darn it, you'll have to tote that barge, lift that bale, learn that code or surely fail.

> >I didn't undergo
> >*any* rituals and hazing unless you'd like to consider the ROWF
> >initiation.
>
> Of course, Herr Robust was already "born to the manor," mighty,
> noble, and so very Proud. :-)

That stuff sounds pretty silly. I was a fourteen year old kid who passed the Novice exam in 1963. Over the years I've studied the material, taken the exams and passed the General, Advanced and the Extra. I went through no hazing rituals nor did I jump through a single hoop in the process. You've taken and passed which amateur radio exam?

> >This is absolutely, with no room for argument, a chat room.
> >Some of the biggest wind here comes from an individual who has no
> >callsign, vanity or otherwise in the ARS. Now quit making an ARS of
> >yourself.
>
> Ah, yes, the old ploy "no one 'belongs here' that doesn't already
> have a license!"

That was not stated by me. The meaning was inserted by you. You made your contemptuous comment regarding those holding 1 x 2 calls and their postings. I simply pointed out that much wind in this newsgroup is generated by one who hold no amateur radio call. That'd be you.

> Oh my, such an old geas attempting to ward a spell. Herr Robust
> behaves as an old witch badly in need of a spell-checker. :-)

Huh?

> Please take your whining to the FCC and demand that all
> Commissioners and Staff take the amateur radio license test
> before you "allow them" to make regulations that affect YOU.
> :-)

I'm not whining about anything, Len. The whining seems to come from you. You are the non-licensed individual seeking to have the rules changed for something of which he has never been and will likely never be a part. No one at the FCC needs to obtain a license unless that person shares your unbounded enthusiasm for amateur radio. Despite working for the Commission, that person will have to pass an exam exactly like the one you will need to pass in order to become a part of amateur radio.

> Suggestion: Do not wear your shiny uniform when making such
> an ex-parte presentation. I know it makes you look so very good
> and authoritative in here, but it is DUMB when you have no real
> authority.

This one is beyond surreal. Which one of your personalities wrote it? Is it from the "Happy Old Man"?

> Fearless Leader might consider trying to join the ranks of the
> citizenry and becoming a human being. There's no real "test"
> for that which can be hung on the wall and pointed to with ten
> kinds of pride. It's a tough thing to go through, dumbing
> yourself down from the gods of Olympus. Persevere and you
> might make it...takes a lot of work, though, and I have no
> optimism that you will make it.

Sour grapes, Len? I'd be embarrassed too if I was seventy years of age and had mere kids of 53 rubbing my nose in my failure to attain even the most basic of amateur radio licenses. Bet you could never climb that rope to the top of the gymnasium either.

Dave K8MN

1620. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 05:26:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C918612.B0349479@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37665

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Recognition of words without gaining insight into their meaning doesn't constitute
> learning.

You can't have it both ways, Dick. When potential American hams memorize English words, they are likely to have at least a feel for the meanings. It is virtually impossible to memorize words in one's native language without gaining some insight into their meaning.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1621. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 05:26:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315002644.08328.00000203@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 37666

In article <20020314203621.21415.00001475@mb-cv.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
>>I want to apologize for calling Mr. Sohl a "bozo."
>>That was wrong of me
>
>Good for you, Val. Most of us have had to take back some of our words on
>this forum. I know I sure have. You are now in good company!
>
>Now, if we can only get Dick, Len and Steve in on this action, we will have
>enough people to form a club.
>
>Steve could be writin' apology posts for some time, though... he has called
>Len a lot of names! :-)

Which "Steve" are you talking about? There's one who has been in here under at least three other pseudoynms. There's one in here who finds great joy talking about a woman who has been dead for 36 years...as if that were somehow on a subject.

1622. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 05:26:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315002644.08328.00000202@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 37667

In article <20020314054459.29995.00001317@mb-cq.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: "K0HB" K0HB@earthlink.net
>
>>Since Ed participates here in his personal time, there is no requirement
>>that his participation on rrap be related in any way to his RFI work, and he
>>is free to express his personal views of ARRL issues without any implication
>>that those views bear any resemblance to the 'official' ARRL position on any
>>matter whatsoever.
>
>It is funny how some of those with whom I disagree end up saying that I only
>say what I say because I am an ARRL employee. The other version of the theme
>is that they will blame ARRL for what I say.

? The ARRL can be "blamed" for what it says directly and has said
over the last half century. Not a problem there at all. Lots of folks
"blame" the ARRL for what the ARRL does.

>In either case, it speaks volumes to
>the weakness of their arguments, because if they could say something more
>effective to counter my positions, they would. :-)

On the other hand, it is a very weak position to hide behind a staff
position as a paid employee and then claim "full independence" of
opinion. To attempt such "full independence" anywhere else for a
prolonged time would result in job termination.

Hans, another manager, is very touchy about titles and feelings.
Way back when I interjected a "Get Smart" TV show common
phrase "sorry about that, chief," he immediately jumped in and
said "that's Master Chief to you!" Some folks ain't got no humor.
Goes with being a Manager from my observation...

1623. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 05:26:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315002645.08328.00000204@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 37668

In article <20020314211731.21382.00001702@mb-cv.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>If the no-code-test Technician class had not been created, the number
>>of US amateur radio licensees would have decreased in the last
>>decade.
>
>Absolutely correct, and that may be a major reason that the FCC is continuing
>to move in that direction.

...since a dozen years ago according to FCC 90-53...

>>You may argue that the no-code-test Technician class is "the entry
>>class for amateur radio" but that is a concept of the ARRL machine
>>of only a couple years back.
>
>I don't know about the "ARRL machine," Len, but I see the NCT as the entry
>level license because that is the license most people get to enter ham radio.

Well, Ed, there are two kinds of ham radio, aren't there? :-)

There's the amateur radio that the FCC regulates...and then there's
the "Real" ham radio in the world below 30 MHz...which the no-code-
test Technician class licensee cannot enter...and the "Real" hams
scorn and denigrate.

>It is not my characterization of the NCT that is pushing them to the back of
>the bus, Len. Your words, not mine, makes "entry level" appear to mean more
>than "enters ham radio."

My words do that?!? Oh, my, must be selective amnesia at work
there, ignorning the outpouring from the "Real" hams. :-)

>In your zeal to triumph over the "ARRL machine," your brush is painting
>rather broad strokes.

Nooo, nooo, it be a very teeny brush highlighting the present words
of the ARRL and what they did NOT say less than a half dozen
years ago when they were still pushing the Novice as "entry level."

I say the ARRL is a publishing machine that also offers some
member services. If you say I'm "wrong," be my guest and log on
the ARRL website from outside and under someone else's account.

That's not "my brush" doing all that painting of ads for books and
products.

Membership in the ARRL is still less than a quarter of all US
amateur radio licensees.

1624. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 05:38:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9188D8.C778D57D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37669

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Sure is ON OF my favorites, though, and nothing else is quite like it. Too
> bad that most people have to be shoved into it to ever have the experience.

Too bad you are shoving newcomers away from CW by telling them they won't
learn Morse code if they are not required to do so.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1625. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 06:17:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315011724.05206.00001158@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 37670

>Subject: Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/15/02 00:26 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020315002645.08328.00000204@mb-fk.aol.com>

>There's the amateur radio that the FCC regulates...and then there's
>the "Real" ham radio in the world below 30 MHz...which the no-code-
>test Technician class licensee cannot enter...and the "Real" hams
>scorn and denigrate.

Actually, there's only the one, Lennie. If we accept your "modifiers" as correct, there can be only one Amateur Radio.

The one YOU describe does not exist.

>I say the ARRL is a publishing machine that also offers some
>member services. If you say I'm "wrong," be my guest and log on
>the ARRL website from outside and under someone else's account.

I'd say that by not being an actively licensed Amateur Radio licensee, you are making some rather embarrassing characterisations of an organization with whom you are only "affiliated" with by surfing thier web site or harrassing Ed Hare and Jon Bloom over.

In no case are you speaking with any informed knowledge. You recite the names, but you can't tell the story.

>Membership in the ARRL is still less than a quarter of all US
>amateur radio licensees.

As long as it doesn't count you as a member, it can be 1/10th.

Steve

1626. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 06:18:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315011823.09600.00000278@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 37671

In article <3C91853F.D0734260@earthlink.net>, A Mere "Kid" <k8mn@earthlink.net>
picked up his crayons and scribbled:

>Sour grapes, Len? I'd be embarrassed too if I was seventy years of age
>and had mere kids of 53 rubbing my nose in my failure to attain even the
>most basic of amateur radio licenses.

69, not 70. :-) The "mere kid of 53" is, from his picture, an overweight
middle-aged person who has to get others to climb his tower. :-)

Ah, back to the MUST HAVE THE LICENSE TO COMMUNICATE
ON THE INTERNET ploy again? :-)

I haven't taken any amateur radio license exam, so how does that
constitute "failure?" Ah, that is as in a stevospeak, such as Ham
Radio Magazine "failing" after 22 years of success as an independent
amateur radio periodical and selling it off to CQ Communications. :-)

>Bet you could never climb that
>rope to the top of the gymnasium either.

Another null since that wasn't done in my high school. I did climb a
rope in Army basic training, outdoors, sandy soil. Did all kinds of
athletic-type things and passed. Went on to climb all sorts of
things, including towers of 200 and 300 feet, but only one wooden
pole (used climber boot spikes and a belt, though). :-)

Oh, and in that Army communications assignment of three years,
we learned the proper way to run RTTY on HF on 24/7 DX circuits.
We used TTY as the order-wire, never used any OOK CW. That
was in the fifties, doing standard-procedure communicating that
was the same in all military branches on those long-haul HF
circuits. Then some self-styled civilian VIP g-stepped in barking all
kinds of stuff about "CW" wonderfulness in here and issued the
rationalization of CW order-wires on RTTY circuits of the eighties
were hot stuff and "State Department Procedure!" Oooo, wow!
From such an important 3rd World country in middle Africa, too
(1.2 million pop., major export cashew nuts)! Hot dang, big time
HF comm there! :-)

"Nose rubbing!" :-) Hell, you couldn't "rub anyone's nose" with
a security clearance paper and two KY-97's strapped on your
ample hips. Go lock yourself in the embassy basement shield
room.

Hey Slimmo, you watch them calories a bit closer and maybe
you'll reach 60 years. Who knows, maybe you can even climb

a tower all by yourself someday! I'm pessimistic about that... :-)

1627. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 06:20:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315012050.05206.00001159@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 37672

>Subject: Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 03/15/02 00:23 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C91853F.D0734260@earthlink.net

> You aren't anything to amateur radio.

I beg to differ. He's a PITA to Amateur Radio.

Always was...Always will be.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1628. It just Figures...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 06:38:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315013843.05239.00001597@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 37673

Why is it that the ONE administrative process the FCC get's PAID for by Amateurs is the ONE that gets screwed up?

(1) The bank has already told them that the money has been paid.

(2) determine that the application is filled right (a minimum wage high-school student can learn this task in about 15 minutes.) Task length, about 60 seconds for a slow reader. If it's not correct, "WIP" it and move on.

(3) See if the call sign requested is available. Again, about 60 seconds for a person of average reading/typing skills.

(4) Issue the document.

Am I missing something? At the most....five minutes per document? At present backlog, that's over 130 man-hours to clear.

FROM THE ARRL WEB PAGE

QUOTE:

FCC Continues to Probe Cause of Latest Vanity Processing Holdup (Mar 14, 2002) -- Efforts continue at the FCC's Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, office to get to the root of a vanity application processing anomaly that led the Commission to again put vanity processing on hold. No vanity applications have been processed this week. The FCC hopes to soon resume processing a remaining backlog of some 1600 vanity applications delayed as a result of mail problems last October.

UNQUOTE

How embarrassing. Sheesh

73

Steve, K4YZ

1629. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 10:40:23 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315054023.06040.00001523@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 37674

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>On the other hand, it is a very weak position to hide behind a staff
>position as a paid employee and then claim "full independence" of
>opinion.

I have never claimed "full independence," Len. That is something you like to fabricate to try to bolster your position. If you didn't understand it the first dozen times I have explained it, I don't think it worth the time for either of us for me to say it all over again.

>Hans, another manager, is very touchy about titles and feelings.
>Way back when I interjected a "Get Smart" TV show common
>phrase "sorry about that, chief," he immediately jumped in and
>said "that's Master Chief to you!" Some folks ain't got no humor.
>Goes with being a Manager from my observation...

I think the pattern of distrust of percieved authority is starting to become more clear.

Don't worry, Len; Hans is not using mind control on you, either.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1630. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 10:42:09 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315054209.06040.00001524@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 37675

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>Going into your lame "those who disagree with me are Nazis" routine
>again?

Hey, with me and Hans, it is apparently "those who disagree with me are
Managers." With others, they are "True Believers brainwashed by ARRL."

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1631. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 10:43:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315054345.06040.00001525@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 37676

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>> Of course, Herr Robust was already "born to the manor," mighty,
>> noble, and so very Proud. :-)

>That stuff sounds pretty silly.

No, the Capitalization makes it noble. :-)

Don't you know there is a difference between feeling proud and feeling Proud?
Apparently...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1632. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 10:46:00 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315054600.06040.00001526@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 37677

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Now, if we can only get Dick, Len and Steve in on this action, we will have
>> enough people to form a club.

>Hey! I *did* apologize to you for suggesting you take a headbath!

Yeah, but then the next week, you said it all over again, and again, and
again...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1633. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 10:49:39 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315054939.06040.00001527@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 37678

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Recognition of words without gaining insight into their meaning doesn't
>constitute
>learning.

If one doesn't know the meaning of an English word and doesn't know the meaning of a Russian word, what is the difference? If you feel they are picking words in the question pool whose meaning they don't know and then using some form of association to somehow link the question and correct answer, they could do the same thing if the entire pool was in Russian.

How would this technique you feel people are using to pass their exams so they won't learn anything work if someone knew the meaning of every word in a question and the correct answer?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1634. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 10:51:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315055113.06040.00001528@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 37679

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Dick, do you wear a turban while performing your mind reading act?
>
> No way-he said what he said, but it's clear that you, Bill and Ed do when
>reading my posts.

To the contrary, Dick. We respond to your posts as written. I often feel that you really mean something different than what you actually said, but you have accused me of being a mind reader so many times that I now take your words literally and respond only to them.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1635. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 10:53:44 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315055344.06040.00001529@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 37680

From: Joshua Houk jlhouk@worldnet.att.net

>> Sending abbreviations is not the worst CW faux pas you will run across.

>Sending abbreviations using CW is a faux pas??? Really???

It could be. If I am in communication with a ham that I know is a rank newcomer (ie, he or she says "I just got my license today"), and I start using the full list of abbreviations, I think that the ham will have a bit more trouble than if I stick to plain language.

>So when the ARRL prints a list of commonly used abbreviations in morse
>code, they're encouraging poor amateur practice?

>Good golly...

Good golly, indeed! :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1636. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 11:06:32 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a6sqq4727op@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 37682

Actually Cecil, this is one of the few good points that Dick actually brings up once in a while.... As a licensed medically trained individual, I cannot be allowed to decide who deserves more treatment based upon a moral choice. Hate to admit it, but it is true....

I must, as legally required by law, to provide the care I was trained for. The only distinguishing factor of who recieves more treatment is under the guise of Triage. I am only allowed to make triage choices based upon the injuries or medical circumstances actually witnessed or diagnosed by me.

Now, after the scene has been cleared, and I am back at the station, or with firends or family that I might be able to vent or share this with, that is the time I can give my opinions or feeling about the situation.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C902647.F54BE1F0@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Just because
> > someone doesn't deserve help for whatever reason does not mean he won't
get it.
>
> HUH?????????
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1637. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 11:24:07 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a6sqq5827op@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 37683

What about Corporate Welfare? One form of this is these damned tax abatements that companies get. If corporations were to pay a very small, say 1 or 2 percent tax like the rest of us have to, the burden on us all would be less as opposed to soaking it from the working guy. What about all the other funding, and many other sources of capital corporations get from the governments?

(for the record I am not a left-winger, although republicrats seem to think there is only 2 parties or way of thinking. I would best be classified as a independant, in other words a free thinker)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

>
> Sure they did. The guilty liberals even created a Welfare State so
> they wouldn't have to. Slavery was a bad thing; the Welfare State
> was worse, since it sent the message that former slaves wern't seen
> as able to contribute to society on the basis of their human ingenuity
> and integrity. We got that completely wrong, and pay a high social
> price for this mistake. The same will happen in the ARS, once the
> code testing requirements are gone.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

1638. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International levels...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 12:18:54 UTC
From: Steve Adell - KF2TI <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a6sors$9oc$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37681

In article <20020315002644.08328.00000203@mb-fk.aol.com>, lenover21
@aol.com drooling on the keyboard and polishing his gun barrel with one
hand whined and cried about his feeling being hurt again and typed
...
> In article <20020314203621.21415.00001475@mb-cv.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
> >
> >>I want to apologize for calling Mr. Sohl a "bozo."
> >>That was wrong of me
> >
> >Good for you, Val. Most of us have had to take back some of our words on
> >this forum. I know I sure have. You are now in good company!
> >
> >Now, if we can only get Dick, Len and Steve in on this action, we will have
> >enough people to form a club.
> >
> >Steve could be writin' apology posts for some time, though... he has called
> >Len a lot of names! :-)
>
> Which "Steve" are you talking about? There's one who has been in
> here under at least three other pseudoynms.

HERE WE GO..ONE MORE TIME ;-)

Still waiting for one shred of proof to these lies and allegations there
Old man. Just stating that it happened certainly doesn't make it any
less a fabrication other than to a demented lonely old man from Los
Angeles, now does it? BTW, according to tracking, looks like Krell and
Len are the same people. E-mail me direct for proof positive (DNS ID's
and ISP tracking information).

There's one in here
> who finds great joy talking about a woman who has been dead for
> 36 years...as if that were somehow on a subject.

What women would that be Len?? Oh that's right, the supposed wife who's
religious heritage you defame with your infatuation with Hitler and his
quest to eliminate all Jews from the planet. Poor Len..poor poor Len.
I find no great joy in seeing that you would honor her memory the way
you do..therefore you couldn't and never did (marry a Jew), so let's not
pretend righteous indignation.

AND..as if anything you post is on subject. Loved the piece about the
AMA. Hey Len, I'm a long time member of the AMA flew a Big Stick and a

1/4 scale P51 back. Belonged to the Vienna Sky Sharks back in the late 70's. Still haven't figured what this has to do with amateur radio other than allowing you another long winded, too many words rant.

Get that TS card out there Geezer, it needs to be punched again. :-o

1639. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 13:26:00 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6sstpdk1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37684

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020315054939.06040.00001527@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Recognition of words without gaining insight into their meaning doesn't
> >constitute
> >learning.
>
> If one doesn't know the meaning of an English word and doesn't know the
meaning
> of a Russian word, what is the difference? If you feel they are picking
words
> in the question pool whose meaning they don't know and then using some
form of
> association to somehow link the question and correct answer, they could do
the
> same thing if the entire pool was in Russian.

For the last 50 years...questions as follows:

What is the unit of measurment for....
Current flow - Amperes
Electomotive Force - Volts
Electrical Resistence - Ohms

There's NOTHING more necessary than memorization
to "leanr" those questions. I did it as a teen in the late
50s. Did I know what the concepts behind it all were
and the why of Ohm's law? Not at all, but there was
no need to understand it to pass the test.

Did I go on to understand after becoming a ham...yes I
did....through personal interests, high school physics
class, high school electronics class, college, military
and a life long career.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1640. Tax abatements commentary

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 13:46:38 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6su3o$8gt$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37685

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:a6sqq5827op@enews1.newsguy.com...
> What about Corporate Welfare? One form of this is these damned tax
> damned tax abatements that companies get.

Most of such abatements are for property taxes to either
entice a company to relocate to another location or to
stay where they are having announced an intent to move.

> If corporations were to pay a very small,
> say 1 or 2 percent tax like the rest of us have to, the burden on us all
> would be less as opposed to soaking it from the working guy.

I don't want to open a long winded discussion, but
just for the record...corporations pay all the same taxes
we do as individuals: Corporate income taxes, corporations
pay property taxes, and they often pay a host of unique taxes
individuals don't.

> What about all the other funding, and many other sources
> of capital corporations get from the governments?

<SNIP>

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1641. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 14:23:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9203E3.2BC2B84@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37686

KC8PMX wrote:
> If corporations were to pay a very small,
> say 1 or 2 percent tax like the rest of us have to, the burden on us all
> would be less as opposed to soaking it from the working guy.

Successful corporations recover all the money they pay in taxes from their
customers. Corporations essentially don't pay taxes - their customers do.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1642. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 14:36:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315093629.25967.00000261@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 37691

In article <3C915D35.D46B6077@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>Jim, I didn't expect you or most anybody here to know that line! Are you
>an old Firesign theater fan?

Dang! You outed me!

There are a few of us on here. Occasionally you may see a pop culture reference
imbedded in one of my posts, similar to what is done by the MST3K crew. Part of
the game is to recognize the source. "Bozo on the bus" actually derives from
two sources, of which FT is one. I'll let you puzzle over the other source.

My mother was a Bozoette at college, btw.

FT is alive and well, by the way. TV special was on PBS some months back.

Search your favorite engine - lots of great sites.

73 de Jim "I spell my name - DANGER!" N2EY
>
> - Mike -
>
>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <3C8F82D0.12F763C6@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
>writes:
>>
>> >Ask yourself, would a man of Val's alleged statue call a near stranger
>> >a "Bozo"?
>>
>> I think we're all Bozos on this bus.
>>
>> Care to squeeze the wheeze? People like to.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY

1643. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 14:36:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315093631.25967.00000263@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 37688

In article <a6r5hm$nk7$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv) <kf2ti@arrl.net> writes:

>> Too many BWB's ("It's in the water!") followed by a demonstration of
>> Fudd's first law of opposition..
>
>If you push something hard enough it will fall over.

Come to the Future Fair!

> Followed up by
>Testicular deviant to Fudd's Law If it goes in, it must come out.

You mean Teslacle's Deviant, sometimes called Fudd's Second Law.

>> > Hey Pallo..he broke de president Uhh Jim!!!
>>
>> This is Worker speaking..
>>
>> "Why does the porridge bird lay her egg in the air?"
>>
>> 73 de Jim "Forty Two" N2EY
>
>Clem Clone, back to the shadows again uhhh Barney@!!

Should I take the Antelope Freeway or the Cheney Quadruple Bypass?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1644. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 14:36:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315093631.25967.00000262@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 37692

In article <3C90CE26.F5E37F23@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>You don't know why normal CW won't pass through a 31 Hz filter? Human hearing
>needs at least the fifth harmonic of the CW square wave audio modulation to
>be
>preserved.

No, that's not true, Cecil. Third harmonic is adequate, but it sounds "soft".

>At reasonable CW speeds, that fifth harmonic won't pass through a
>31 Hz filter and the result is extreme ringing rendering the CW uncopyable
>by humans at normal CW speeds.

In other posts you say you assume 20 wpm CW. So 20 wpm is a "reasonable CW speed" to you. If it's so reasonable, why all the fuss from you about the 20 wpm test for so many years?

How much CW operating do you do at "reasoanble" speeds, Cecil?

Here are some numbers:

At 12 wpm, a dit and the space following it are ~200 milliseconds long. That corresponds to a fundamental keying speed of 5 Hz, and a necessary bandwidth of 10 Hz to send very soft dits. Include the third harmonic and we're up to 30 Hz
necessary bandwidth. Include the fifth harmonic and the code speed needs to reduce to about 8 wpm to fit into a 31 Hz bandwidth.
>
>If you allow PSK to occupy the same bandwidth as CW, then redundancy can be
>built into the PSK signal that will make it superior to CW.

Actually, PSK occupies a wider bandwidth. PSK31 does not use "pure" PSK for this reason - instead, it uses a mixture of PSK and OOK, set up so that the transmitter output goes to zero during phase transitions. This is specifically done to reduce the transmitted bandwidth, but it means that a PSK31 signal must be handled by linear amplifiers. A true PSK or FSK signal does not have that restriction.

> On a level playing
>field, PSK has an advantage over OOK.

"Level" in what way? Power, bandwidth, S/N? Immunity to various types of noise or fading?

The fact is that there was a situation where CW got through and PSK31 wouldn't. Widening the receiver bandwidth for the PSK31 signal would not have made the PSK31 signal work any better. In fact, it would be worse, because more noise would have reached the PSK31 detector.

Phase distortion in the signal path is the most likely culprit. Noise takes many forms, and simply assuming that Gaussian/"thermal" noise is the only problem
is short sighted.

"If it happens, it must be possible".

--

As for ringing in narrow filters used for CW, that is usually caused by poor filter design. Doesn't matter if it's DSP, xtal, mechanical, audio or even regenerative,
some designs ring and others of equal bandwidth don't. Price is not always a good indicator, either.

Most HF/MF transceivers manufactered for the amateur market for the past 40+ years are not very good for CW or other narrow modes. Besides lacking narrow filters, many models also lack an AGC off switch, good gain distribution, RIT, and a host of other features. Ringing filters are just another example.

Saying that Mode X will "run rings around" Mode Y without specifying all the conditions of comparison is the same as saying Antenna A "works great" without specifying the conditions. The pseudonymous "Kurt N. Sterba" is a famous for that sort of thing. You're beginning to sound just like him, Cecil - maybe the two of you are one and the same...;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

1645. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 14:36:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315093632.25967.00000265@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 37687

In article <a6ptir01qf@enews1.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>I would have to agree that the morse code would also need 100% undivided
>attention from me also.

Most people are like that when they first learn it. Remember when you first
learned to drive a car or ride a bike? Probably took all your concentration at
first,
then gradually became almost automatic. Morse is the same way.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1646. Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 14:36:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315093632.25967.00000264@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 37693

In article <Ad5k8.74128$Nn6.3735374@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>, "Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> writes:

>Didn't FCC preempt rules against outside receiving antennas?
>Or am I
>confused?
>I didn't think the LL could prevent you from having a satellite dish.

The FCC preemption does not cover landlord-tenant relationships because the tenant does not own the property.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1647. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 14:36:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315093633.25967.00000266@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 37689

In article <3C911101.E94FE859@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>> > If so, it is in the direction of proving that there is no history of
>amateur
>> > HF radio without a code test requirement.
>>
>> Yet another mistake, Cecil.
>>
>> Did you forget Japan?
>
>Good Lord, Jim, We've been discussing ham radio testing in the USA.

That means you forgot about Japan. Typical shaggy-dog approach - spell out the details one post at a time.

Japan has had no-code-test HF licenses for decades. They use an interesting bit of logic to get around S25.5. They've also had quite a drop in the number of active hams (as judged by station licenses) since 1995 or so.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1648. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 14:36:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315093634.25967.00000267@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 37690

In article <3C9101B0.B38D7FE7@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>When I tried to copy CW while studying for my license, I ran across
>this problem. I got pretty frustrated when trying to make sense out it
>all. If a person is learning Morse Code, it really helps to have it be
>in the language they are using, not a new language (Morse code) with a
>second new language buried in it (cwspeak)
>
> - mike -

Part of learning the code is learning the abbreviations. Pounding out "LOCATION HERE IS WAYNE PA" at 5 wpm takes a bit longer than "QTH HR WAYNE PA" or just "QTH WAYNE PA".

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Dick Carroll wrote:
>
>> Not that long ago most all routine CW conversations included much of this
>> economy of verbiage. Today it's not so common at all, seems everyone
>thinks it
>> all needs to be spelled out.
>>
>> "ge om ur 579 hr in stlouis mo stlouis mo rig is 100 w to a dipole ant
>es
>> name hr is dick dick bt hw cpi?"
>>
>> wouldn't make much sense to most new CW ops, it seems.
>

1649. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 15:20:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C921131.ABBA5C1C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37694

N2EY wrote:
> No, that's not true, Cecil. Third harmonic is adequate, but it sounds "soft".

Our opinion differs on that point, Jim. I do not think third harmonic
is "adequate". I have tried to copy 13wpm CW through a 100Hz filter
and just could not do it.

> In other posts you say you assume 20 wpm CW. So 20 wpm is a "reasonable CW
> speed" to you. If it's so reasonable, why all the fuss from you about the 20
> wpm test for so many years?

I just cannot please you guys. If I give examples at 10wpm, you guys say
that's not real CW. You say 20wpm is slow CW. Then when I use a 20wpm
example, you rag on me. Seems you select whatever code speed supports
your side of the argument. In any case, I was trying to choose a code
speed that would get the throughput of CW up in the neighborhood of PSK31.
Throughput is one of the terms in Shannon's Theorem.

> At 12 wpm, ...

Like I said, all my statements were based on 20wpm which still doesn't
equal the throughput of PSK31. In reality, I should have been using 50wpm
CW in the example to equalize the throughput.

> "Level" in what way? Power, bandwidth, S/N? Immunity to various types of noise
> or fading?

If I remember correctly, PSK has a 3dB S/N advantage over OOK at the
same average power level. Also, if I remember correctly, PSK31 has a
throughput of around 50wpm. Having to lower CW throughput to 20% of
PSK31's in order to make a point seems to be stretching it a bit.
To be a fair comparison, 50wpm CW needs to be copied through a 31 Hz
filter.

> The fact is that there was a situation where CW got through and PSK31 wouldn't.

A Corvette will outrun a Chevette - Apples and oranges. One can overhaul a
Chevette to make it better. One could overhaul PSK31 to make it better.

A fair comparison includes S/N ratio, power, bandwidth, and throughput.

> Widening the receiver bandwidth for the PSK31 signal would not have made the
> PSK31 signal work any better.

It would have allowed a different kind of PSK to be used that is superior
to PSK31. PACTOR II uses a wider PSK signal than PSK31 and it will run
circles around CW when comparing S/N ratio, bandwidth, and throughput.
--

cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1650. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 15:22:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9211D2.9A1D3305@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37695

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <a6ptir01qf@enews1.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >I would have to agree that the morse code would also need 100% undivided
> >attention from me also.
>
> Most people are like that when they first learn it. Remember when you first
> learned to drive a car or ride a bike? Probably took all your concentration at
> first, then gradually became almost automatic. Morse is the same way.

Not for everyone, Jim. I have used it for decades and still cannot
head copy words with four or more letters. I also cannot repeat a
telephone number back to you. I seem to have a very small buffer
for things I hear.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1651. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 15:25:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C92127E.F9F22B89@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37696

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Good Lord, Jim, We've been discussing ham radio testing in the USA.
>
> That means you forgot about Japan.

I forget about Japan every chance I get. You can assume that anything
I say is referring to the Amateur Radio Service in the USA unless I
specifically state otherwise.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1652. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 16:28:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315112830.13086.00000246@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 37697

In article <3C90D3E5.CAFBAA1C@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>W1RFI wrote:
>>
>> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>>
>> >IMO, the major problem facing the ARS in the
>> >future will be in finding recruits, not in being overwhelmed
>> >by masses of the unwashed. Not everyone likes to talk to
>> >strangers.
>>
>> Through all of the changes in ham radio over the decades, Cecil, its ranks
>have
>> consitently grown in the long run. When is this "finding recruits" problem
>> expected to start?
>
>What would the ham population be without the nocode techs?

Nobody knows, Cecil - not even you.

The number of US hams was growing steadily for at least two decades before the FCC dropped the code test from the Tech back in 1991. It has grown since - but somewhat less steadily.

>If the FCC had done nothing, the ARS would be in decline.

How do you know? Show us some proof, or even some credible evidence.

>The problem will get worse in the future, IMO.

Why?

It is interesting to note that the elimination of the 13 and 20 wpm code tests had very little if any long-term effect on the growth of the ARS in the USA. I would not
be surprised if total elimination of all code testing had a similar lack of effect.

--

It should be remembered that in 1990 the ARRL BoD voted in favor of a nocodetest amateur radio license in its recommendations to the FCC. Also, the ARRL extends full voting membership to anyone with a valid US amateur radio license, regardless of license class or tests passed. A new ham has the same voting power as any old-timer. No second-class status, no "back of the bus".

73 de Jim, N2EY

1653. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 17:30:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C922FB6.360AFD26@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37698

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >What would the ham population be without the nocode techs?
>
> Nobody knows, Cecil - not even you.

No, but people can hold opinions based on reality-based considerations.

> How do you know? Show us some proof, or even some credible evidence.

It's an opinion, Jim, based on subtracting out the nocode techs.
I realize that's a broad brush so don't bother nitpicking it to death.

> >The problem will get worse in the future, IMO.
>
> Why?

e.g. Cellphones, computers, and future technology. When a ham radio
was the only game in town, e.g. Madisonville, TX in the 50's, it was
much more attractive than it is now.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1654. Re: It just Figures...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 18:33:24 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <U7rk8.17772$P4.1534308@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 37699

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" whines thusly:

> Why is it that the ONE administrative process the FCC get's PAID for by
> Amateurs is the ONE that gets screwed up?

Because their postal service was hosed up by the anthrax attacks last
fall, and because they are committed to fairness-of-the-process by
handling both snail mail and electronic submissions on a equal footing
(not true of other applications), there is a delay.

If that embarrasses you....

.....well I guess you'll just need to find a way
to deal with your embarrassment.

With all kind wishes for a speedy recovery,

de Hans, K0HB

1655. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 19:30:04 UTC
From: "Ronnie D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <0Zrk8.17862$P4.1541910@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 37700

Section 8 "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020315011823.09600.00000278@mb-fp.aol.com...
> In article <3C91853F.D0734260@earthlink.net>, A Mere "Kid"
<k8mn@earthlink.net>
> picked up his crayons and scribbled:
>
> >Sour grapes, Len? I'd be embarrassed too if I was seventy years of age
> >and had mere kids of 53 rubbing my nose in my failure to attain even the
> >most basic of amateur radio licenses.
>
> 69, not 70. :-) The "mere kid of 53" is, from his picture, an
overweight
> middle-aged person who has to get others to climb his tower. :-)
>
> Ah, back to the MUST HAVE THE LICENSE TO COMMUNICATE
> ON THE INTERNET ploy again? :-)
>
> I haven't taken any amateur radio license exam, so how does that
> constitute "failure?" Ah, that is as in a stevospeak, such as Ham
> Radio Magazine "failing" after 22 years of success as an independent
> amateur radio periodical and selling it off to CQ Communications. :-)
>
> >Bet you could never climb that
> >rope to the top of the gymnasium either.
>
> Another null since that wasn't done in my high school. I did climb a
> rope in Army basic training, outdoors, sandy soil. Did all kinds of
> athletic-type things and passed. Went on to climb all sorts of
> things, including towers of 200 and 300 feet, but only one wooden
> pole (used climber boot spikes and a belt, though). :-)
>
> Oh, and in that Army communications assignment of three years,
> we learned the proper way to run RTTY on HF on 24/7 DX circuits.
> We used TTY as the order-wire, never used any OOK CW. That
> was in the fifties, doing standard-procedure communicating that
> was the same in all military branches on those long-haul HF
> circuits. Then some self-styled civilian VIP g-stepped in barking all
> kinds of stuff about "CW" wonderfulness in here and issued the
> rationalization of CW order-wires on RTTY circuits of the eighties
> were hot stuff and "State Department Procedure!" Oooo, wow!
> From such an important 3rd World country in middle Africa, too
> (1.2 million pop., major export cashew nuts)! Hot dang, big time
> HF comm there! :-)

I would have been really disappointed if you didn't get some reference in as to that sterling military career you seemingly had.

Yep, disappointed indeed. Once again, there Sgt Len, must be a dull life if all you have to fall back on is some clerk typist, excuse me some clerk relayist job you held in Korea was it? Wow, something to keep the grandkiddies asleep dazzling them with your war stories...

BTW, so far, I've found no one who has ever heard the phrase commie squad in reference to communications squadron. Must be a personal thing :)

You're never going to learn that compared to many, your service record is a tad this side of dull and duller, but then again, reading your posts for the past several months and having you accuse me of being someone I am not, it seems to fit your personality to a "T"

Poor whittle Wennie...all a thith cause da big bads mans are just picking on you tsk tsk GROW UP.

At ease SGT Anderson, disassemble your gun and polish that barrel really shiny now.

1656. unsubscribe

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 19:33:21 UTC
From: "Ronnie D." <ronaldd@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <50sk8.17886$P4.1542206@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 37701

```
unsubscribe rec.radio.amateur.policy
```

1657. Re: Tax abatements commentary

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 20:39:22 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0203152038090.30934-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 37702

On Fri, 15 Mar 2002, Bill Sohl wrote:
>"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
>news:a6sqq5827op@enews1.newsguy.com...
>> What about Corporate Welfare? One form of this is these damned tax
>> damned tax abatements that companies get.
>
>Most of such abatements are for property taxes to either
>entice a company to relocate to another location or to
>stay where they are having announced an intent to move.
>
>> If corporations were to pay a very small,
>> say 1 or 2 percent tax like the rest of us have to, the burden on us all
>> would be less as opposed to soaking it from the working guy.
>
>I don't want to open a long winded discussion, but
>just for the record...corporations pay all the same taxes
>we do as individuals: Corporate income taxes, corporations
>pay property taxes, and they often pay a host of unique taxes
>individuals don't.

Wrong. They may pay the same type of taxes, but they don't pay at the same
rates. Income tax rates are substantially different.

>> What about all the other funding, and many other sources
>> of capital corporations get from the governments?
>
><SNIP>
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK
>
>
>

1658. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 20:47:09 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C925DCC.29AFE03@psu.edu>
Source record: 37703

Yes, it is a part of the process. I was happy enough with the "Q"
signals, but the novel spellings were what was a problem. It reminds me
of what an old friend once said: "I have no respect for a person who
only knows one way to spell a word".

If I were to make a criticism of people who regularly use Morse code,
it is the tremondous variability in the spelling as regards the
abbreviations. multiple abbreviations were a nuisance for me

es=is
here=hr
Thanks=tks=tk

There are others, but you get the point. It's not that big of a deal,
but I would have expected more precision.

N2EY wrote:

> Part of learning the code is learning the abbreviations. Pounding out "LOCATION
> HERE IS WAYNE PA" at 5 wpm takes a bit longer than "QTH HR WAYNE PA" or just
> "QTH WAYNE PA".

1659. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 21:10:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315161011.03008.00000012@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 37704

In article <3C9211D2.9A1D3305@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <a6ptir01qf@enews1.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
>> <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:
>>
>> >I would have to agree that the morse code would also need 100% undivided
>> >attention from me also.
>>
>> Most people are like that when they first learn it. Remember when you first
>> learned to drive a car or ride a bike? Probably took all your concentration
>at
>> first, then gradually became almost automatic. Morse is the same way.
>
>Not for everyone, Jim. I have used it for decades and still cannot
>head copy words with four or more letters. I also cannot repeat a
>telephone number back to you. I seem to have a very small buffer
>for things I hear.

Uh-huh.

Then how do you understand a word with four or more syllables, a sentence with four or more words, or an equation with four or more terms?

That dog's gettin shaggier all the time.....;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY
>--

1660. Re: unsubscribe

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 21:14:07 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C92641F.F03B9EFC@psu.edu>
Source record: 37705

No can do Ronnie! you are stuck here with the rest of us.

- Mike -

(You have to unsubscribe from your end. The exact process depends on
your newsreader.)

"Ronnie D." wrote:
>
> unsubscribe rec.radio.amateur.policy

1661. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 21:32:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315163206.15084.00000008@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 37706

In article <3C922FB6.360AFD26@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >What would the ham population be without the nocode techs?
>>
>> Nobody knows, Cecil - not even you.
>
>No, but people can hold opinions based on reality-based considerations.

Sure - so when ya gonna start? ;-)
>
>> How do you know? Show us some proof, or even some credible evidence.
>
>It's an opinion, Jim, based on subtracting out the nocode techs.
>I realize that's a broad brush so don't bother nitpicking it to death.

It's a brush that is unconnected with reality. It presumes that none of the
post-Feb 14 1991 Tech would have gotten a license.
>
>> >The problem will get worse in the future, IMO.
>>
>> Why?
>
>e.g. Cellphones, computers, and future technology. When a ham radio
>was the only game in town, e.g. Madisonville, TX in the 50's, it was
>much more attractive than it is now.

Now THAT I can agree with!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1662. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 21:32:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315163206.15084.00000007@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 37707

In article <3C925DCC.29AFE03@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Yes, it is a part of the process. I was happy enough with the "Q"
>signals, but the novel spellings were what was a problem. It reminds me
>of what an old friend once said: "I have no respect for a person who
>only knows one way to spell a word".

HAW! That's a keeper!
>
> If I were to make a criticism of people who regularly use Morse code,
>it is the tremondous variability in the spelling as regards the
>abbreviations. multiple abbreviations were a nuisance for me
>
> es=is

That's really bad, because "es" actually means "and". (The abbreviation derives from the American Morse code for "&", which is dit dididit.

> here=hr

That's what all the decent CW ops I know use! Been that way since way back - "hr" for both "hear" and "here". Context, man, context.

> Thanks=tks=tk

Ugh. TNX, nothing else.

Watch out for this one: "X" for "thank you". Derives from "TU" and running the letters together.
>
> There are others, but you get the point. It's not that big of a deal,
>but I would have expected more precision.

Not all who claim to be CW "experts" have the same skills or experience. Those from a traffic handling background are, in my opinion, the best.

And the same thing happens with voice. You'd expect that all hams using voice would know the standard alfa, bravo, charlie phonetics, and use them when conditions get tough, but I hear plenty of hams who insist on using confusing nonstandard phonetics for some reason.

There was a complaint on one of the sites (qrz or eham) about PSK31 using hams with huge "bragfiles" that take forever to receive.

Take a look at:

http://www.arrl.org/news/features/2002/03/17/1/?nc=1

Just put up today.

73 de Jim, "Love those Loosner's!" N2EY

1663. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International levels...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 22:27:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315172702.17781.00000032@mb-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 37710

In article <a6sors$9oc$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv) <kf2ti@arrl.net> writes:

>> There's one in here
>> who finds great joy talking about a woman who has been dead for
>> 36 years...as if that were somehow on a subject.
>
>What women would that be Len?? Oh that's right, the supposed wife who's
>religious heritage you defame with your infatuation with Hitler and his
>quest to eliminate all Jews from the planet.

In his pitiable little rage and unable to control himself or his other personalities, Adell has made a number of unwarranted and untrue statements. Those must be corrected.

First of all, I have absolutely NO desire to "eliminate all Jews from the planet." That is an outrageous statement, a total fabrication, a lie.

Second, I have NO "infatuation with Hitler" or any other fascist or dictator, living or dead. That is an outrageous statement, a total fabrication, a lie.

As one who has studied military history and technology, there are a number of familiar terms and titles that I have used, taken from the German land and air military, past and present. Regardless of one's religious or socio-political beliefs, the German military was a skilled and efficient force. History is ample proof of this.

History will also show that the second World War ended in 1945 and that West Germany and, finally, the united Germany, is now an Ally of the West, a long-time member of NATO. The old Germany of 1945 was defeated 57 years ago. Rage and hatred of the old enemy remains in many, even those who were never alive at the time...some of those use the old history (that they never lived through) as a rationale to vent their own personal frustrations over minor events.

>Poor Len..poor poor Len.
>I find no great joy in seeing that you would honor her memory the way
>you do..therefore you couldn't and never did (marry a Jew), so let's not
>pretend righteous indignation.

It might be an unresolvable theological argument concerning the applicability of only a civil ceremony "not being a 'correct' or 'true' marriage" but that is not a subject for this newsgroup. My second

marriage (to my childhood sweetheart) took place in a Protestant church many years later. My best man held W6MJN then, still does.

I don't have any "righteous indignation," only sadness that some perverse little minds are so warped with personal rage and frustration that they feel some "right" to impugn others, to insult others personally far from a subject area...all because they cannot get their way on a particular subject in a newsgroup.

I have a touch of sadness that some are afflicted with a need to assume different identities that are easily seen as false, then assuming righteous indignation at being caught.

I have come to accept some as having a quasi-religious belief system in a hobby activity the seems to feed on myths and exaggerations and self-defined importances. Those religious zealots cannot be appeased for their religion is their very life. They must win at all costs. Any manner of "winning" is permissible in their world.

1664. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 22:27:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315172703.17781.00000033@mb-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 37709

In article <20020315054023.06040.00001523@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>On the other hand, it is a very weak position to hide behind a staff
>>position as a paid employee and then claim "full independence" of
>>opinion.
>
>I have never claimed "full independence," Len. That is something you like to
>fabricate to try to bolster your position. If you didn't understand it the
>first dozen times I have explained it, I don't think it worth the time for
>either of us for me to say it all over again.

Improper response from the wrong page of the Manager's charm school manual. The correct response would be to remain aloof and let any "outsider" remarks lay without comment.

No paid employee of any private organization will remain a paid employee by expressions of full independence that includes negative criticsm of the employer. There may be disagreement over partial independence but that depends on the employer. Some employers are liberal and allow some independence. Some employers allow no negative criticsm whatsoever.

In this little dispute the employer is the ARRL. There is a de facto representation of the ARRL in a continuing presence in this news-group of one ARRL manager. The ARRL is nearly always presented in a "good light" even to "explanations" of "actual dispute behind the scenes" to somehow show the "democratic processes and the expressions of free will possible within the ARRL."

Incredulity arises among those adults who have been working for any employer. Those within an organization have direct experience of conflicting "insider" viewpoints where the evidence, to other "insiders," is based largely on the personal views of the "insider." This translates to the outsiders of an organization expressing justified skepticsm of all those "insider" comments.

From actual life experience on encountering "insiders," the "insider" may actually believe (to the core of their being) that what they do is noble, good, and true. That is no valid justification of the employer or the organization despite strength of beliefs.

The membership of the ARRL is still less than a quarter of all US amateur radio licensees despite the belief system repetitions of

the goodness, nobility, importance, or "representation" of the ARRL.

>I think the pattern of distrust of percieved authority is starting to become
>more clear.
>
>Don't worry, Len; Hans is not using mind control on you, either.

Redirection towards implication that negative critics are foolish or
ridiculous for their beliefs is not a weak argument, it is no argument
at all. It is simply a thinly-disguised bit of contempt.

Expressed contempt of non-members does not gain newcomers.

1665. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 22:27:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315172704.17781.00000034@mb-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 37708

In article <20020315054345.06040.00001525@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
>>> Of course, Herr Robust was already "born to the manor," mighty,
>>> noble, and so very Proud. :-)
>
>>That stuff sounds pretty silly.
>
>No, the Capitalization makes it noble. :-)

No, the captitalization was meant as sarcasm, both for his ridicule of "lesser" (in his belief system) beings, past evidence of less-than-good-standard professional radio explanations, and general haughty almost-Prussian demeanor of elitist superiority.

"Oberst" is a german military title corresponding to colonel. "Herr Robust" is a clearly-sarcastic play on words that dates back two or three decades to point out stereotypical conduct (see the characterization by actor Otto Preminger in the classic motion picture "Stalag 17").

>Don't you know there is a difference between feeling proud and feeling Proud?
>Apparently...

Again, bad response according to Manager's charm school manual for public conduct. The proper response would have been to be silent for a period and then bring out calm, reasoned examples to the contrary which do not involve personal expressions of implied ridicule against individuals.

1666. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International levels...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-15 23:24:39 UTC
From: Steve Adell - KF2TI <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a6tvrn$8rl$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37711

In article <20020315172702.17781.00000032@mb-fl.aol.com>, lenover21
@aol.com says...
> In article <a6sors$9oc$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, Steve Adell - KF2TI
> (Landing, NJ FN20qv) <kf2ti@arrl.net> writes:
>
> >> There's one in here
> >> who finds great joy talking about a woman who has been dead for
> >> 36 years...as if that were somehow on a subject.
> >
> >What women would that be Len?? Oh that's right, the supposed wife who's
> >religious heritage you defame with your infatuation with Hitler and his
> >quest to eliminate all Jews from the planet.
>
> In his pitiable little rage and unable to control himself or his other
> personalities, Adell has made a number of unwarranted and untrue
> statements. Those must be corrected.

Ah yes, the spin..here it comes. BTW which Len personality is this
Krell or the real OLD GEEZER himself :) Better yet, is the Jim or Larry
in the Len personna? After all, the 3 of you all use the same
newsreader and ISP, right? That's your criteria of alternate personna,
right?? Moron!!!

>
> First of all, I have absolutely NO desire to "eliminate all Jews from
> the planet." That is an outrageous statement, a total fabrication,
> a lie.

Never said you did.

>
> Second, I have NO "infatuation with Hitler" or any other fascist or
> dictator, living or dead. That is an outrageous statement, a total
> fabrication, a lie.

Well the facts show different but if you want to believe that go right
ahead. Better stated you have a perverse infatuationn with Hitler's 3rd
Reich. Is that better Herr Anderson?

>
> As one who has studied military history and technology, there
> are a number of familiar terms and titles that I have used, taken
> from the German land and air military, past and present.
> Regardless of one's religious or socio-political beliefs, the
> German military was a skilled and efficient force. History is
> ample proof of this.

History shows they lost. History shows that they were responsible for
the death of millions of innocent people. Proof positive that you are
as perverse as they were (the Nazi's). What next Herr Len??

>
> History will also show that the second World War ended in 1945
> and that West Germany and, finally, the united Germany, is now
> an Ally of the West, a long-time member of NATO. The old
> Germany of 1945 was defeated 57 years ago. Rage and hatred
> of the old enemy remains in many, even those who were never
> alive at the time...some of those use the old history (that they
> never lived through) as a rationale to vent their own personal
> frustrations over minor events.

And even some who have lived through it and must continually re-live it
I guess :)

>
> >Poor Len..poor poor Len.
> >I find no great joy in seeing that you would honor her memory the way
> >you do..therefore you couldn't and never did (marry a Jew), so let's not
> >pretend righteous indignation.
>
> It might be an unresolvable theological argument concerning the
> applicability of only a civil ceremony "not being a 'correct' or 'true'
> marriage" but that is not a subject for this newsgroup. My second
> marriage (to my childhood sweetheart) took place in a Protestant
> church many years later. My best man held W6MJN then, still
> does.

OH I C now you really weren't married to a Jewish women. Well thanks
for the admission. That explains a lot. As to subject in the
newsgroup..lets see..AMA model planes..continuous military career
stories, professional radio careers and all in an AMATEUR radio NG.

>
> I don't have any "righteous indignation," only sadness that some
> perverse little minds are so warped with personal rage and
> frustration that they feel some "right" to impugn others, to insult
> others personally far from a subject area...all because they
> cannot get their way on a particular subject in a newsgroup.

You, as the master debater, should be thrilled that there are so many
who have adopted your particular style. It should be a smile to that
wrinkly ol face :)

>
> I have a touch of sadness that some are afflicted with a need to
> assume different identities that are easily seen as false, then
> assuming righteous indignation at being caught.

As before Len, unlike you, I have NEVER assumed other personna. Again,
you can say anything you want, it proves conclusively you have no proof
as to anything to the contrary. It would seem that if you had 1 piece of

evidence you'd be the first to trot it out, but seeing is that all you have is a continually dull statement...I think the rest of the NG can see that you are liar and a fake..but then again, you already knew that. ;)

So troll away witless droll. If you want to think I was the King of England, so be it.

>
> I have come to accept some as having a quasi-religious belief
> system in a hobby activity the seems to feed on myths and
> exaggerations and self-defined importances. Those religious
> zealots cannot be appeased for their religion is their very life.
> They must win at all costs. Any manner of "winning" is
> permissible in their world.

If you say there Old man. Geezer heal thyself.

I can appreciate the difficulty it took to say you were wrong in so many ways. It's a start.

1667. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 00:30:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C92922A.2CDB38B3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37712

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Not for everyone, Jim. I have used it for decades and still cannot
> >head copy words with four or more letters. I also cannot repeat a
> >telephone number back to you. I seem to have a very small buffer
> >for things I hear.
>
> Then how do you understand a word with four or more syllables, a sentence with
> four or more words, or an equation with four or more terms?

I don't have trouble with written items but I have a lot of trouble with a
spoken equation. It is some sort of disability. If someone gives me a fast
food list of more than three items, I have to write them down.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1668. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 00:35:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C92935F.DFB944BD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37713

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >It's an opinion, Jim, based on subtracting out the nocode techs.
> >I realize that's a broad brush so don't bother nitpicking it to death.
>
> It's a brush that is unconnected with reality. It presumes that none of the
> post-Feb 14 1991 Tech would have gotten a license.

"None" is a rail response and is much too strong. I'm assuming that the major
majority of nocode techs wouldn't have bothered with a coded license. Based
on the thirty or so nocode techs whom I Elmered, I think that is a reasonable
assumption.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1669. Re: unsubscribe

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 00:37:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9293CB.24DB31EC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37714

Keith wrote:
>
> [Posted to rec.radio.amateur.policy & E-mailed]
>
> In article
> <50sk8.17886$P4.1542206@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
> ronaldd@yahoo.com Wrote:
>
> > unsubscribe rec.radio.amateur.policy
>
> This is a newsgroup, not a email list.

Isn't this newsgroup available as an email list? It used to be.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1670. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International levels...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 02:13:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315211340.01841.00000008@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 37716

In article <a6tvrn$8rl$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, Steve Adell - KF2TI
(Landing, NJ FN20qv) <kf2ti@arrl.net> writes:

>In article <20020315172702.17781.00000032@mb-fl.aol.com>, lenover21
>@aol.com says...
>> In article <a6sors$9oc$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, Steve Adell - KF2TI
>> (Landing, NJ FN20qv) <kf2ti@arrl.net> writes:
>>
>> >> There's one in here
>> >> who finds great joy talking about a woman who has been dead for
>> >> 36 years...as if that were somehow on a subject.
>> >
>> >What women would that be Len?? Oh that's right, the supposed wife who's
>> >religious heritage you defame with your infatuation with Hitler and his
>> >quest to eliminate all Jews from the planet.
>>
>> In his pitiable little rage and unable to control himself or his other
>> personalities, Adell has made a number of unwarranted and untrue
>> statements. Those must be corrected.
>
>Ah yes, the spin..here it comes. BTW which Len personality is this
>Krell or the real OLD GEEZER himself :) Better yet, is the Jim or Larry
>in the Len personna? After all, the 3 of you all use the same
>newsreader and ISP, right? That's your criteria of alternate personna,
>right?? Moron!!!

There is only one "me." Had "jonathan" ever bothered to travel
to my southern residence (as "jonathan" had promised in claims of
having "taken pictures" of "my hood") he could have properly
identified who was who...from any of several neighbors.

>> First of all, I have absolutely NO desire to "eliminate all Jews from
>> the planet." That is an outrageous statement, a total fabrication,
>> a lie.
>
>Never said you did.

That's what "Adell" wrote.

>> Second, I have NO "infatuation with Hitler" or any other fascist or
>> dictator, living or dead. That is an outrageous statement, a total
>> fabrication, a lie.
>
>Well the facts show different but if you want to believe that go right
>ahead. Better stated you have a perverse infatuationn with Hitler's 3rd
>Reich. Is that better Herr Anderson?

Wrong again. Neither "infatuationn" nor infatuation.

>> As one who has studied military history and technology, there
>> are a number of familiar terms and titles that I have used, taken
>> from the German land and air military, past and present.
>> Regardless of one's religious or socio-political beliefs, the
>> German military was a skilled and efficient force. History is
>> ample proof of this.
>
>History shows they lost. History shows that they were responsible for
>the death of millions of innocent people. Proof positive that you are
>as perverse as they were (the Nazi's). What next Herr Len??

Wrong again. There is no "proof positive" of my perversity. There
is only Adell's rage and frustration showing through again for not
being able to win previous arguments in this newsgroup. That rage
and frustration is evident from hasty typing and a continual use
of personal insults.

"Herr" is an honorific prefix meaning the same as the English-
American "Mister." It is in common use in Germany, Denmark,
Sweden, and Norway.

>> It might be an unresolvable theological argument concerning the
>> applicability of only a civil ceremony "not being a 'correct' or 'true'
>> marriage" but that is not a subject for this newsgroup. My second
>> marriage (to my childhood sweetheart) took place in a Protestant
>> church many years later. My best man held W6MJN then, still
>> does.
>
>OH I C now you really weren't married to a Jewish women. Well thanks
>for the admission. That explains a lot.

Only one woman, not plural. Quite legal according to the Registrar-
Recorder's office. She died in 1964. Why must "Adell" continually
bring that up in this newsgroup?

>You, as the master debater, should be thrilled that there are so many
>who have adopted your particular style. It should be a smile to that
>wrinkly ol face :)

Anyone is free to use whatever "style" they wish. Except for the
pseudonymous who claim to be "others," everyone's "style" is
unique.

>As before Len, unlike you, I have NEVER assumed other personna.

I have used other screen names for log-on purposes to AOL but have
never attempted to disguise myself as someone else. Anyone who
has software that can unpack a "cookie" from any one of my screen
names will see my real name identical in all of them.

"Adell" is another case. He should consult with "jonathan" (who
conveniently disappeared) or the "activated NY National Guard

member" (who apparently has gone TDY far from any Internet
access) or perhaps with "Ronnie D" (who has suddenly surfaced,
not quite coincidentally as has been evident before).

A problem with trying to go "undercover" with a new personna is
the lack of self-control and awareness, particularly with the
highly self-centered. They "lose it" by using common,
identifiable words, phrases, and style. It's a dead giveaway.

>have is a continually dull statement...I think the rest of the NG can
>see that you are liar and a fake..but then again, you already knew that.

"Adell's" problem is the immature use of "the rest of the NG" as
if that were a qualifier for a personal insult. It is not. Such is
merely a word-game used by youngsters trying to intimidate.
Very poor technique in any newsgroup or BBS.

>So troll away witless droll. If you want to think I was the King of
>England, so be it.

? Why would anyone want to think that of "Adell?"

It is ridiculous to attempt insulting the English Crown in that
manner.

>If you say there Old man. Geezer heal thyself.

Everyone's physical body is self-healing to a large extent. That
is basic middle-school biology.

> I can appreciate the difficulty it took to say you were wrong in so
>many ways. It's a start.

This is another aberration of "Adell's" thinking...or rather delusional
thought processes (a more correct term). Those two quoted
sentences are another poor attempt at intimidation, too often used
by the immature in computer-modem communications to be
effective. Those people think they've originated the technique but
it is old and trite.

1671. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 02:13:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C92AA1C.8E364922@earthlink.net>
Source record: 37715

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3C91853F.D0734260@earthlink.net>, A Mere "Kid" <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> picked up his crayons and scribbled:
>
> >Sour grapes, Len? I'd be embarrassed too if I was seventy years of age
> >and had mere kids of 53 rubbing my nose in my failure to attain even the
> >most basic of amateur radio licenses.
>
> 69, not 70. :-) The "mere kid of 53" is, from his picture, an overweight
> middle-aged person who has to get others to climb his tower. :-)

You're as wrong on that as you are about most things having to do with amateur radio. This kid did about twenty trips up and down the 70 foot tower just last Autumn lowering the 40m yagi, installing new guy wire and installing a Hazer tram system. It appears that you really don't know what you're talking about, Len (you spry pup).

> Ah, back to the MUST HAVE THE LICENSE TO COMMUNICATE
> ON THE INTERNET ploy again? :-)

No, no, no, no. You only need to obtain a license in order to have many hams take your views much credence. You've blown smoke here for years without much in the way of support. You tend to lecture and pontificate. That attitude isn't going to win over hams who have been on the air for decades and I don't think you are apt to gain much support from those who are about to become hams. Who would go to a non-ham for advice about amateur radio.

> I haven't taken any amateur radio license exam, so how does that
> constitute "failure?" Ah, that is as in a stevospeak, such as Ham
> Radio Magazine "failing" after 22 years of success as an independent
> amateur radio periodical and selling it off to CQ Communications. :-)

I think that if you've professed interest in something for several decades and that after all that time you've never achieved it, one could consider that a stunning and remarkable failure. That little 5 wpm code test never had a chance to stump you. Your overwhelming fear of it kept you from even attempting something you wanted. Whatever bile built up as a result has been spewed here in the form of your childish outbursts at anyone you perceive as "acting superior" or in lashing out at the ARRL who honked you off about some article you wrote in the distant past. As an aside, Len, "Ham Radio" magazine did fail. It went under. It died. It is no more. It is defunct. It makes no difference that it was around for 22 years. It couldn't make it for the 23rd year.

> >Bet you could never climb that
> >rope to the top of the gymnasium either.
>
> Another null since that wasn't done in my high school. I did climb a
> rope in Army basic training, outdoors, sandy soil. Did all kinds of
> athletic-type things and passed. Went on to climb all sorts of
> things, including towers of 200 and 300 feet, but only one wooden
> pole (used climber boot spikes and a belt, though). :-)

Well bully for you, Len. Now to climb that amateur radio ladder...
>
> Oh, and in that Army communications assignment of three years,
> we learned the proper way to run RTTY on HF on 24/7 DX circuits.
> We used TTY as the order-wire, never used any OOK CW. That
> was in the fifties, doing standard-procedure communicating that
> was the same in all military branches on those long-haul HF
> circuits. Then some self-styled civilian VIP g-stepped in barking all
> kinds of stuff about "CW" wonderfulness in here and issued the
> rationalization of CW order-wires on RTTY circuits of the eighties
> were hot stuff and "State Department Procedure!" Oooo, wow!
> From such an important 3rd World country in middle Africa, too
> (1.2 million pop., major export cashew nuts)! Hot dang, big time
> HF comm there! :-)

It's a great yarn except it simply didn't take place the way you've outlined it. Nobody "g-stepped" (just can't stay away from that Nazi stuff, can you?). Nobody barked. Nobody issued anything. Nobody used a term like "hot stuff". There was no "self-styled" civilian. I was born a civilian. Somebody did refute your mantra that government was not using CW anymore. As a matter of fact, in those years government was using a helluva lot of CW. Sorry it didn't conform to the Army way. We weren't in the Army and had need of doing it in a different way for a number of reasons. It chafed you then and obviously chafes you now. As far as your attempt to belittle the job I did and the place that I did it, it only demonstrates what a pathetic little man you are. Other than the differences between your tale and truth, you've got yourself an accurate and fascinating story there.

> "Nose rubbing!" :-) Hell, you couldn't "rub anyone's nose" with
> a security clearance paper and two KY-97's strapped on your
> ample hips. Go lock yourself in the embassy basement shield
> room.

Never used anything as dark ages as a KY-97. I've only worked in two embassies which had basements. I've never been exposed to anything called a shield room. Oh yeah--and your nose *was* rubbed. It is now being rubbed again. You know nothing more about amateur radio than you do about embassy commo procedures, equipment used by embassies or about my tower climbing ability.

> Hey Slimmo, you watch them calories a bit closer and maybe
> you'll reach 60 years. Who knows, maybe you can even climb
> a tower all by yourself someday! I'm pessimistic about that... :-)

...just another instance in which you've written something you know nothing about. Such utterings by you have become rather commonplace and, as Ed pointed out, are a pretty good indicator that you have run out of ammunition
.
Do you now have tower envy too?

Dave K8MN

1672. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 02:18:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C92AB46.C3A803FB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 37717

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >Going into your lame "those who disagree with me are Nazis" routine
> >again?
>
> Hey, with me and Hans, it is apparently "those who disagree with me are
> Managers." With others, they are "True Believers brainwashed by ARRL."

I was never a manager in Len's eyes, just some baggy-eyed communicator
in a small, unimportant, cashew munching country.

He may be on to something though. Ever since that ROWF ceremony, I've
kept votive candles burning beneath that framed portrait of HPM.

Dave K8MN

1673. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 02:19:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C92AB9E.E6C09BE2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 37718

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >> Of course, Herr Robust was already "born to the manor," mighty,
> >> noble, and so very Proud. :-)
>
> >That stuff sounds pretty silly.
>
> No, the Capitalization makes it noble. :-)
>
> Don't you know there is a difference between feeling proud and feeling Proud?
> Apparently...

Pride goeth before...ummm "And Prejudice"?

Dave K8MN

1674. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 02:34:53 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C92AF56.F30F71A6@adelphia.net>
Source record: 37719

I would ace the test for sure then. The formula based stuff was the easiest for me. The hardest parts were the band plans, if you can believe it.

- Mike -

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >I think becoming a VE should require a separate test over nothing but VE
> >subject
> >matter, administered by the VE's without any FCC involvement.
>
> I agree, in fact, such a test already exists, although it is open book.
>
> There are many things that I think should be improved in the question pools,
> from fixing the questionable questions to adding more questions on the
> formula-based subjects.

1675. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 02:38:28 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C92AFFD.24D9C299@earthlink.net>
Source record: 37720

Len Over 21 wrote:

> The membership of the ARRL is still less than a quarter of all US
> amateur radio licensees despite the belief system repetitions of
> the goodness, nobility, importance, or "representation" of the ARRL.

Some see the glass half full. Then there's Leonard H.
Did you know that in some countries, it is mandatory for a radio amateur
to belong to the national radio society? Wouldn't that be nice--100%
ARRL membership.

Tell us, Leonard, what radio amateur organization has a larger
percentage of U.S. hams as members than The American Radio Relay League?

Dave K8MN

1676. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 02:53:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C92B36E.85C883CE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 37721

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20020315054345.06040.00001525@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >
> >>> Of course, Herr Robust was already "born to the manor," mighty,
> >>> noble, and so very Proud. :-)
> >
> >>That stuff sounds pretty silly.
> >
> >No, the Capitalization makes it noble. :-)
>
> No, the captitalization was meant as sarcasm, both for his ridicule of
> "lesser" (in his belief system) beings, past evidence of less-than-
> good-standard professional radio explanations, and general haughty
> almost-Prussian demeanor of elitist superiority.
>
> "Oberst" is a german military title corresponding to colonel. "Herr
> Robust" is a clearly-sarcastic play on words that dates back two
> or three decades to point out stereotypical conduct (see the
> characterization by actor Otto Preminger in the classic motion
> picture "Stalag 17").

Let's see. I'm not German. You're not German. Ed isn't German. We
aren't actually IN Germany. While my surname is Heil, I have more
English blood than German. You must have forgotten your references to
"g-stepping" and the SS.

> >Don't you know there is a difference between feeling proud and feeling Proud?
> >Apparently...
>
> Again, bad response according to Manager's charm school manual
> for public conduct. The proper response would have been to be
> silent for a period and then bring out calm, reasoned examples to
> the contrary which do not involve personal expressions of implied
> ridicule against individuals.

At least Ed has only implied ridicule, Len. There isn't any "Manager's
charm school manual for public conduct" so your comment is pure
Fantasyland. I'd think the calm, reasoned examples you believe to be
your due are cancelled when your diatribes have not been calm and
reasoned. You only expect "calm" and "reasoned" from others.

Tell us in a calm and reasoned manner, Leonard, what you propose to do for amateur radio. What will be your epitaph? How would you like to be remembered?

Dave K8MN

1677. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 03:10:08 UTC
From: Martin <mdwade@mobiletel.com>
Message-ID: <3C92B790.58A1@mobiletel.com>
Source record: 37722

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> > The membership of the ARRL is still less than a quarter of all US
> > amateur radio licensees despite the belief system repetitions of
> > the goodness, nobility, importance, or "representation" of the ARRL.
>
> Some see the glass half full. Then there's Leonard H.
> Did you know that in some countries, it is mandatory for a radio amateur
> to belong to the national radio society? Wouldn't that be nice--100%
> ARRL membership.
>
Yeah, and in some countries you can't criticize the govt., the national
radio org or have decent QSOs.

"U R 599 in outter slobvania, name is Boris, QTH is downtown Elbonia,
QSL via buro, bye bye de @@6*!^"

On second thought, I will take the USA and Canada, Separation of
Church and State, (ARRL and FCC), is a good thing.

ARRL leaves a lot to be desired, see http://www.ares.org for
how the ARRL will probably set Emergency Services back 20 yrs
by not exploiting a resource and trying to dictate to
the locals how to run their programs.

> Tell us, Leonard, what radio amateur organization has a larger
> percentage of U.S. hams as members than The American Radio Relay League?
>
> Dave K8MN
NCI or FISTS? DAMFINO, the ARRL is the only game in town to protect
Amateur Radio. It had better start promoting AR to the School Kids,
Whiz kids, Soccer Moms, Hot Moms and Dot.Coms if we want the ARS
to stay viable in 20 to 40 yrs.

Martin N5PZJ

1678. Len at the end of his rope

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 03:43:59 UTC
From: Steve Adell - KF2TI <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a6uf22gpn1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37723

In article <20020315211340.01841.00000008@mb-fg.aol.com>, lenover21
@aol.com says...
> In article <a6tvrn$8rl$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, Steve Adell - KF2TI
> (Landing, NJ FN20qv) <kf2ti@arrl.net> writes:
>
> >In article <20020315172702.17781.00000032@mb-fl.aol.com>, lenover21
> >@aol.com says...
> >> In article <a6sors$9oc$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, Steve Adell - KF2TI
> >> (Landing, NJ FN20qv) <kf2ti@arrl.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >> There's one in here
> >> >> who finds great joy talking about a woman who has been dead for
> >> >> 36 years...as if that were somehow on a subject.
> >> >
> >> >What women would that be Len?? Oh that's right, the supposed wife who's
> >> >religious heritage you defame with your infatuation with Hitler and his
> >> >quest to eliminate all Jews from the planet.
> >>
> >> In his pitiable little rage and unable to control himself or his other
> >> personalities, Adell has made a number of unwarranted and untrue
> >> statements. Those must be corrected.
> >
> >Ah yes, the spin..here it comes. BTW which Len personality is this
> >Krell or the real OLD GEEZER himself :) Better yet, is the Jim or Larry
> >in the Len personna? After all, the 3 of you all use the same
> >newsreader and ISP, right? That's your criteria of alternate personna,
> >right?? Moron!!!
>
> There is only one "me." Had "jonathan" ever bothered to travel
> to my southern residence (as "jonathan" had promised in claims of
> having "taken pictures" of "my hood") he could have properly
> identified who was who...from any of several neighbors.

Yes Len what ever you say. Yes Len.

>
>
> >> First of all, I have absolutely NO desire to "eliminate all Jews from
> >> the planet." That is an outrageous statement, a total fabrication,
> >> a lie.
> >
> >Never said you did.
>
> That's what "Adell" wrote.

Yes Len, whatever you say. Must be true because you say it..yes Len

>
> >> Second, I have NO "infatuation with Hitler" or any other fascist or
> >> dictator, living or dead. That is an outrageous statement, a total
> >> fabrication, a lie.
> >
> >Well the facts show different but if you want to believe that go right
> >ahead. Better stated you have a perverse infatuationn with Hitler's 3rd
> >Reich. Is that better Herr Anderson?
>
> Wrong again. Neither "infatuationn" nor infatuation.

Yes Len. Keep saying it and it will come true. Just click your heels 3
times and you'll be in the home once again.

>
>
> >> As one who has studied military history and technology, there
> >> are a number of familiar terms and titles that I have used, taken
> >> from the German land and air military, past and present.
> >> Regardless of one's religious or socio-political beliefs, the
> >> German military was a skilled and efficient force. History is
> >> ample proof of this.
> >
> >History shows they lost. History shows that they were responsible for
> >the death of millions of innocent people. Proof positive that you are
> >as perverse as they were (the Nazi's). What next Herr Len??
>
> Wrong again. There is no "proof positive" of my perversity. There
> is only Adell's rage and frustration showing through again for not
> being able to win previous arguments in this newsgroup. That rage
> and frustration is evident from hasty typing and a continual use
> of personal insults.

Yes Len. Keep saying it and even your delusional mind will eventually
think it true. Yes Len....

>
> "Herr" is an honorific prefix meaning the same as the English-
> American "Mister." It is in common use in Germany, Denmark,
> Sweden, and Norway.

Would you prefer Shithead Anderson or better yet The Great Pretender
Leonard H(itler) Anderson. Take your pick.

>
>
> >> It might be an unresolvable theological argument concerning the
> >> applicability of only a civil ceremony "not being a 'correct' or 'true'
> >> marriage" but that is not a subject for this newsgroup. My second
> >> marriage (to my childhood sweetheart) took place in a Protestant
> >> church many years later. My best man held W6MJN then, still

> >> does.
> >
> >OH I C now you really weren't married to a Jewish women. Well thanks
> >for the admission. That explains a lot.
>
> Only one woman, not plural. Quite legal according to the Registrar-
> Recorder's office. She died in 1964. Why must "Adell" continually
> bring that up in this newsgroup?

Because no person I have ever met that was married to someone of the
Jewish faith so b latently shows such total infautaion with a group of
people that would have just as soon wiped them off the face of the earth
than spit. You don't fit the mold, except for that which probably grows
in your house.

>
>
> >You, as the master debater, should be thrilled that there are so many
> >who have adopted your particular style. It should be a smile to that
> >wrinkly ol face :)
>
> Anyone is free to use whatever "style" they wish. Except for the
> pseudonymous who claim to be "others," everyone's "style" is
> unique.
>

Yes Len.. Keep saying it so then it must be true. Yes Len.

> >As before Len, unlike you, I have NEVER assumed other personna.
>
> I have used other screen names for log-on purposes to AOL but have
> never attempted to disguise myself as someone else. Anyone who
> has software that can unpack a "cookie" from any one of my screen
> names will see my real name identical in all of them.
>

Several posts have already proven otherwise..but keep telling yourself
that Len..it must be true Yes Len

> "Adell" is another case. He should consult with "jonathan" (who
> conveniently disappeared) or the "activated NY National Guard
> member" (who apparently has gone TDY far from any Internet
> access) or perhaps with "Ronnie D" (who has suddenly surfaced,
> not quite coincidentally as has been evident before).

So far, other than having talked on the phone to one of these persona, I
am still ion the dark about anything you are referring to, but again
Len, it you keep saying it enough, it must be true. Yes Len

>
> A problem with trying to go "undercover" with a new personna is
> the lack of self-control and awareness, particularly with the
> highly self-centered. They "lose it" by using common,

> identifiable words, phrases, and style. It's a dead giveaway.

I thought you stated it was due to newsreaders Len. Now it's
identifiable phrases? Get your clues in order Len. Which is it?
Newsreaders?? ISP's?? Phrases? That being the case you and the Troll
are identical..both obnoxious, both opinionated, although the Len
persona is more of an ass, but the Larry persona you present is a close
2nd. But since you say so Len, it must be true YES LEN

>
>
> >have is a continually dull statement...I think the rest of the NG can
> >see that you are liar and a fake..but then again, you already knew that.
>
> "Adell's" problem is the immature use of "the rest of the NG" as
> if that were a qualifier for a personal insult. It is not. Such is
> merely a word-game used by youngsters trying to intimidate.
> Very poor technique in any newsgroup or BBS.

Only mirroring the master Yes Len Yes Len

>
> >So troll away witless droll. If you want to think I was the King of
> >England, so be it.
>
> ? Why would anyone want to think that of "Adell?"
>
> It is ridiculous to attempt insulting the English Crown in that
> manner.

Really?? What's the King of England's name perhaps Len Anderson??
Maybe I'm Jimmy Hoffa in disguise OOhhhh the possibilities are endless

>
>
> >If you say there Old man. Geezer heal thyself.
>
> Everyone's physical body is self-healing to a large extent. That
> is basic middle-school biology.

What, what insight Yes Len You go girl :)

>
>
> > I can appreciate the difficulty it took to say you were wrong in so
> >many ways. It's a start.
>
> This is another aberration of "Adell's" thinking...or rather delusional
> thought processes (a more correct term). Those two quoted
> sentences are another poor attempt at intimidation, too often used
> by the immature in computer-modem communications to be
> effective. Those people think they've originated the technique but
> it is old and trite.

Well then it's perfect for you. You are both OLD and TRITE

Len you are the best. I salute you SEIG HEIL SEIH HEIL

1679. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 04:09:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C92C576.E87427F0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37724

Mike Coslo wrote:
> I would ace the test for sure then. The formula based stuff was the
> easiest for me. The hardest parts were the band plans, if you can
> believe it.

No sweat, Mike. Rote-memorizing that stuff is trivial according to some.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1680. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 04:13:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315231307.06039.00001534@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 37725

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>e.g. Cellphones, computers, and future technology. When a ham radio
>was the only game in town, e.g. Madisonville, TX in the 50's, it was
>much more attractive than it is now.

One could always have played with the non-radio technology of the day without being a ham, Cecil.

A cellphone does not do what ham radio does.

A computer is no more high-tech for most people than a cell phone.

Ham radio IS the only game in town for someone who wants virtually unlimited license to personally experience a wide range of radio technology.

That is what is has always been for most hams. The fear that all new hams want to do is yak is, IMHO, no more founded than it always was.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1681. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 04:21:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C92C80B.E6F626CD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 37726

Martin wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > > The membership of the ARRL is still less than a quarter of all US
> > > amateur radio licensees despite the belief system repetitions of
> > > the goodness, nobility, importance, or "representation" of the ARRL.
> >
> > Some see the glass half full. Then there's Leonard H.
> > Did you know that in some countries, it is mandatory for a radio amateur
> > to belong to the national radio society? Wouldn't that be nice--100%
> > ARRL membership.
> >
> Yeah, and in some countries you can't criticize the govt., the national
> radio org or have decent QSOs.

decent QSOs?

> "U R 599 in outter slobvania, name is Boris, QTH is downtown Elbonia,
> QSL via buro, bye bye de @@6*!^"

> On second thought, I will take the USA and Canada, Separation of
> Church and State, (ARRL and FCC), is a good thing.

Here's a buck. Now run on down the street and buy yourself a sense of
humor.
>
> ARRL leaves a lot to be desired, see http://www.ares.org for
> how the ARRL will probably set Emergency Services back 20 yrs
> by not exploiting a resource and trying to dictate to
> the locals how to run their programs.

I went to the site and looked through it. I was especially struck by
the childish response which Karen Johansen sent the ARRL. Why should
she or you object to the League's protecting its registered name and why
should it not act to prevent others from thinking that ares.org is a
site operated by the ARRL? I won't let facts or rationality stand in the
way of your rage at the League's audacity.

> > Tell us, Leonard, what radio amateur organization has a larger
> > percentage of U.S. hams as members than The American Radio Relay League?

> NCI or FISTS? DAMFINO, the ARRL is the only game in town to protect
> Amateur Radio. It had better start promoting AR to the School Kids,

> Whiz kids, Soccer Moms, Hot Moms and Dot.Coms if we want the ARS
> to stay viable in 20 to 40 yrs.

That's right, Martin. The growth we have is not enough. We shouldn't stop until every man, woman and child in the United States is a ham!

Dave K8MN

1682. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 04:21:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315232159.06039.00001536@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 37727

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>Well, Ed, there are two kinds of ham radio, aren't there? :-)
>
>There's the amateur radio that the FCC regulates...and then there's
>the "Real" ham radio in the world below 30 MHz...which the no-code-
>test Technician class licensee cannot enter...and the "Real" hams
>scorn and denigrate.

I don't see two ham radios, Len. I have operated both above and below 30 MHz, and my work has taken me above and below 30 MHz. My biggest concern this week is 70 cm.

>>It is not my characterization of the NCT that is pushing them to the back of
>>the bus, Len. Your words, not mine, makes "entry level" appear to mean more
>>than "enters ham radio."

>My words do that?!? Oh, my, must be selective amnesia at work
>there, ignorning the outpouring from the "Real" hams. :-)

It would be pretty silly of me to be discussing something with you and continue that discussion by discussing the words of others. Can you really be offering that I have ignored the output of those that you are characterizing as "real hams?" Hey Dick, do you feel ignored? I think he is talking about you. :-)

>>In your zeal to triumph over the "ARRL machine," your brush is painting
>>rather broad strokes.

>Nooo, nooo, it be a very teeny brush highlighting the present words
>of the ARRL and what they did NOT say less than a half dozen
>years ago when they were still pushing the Novice as "entry level."

For such a teeny brush, you sure do wave it around a lot...

A half dozen years ago, the Novice was not the usual entry point into ham radio, the Tech was (+ or otherwise). ARRL has been promoting the Tech license as the best starting point for a long time; it gives one a lot more priveleges than the Novice did, and one could enter with or without Morse code.

>I say the ARRL is a publishing machine that also offers some
>member services. If you say I'm "wrong," be my guest and log on
>the ARRL website from outside and under someone else's account.

I have seen the entire web page, Len, and I believe that the vast majority of it is devoted to membership.

I log on to ARRL.org regularly from home, but why would I want to use someone else's account?

>That's not "my brush" doing all that painting of ads for books and
>products.

Books and products are important to ARRL for two reasons. They provide a lot of good information that hams can use to do hamming. The excess of revenues over expenses help fund guys like me, who don't raise any significant revenues. The alternative would be to have fewer guys like me, or ask members to pony up about $75 a year for dues. Most seem happy.

>Membership in the ARRL is still less than a quarter of all US
>amateur radio licensees.

Yup, math hasn't changed much since you said that yesterday.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1683. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 04:25:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020315232540.06039.00001537@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 37728

From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu

> es=is

Actually, "es" in Morse-ese means "and." It is from French.

> here=hr

That one is pretty universal, and over used. The rig and name are always "hr," as if the guy could be talking about the name somewhere else. :-)

> Thanks=tks=tk

And that could also be TX or TU. The usual is tnx.

> There are others, but you get the point. It's not that big of a deal,
>but I would have expected more precision.

In casual conversation, no more precision is needed than in casual verbal communication. The range of precision in the spoken word varies all over the place.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1684. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 05:03:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020316000337.02938.00000059@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 37729

In article <3C902C8B.13EF5ED4@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> The Welfare State was a bad thing for former slaves;
>
>Larry, the slaves were freed in the 1860's. The Welfare State
>started with the New Deal some 77 or so years later. Most
>of the former slaves were dead by then.

Right -- but their ancestors live on, and their hands are out, and
reaching into our pockets!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1685. Re: It just Figures...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 05:03:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020316000337.02938.00000058@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 37732

In article <20020315013843.05239.00001597@mb-mj.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>Why is it that the ONE administrative process the FCC get's PAID for by
>Amateurs is the ONE that gets screwed up?
>
> (1) The bank has already told them that the money has been paid.
>
> (2) determine that the application is filled right (a minimum wage
>high-school student can learn this task in about 15 minutes.) Task length,
>about 60 seconds for a slow reader. If it's not correct, "WIP" it and move
>on.
>
> (3) See if the call sign requested is available. Again, about 60
>seconds
>for a person of average reading/typing skills.
>
> (4) Issue the document.
>
> Am I missing something? At the most....five minutes per document? At
>present backlog, that's over 130 man-hours to clear.

Steve:

It may seem simple for you and me, but for the people doing it, it may actually be quite an arduous and perplexing task. After all, they most likely think and speak in jive "Ebonics," and resent the fact that they had to take a job in the first place, having been brought up with the notion that the world owes them a living because of things that happened to their ancestors several generations ago. Then there's the problem with them being constantly pregnant, and if not, then overweight by several times a normal body weight. Also, spending 7.5 out of eight working hours making personal phone calls and taking smoking breaks kind of puts a crimp on productivity. So you see, these people face working challenges you and I never have had to contend with, other than as supervisors of people with the same problems. However, the fact that they can't get the job done isn't their fault -- it is the problem of their superiors who aren't taking good enough "care" of "their people."

73 de Larry, K3LT

1686. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 05:03:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020316000338.02938.00000061@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 37730

In article <20020314204510.21382.00001685@mb-cv.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>The same will happen in the ARS, once the
>>code testing requirements are gone.
>
>Are you telling me that someone will start giving me money once the code
>testing requirements are gone?

Ed:

It's possible, especially if you serve as a VE!

>No wonder there are so many who advocate an end to code testing!

Nothing so mysterious about it -- laziness is a very common human trait!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1687. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 05:03:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020316000338.02938.00000060@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 37731

In article <3C902D27.F24B4AC@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >Just because the slaves were freed didn't mean they stopped working.
>>
>> Sure they did. The guilty liberals even created a Welfare State so
>> they wouldn't have to.
>
>Uhhhhh Larry, the Welfare State started about 77 years after the
>slaves were freed. How many former slaves lived to see the New Deal?

Cecil:

Well, none, axeually -- but their ancestors, who never chopped a lick
of cotton or pulled a single barge, all claim to be permanently owed a
living based on what happened to their ancestors of several generations
past. Now it is the hard-working, middle-class people (of all races) who
are the "slaves" -- who must have their wealth be re-distributed to those
who produce nothing out of their own choice, only because guilty liberals--
usually rich ones, have decided that that's how it should be for the rest
of us.

I think it's time for the hard working people of this country to take a
lesson from John Galt.

73 de Larry, K3LT

Who is John Galt?

1688. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 05:03:39 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020316000339.02938.00000062@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 37733

In article <a6sqq5827op@enews1.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>
>What about Corporate Welfare? One form of this is these damned tax
>abatements that companies get. If corporations were to pay a very small,
>say 1 or 2 percent tax like the rest of us have to, the burden on us all
>would be less as opposed to soaking it from the working guy. What about all
>the other funding, and many other sources of capital corporations get from
>the governments?
>
>(for the record I am not a left-winger, although republicrats seem to think
>there is only 2 parties or way of thinking. I would best be classified as a
>independant, in other words a free thinker)
>
>
>--
>Ryan, KC8PMX
>FF/MFR

I'm a solid Republican when it comes to Corporate Welfare. I believe
in it. I think the big corporations that create the jobs and produce the
goods and services that fuel our economy should pay absolutely
nothing in state and federal taxes. The notion that corporations and
businesses of all sizes don't pay any taxes is absolutely false, and
a popular misconception among liberals. The problem is that corporate
taxes are very high in some areas, forcing businesses to go elsewhere --
usually overseas -- in order to be able to operate at an acceptable
level of profitability.

If you think we have a problem because corporations aren't paying
enough taxes, then I suggest that perhaps we have too big and burdensome
of a government overhead on our society, making demands on the tax
base. Bottom line: People who produce wealth through their initiative
and ingenuity deserve all the tax breaks they can get. People who
sit back and let life pass them by with their hands out, deserve a
lesson in nature taking it's course.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1689. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 05:10:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316001012.09101.00000019@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 37734

In article <3C921131.ABBA5C1C@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> No, that's not true, Cecil. Third harmonic is adequate, but it sounds
>"soft".
>
>Our opinion differs on that point, Jim. I do not think third harmonic
>is "adequate".

My "Reference Data For Radio Engineers" says it is. You argue with the IRE ;-)

> I have tried to copy 13wpm CW through a 100Hz filter
>and just could not do it.

I have tried to run a 4 minute mile and just could not do it, either. Doesn't
mean
it can't be done.
>
>> In other posts you say you assume 20 wpm CW. So 20 wpm is a "reasonable CW
>> speed" to you. If it's so reasonable, why all the fuss from you about the
>20
>> wpm test for so many years?
>
>I just cannot please you guys.

Who are "you guys"? I'm only me. No multiple personalities. I don't even say
"we" on 'phone modes, even though it is derived from "the rig and me".

> If I give examples at 10wpm, you guys say
>that's not real CW.

Bull. Produce a post where I have said that, or anything close to it.

>You say 20wpm is slow CW.

More bull. Produce a post where I have said that, or anything close to it.

> Then when I use a 20wpm
>example, you rag on me.

All I did was show the errors in your posts.

>Seems you select whatever code speed supports
>your side of the argument.

An excellent description of your method, Cecil.

>In any case, I was trying to choose a code
>speed that would get the throughput of CW up in the neighborhood of PSK31.

>Throughput is one of the terms in Shannon's Theorem.
>
Sure.

More important, however, is the Unnamed Law, also known as the Existence
Corollary:

"If it happens, it must be possible".

>> At 12 wpm, ...
>
>Like I said, all my statements were based on 20wpm which still doesn't
>equal the throughput of PSK31. In reality, I should have been using 50wpm
>CW in the example to equalize the throughput.

The throughput of PSK31 in the case cited by W0EX was 0 wpm. CW ran rings
around it.
>
>> "Level" in what way? Power, bandwidth, S/N? Immunity to various types of
>noise
>> or fading?
>
>If I remember correctly, PSK has a 3dB S/N advantage over OOK at the
>same average power level.

PSK or PSK31? They are not the same.

>Also, if I remember correctly, PSK31 has a
>throughput of around 50wpm.

That's right - IF it works.

>Having to lower CW throughput to 20% of
>PSK31's in order to make a point seems to be stretching it a bit.
>To be a fair comparison, 50wpm CW needs to be copied through a 31 Hz
>filter.

Why? Under the conditions W0EX experienced, the PSK31 throughput was 0 wpm. If
it happens...
>
>> The fact is that there was a situation where CW got through and PSK31
>wouldn't.
>
>A Corvette will outrun a Chevette - Apples and oranges.

??

> One can overhaul a
>Chevette to make it better. One could overhaul PSK31 to make it better.

A Chevette will outrun a Corvette on a level playing field that includes things
like a fixed amount of fuel.
>
>A fair comparison includes S/N ratio, power, bandwidth, and throughput.

A fair comparison also includes real-world noise conditions.
>
>> Widening the receiver bandwidth for the PSK31 signal would not have made
>the
>> PSK31 signal work any better.
>
>It would have allowed a different kind of PSK to be used that is superior
>to PSK31.

Ah, but the comparison was between PSK31 and CW.

>PACTOR II uses a wider PSK signal than PSK31 and it will run
>circles around CW when comparing S/N ratio, bandwidth, and throughput.

Maybe. Why isn't it used for EME, if it's so good?

Can it be copied through a 200 Hz filter?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1690. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 05:10:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316001013.09101.00000020@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 37736

In article <3C92935F.DFB944BD@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >It's an opinion, Jim, based on subtracting out the nocode techs.
>> >I realize that's a broad brush so don't bother nitpicking it to death.
>>
>> It's a brush that is unconnected with reality. It presumes that none of the
>> post-Feb 14 1991 Tech would have gotten a license.
>
>"None" is a rail response and is much too strong.

You say you "subtracted out the nocode techs". Without any qualifiers, that means all of them.

> I'm assuming that the major
>majority of nocode techs wouldn't have bothered with a coded license.

Not a reasonable assumption, based on how many new has DID "bother" with a code-tested license before Feb 14, 1991.

> Based
>on the thirty or so nocode techs whom I Elmered, I think that is a reasonable
>assumption.
>
The 30 or so that you know are hardly a representative sample of the more than 200,000 that have entered US ham radio via that license.

Fact is, there's NO way to know what would have happened if the FCC had let well enough alone in 1991. And there's no way to know for sure what will happen if/when the FCC drops all code testing. Which will probably happen shortly after WRC 2003.

But here's a clue: The number of US ham licenses has increased by less than 9000 since mid-May of 2002, despite massive reductions in both code and written testing. Most of that increase happened in the first year or so after the restructuring of 2000. I'm surprised the increase is so small. Way back when, I predicted that the total would exceed 700,000 before March, 2001, but that never happened.

We are approaching 100,000 Extras, though.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1691. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 05:10:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316001014.09101.00000021@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 37735

Here are some numbers to think about. These are the number of unexpired
FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of March 14, 2002:

Novice - 39,368 (decrease of 9,961)
Tech - 237,536 (increase of 32,142)
Tech Plus - 82,380 (decrease of 46,480)
General - 138,890 (increase of 26,213)
Advanced - 86,070 (decrease of 13,712)
Extra - 99,185 (increase of 20,435)
Total - 683,429 (increase of 8,637)

73 de Jim, N2EY

1692. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 05:23:27 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6ul2toep1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37737

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020315231307.06039.00001534@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >e.g. Cellphones, computers, and future technology. When a ham radio
> >was the only game in town, e.g. Madisonville, TX in the 50's, it was
> >much more attractive than it is now.
>
> One could always have played with the non-radio technology of the day
without
> being a ham, Cecil.

Just curious, but what might that be?

> A cellphone does not do what ham radio does.

The point being?

> A computer is no more high-tech for most people than a cell phone.

I really doubt that.

> Ham radio IS the only game in town for someone who wants virtually
unlimited
> license to personally experience a wide range of radio technology.

Agreed.

> That is what is has always been for most hams. The fear that all new hams
want
> to do is yak is, IMHO, no more founded than it always was.

Agree also.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1693. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 05:45:18 UTC
From: Martin <mdwade@mobiletel.com>
Message-ID: <3C92DBEE.5661@mobiletel.com>
Source record: 37738

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Martin wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > > The membership of the ARRL is still less than a quarter of all US
> > > > amateur radio licensees despite the belief system repetitions of
> > > > the goodness, nobility, importance, or "representation" of the ARRL.
> > >
> > > Some see the glass half full. Then there's Leonard H.
> > > Did you know that in some countries, it is mandatory for a radio amateur
> > > to belong to the national radio society? Wouldn't that be nice--100%
> > > ARRL membership.
> > >
> > Yeah, and in some countries you can't criticize the govt., the national
> > radio org or have decent QSOs.
>
> decent QSOs?

Yeah, like shooting the breeze on the repeater, talking about the
weather or
just commenting on the pothole in front of the house!
>
> > "U R 599 in outter slobvania, name is Boris, QTH is downtown Elbonia,
> > QSL via buro, bye bye de @@6*!^"
>
> > On second thought, I will take the USA and Canada, Separation of
> > Church and State, (ARRL and FCC), is a good thing.
>
> Here's a buck. Now run on down the street and buy yourself a sense of
> humor.

Want a sense of Humor, come down to Louisiana for Mardi Gras.

> >
> > ARRL leaves a lot to be desired, see http://www.ares.org for
> > how the ARRL will probably set Emergency Services back 20 yrs
> > by not exploiting a resource and trying to dictate to
> > the locals how to run their programs.
>
> I went to the site and looked through it. I was especially struck by
> the childish response which Karen Johansen sent the ARRL.

Sadly, Karen is right, this thing was handled by a complete lack of
tact which has caused great harm to Amateur Radio by turning a lot of
people off from ARRL. Louisiana Emergency Services were just beginning
to warm up to Amateur Radio, we have had a rough go here due to
the common perception of radio freaks ala Dukes of Hazard.

Why should
> she or you object to the League's protecting its registered name

In the beginning of SEAL ARES, INC. (we are also a non-profit org
domiciled in the Parish of Jefferson, State of Louisiana) we approached
Rick Palm, the officer we were directed to and he assited us and gave us
encouragement on our venture. Now Karen recieved a letter on this
matter
in a threatening manner instead of using a diplomatic touch which
would have achieved the purpose. We don't object but the ground work
should have been made clear from the start. First, each locality is
different and these differences are what should be first addressed. The
League should adopt a standard policy on its Logos and Such and then
put it out for the Community to see. (amateur radio community). Did we
(arrl)
do that, no, it just evolved until this happened. Legal standards
should
be developed and quality controls insisted upon. But up front!

and why
> should it not act to prevent others from thinking that ares.org is a
> site operated by the ARRL?

The site was one of the best sites on the WEB for ARES. ARRL blew their
chance when they acted like a bull in a china shop. ARRL had no
objection to the site years ago, why now. I researched the ACRONYM
"ARES" and found it in use by many other groups-most not even remotely
connected with Amateur Radio. BTW-go threaten them, it would be
interesting
to see that, maybe even be good entertainment, talk about a sense of
HUMOR.

I won't let facts or rationality stand in the
> way of your rage at the League's audacity.

I don't have have rage, I have disappointment.

>
> > > Tell us, Leonard, what radio amateur organization has a larger
> > > percentage of U.S. hams as members than The American Radio Relay League?
>
> > NCI or FISTS? DAMFINO, the ARRL is the only game in town to protect
> > Amateur Radio. It had better start promoting AR to the School Kids,
> > Whiz kids, Soccer Moms, Hot Moms and Dot.Coms if we want the ARS
> > to stay viable in 20 to 40 yrs.
>
> That's right, Martin. The growth we have is not enough. We shouldn't

> stop until every man, woman and child in the United States is a ham!

Now thats the spirt. Martin N5PZJ
>
> Dave K8MN

1694. Re: It just Figures...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 06:20:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316012006.25849.00001465@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 37739

>Subject: Re: It just Figures...
>From: "K0HB" K0HB@earthlink.net
>Date: 03/15/02 13:33 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <U7rk8.17772$P4.1534308@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>Because their postal service was hosed up by the anthrax attacks last
>fall, and because they are committed to fairness-of-the-process by
>handling both snail mail and electronic submissions on a equal footing
>(not true of other applications), there is a delay.

OK, Hans, then by THAT "logic", the FCC should hold ALL vanity applications
until 31 December of each year just to make sure that someone's application
didn't get hosed by USPS in the process.

>If that embarrasses you....
>
>.....well I guess you'll just need to find a way
>to deal with your embarrassment.

Nope...Just not very tolerant of excuses made on behalf of my tax dollars.

>With all kind wishes for a speedy recovery,

From what?

73

Steve, K4YZ

1695. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 06:26:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316012616.25849.00001467@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 37740

>Subject: Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 03/15/02 21:13 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C92AA1C.8E364922@earthlink.net>

>> Another null since that wasn't done in my high school. I did climb a
>> rope in Army basic training, outdoors, sandy soil. Did all kinds of
>> athletic-type things and passed. Went on to climb all sorts of
>> things, including towers of 200 and 300 feet, but only one wooden
>> pole (used climber boot spikes and a belt, though).

>
>Well bully for you, Len. Now to climb that amateur radio ladder...

BAM! that HAD to hurt!

ROTMFFLMMFAO ! ! ! ! ! ! !

WTG Dave!

Steve, K4YZ

1696. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 06:41:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316014147.25849.00001469@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 37741

>Subject: Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/15/02 17:27 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020315172704.17781.00000034@mb-fl.aol.com>

> The proper response would have been to be
>silent for a period and then bring out calm, reasoned examples to
>the contrary which do not involve personal expressions of implied
>ridicule against individuals.
>

Lennie, I guess you haven't been doing the math lately, but even the people who passively tolerated your lying bile and "defended" your "right" to be a liar and fool are at ends with you.

Even the most liberal and tolerant of voices here are tired of you. But I can understand your need to be here...You probably PO'd Mrs. A with your King-Of-The-Hill crap years ago. I can understand her wanting to save SOME last vestiges of pride and self respect by keeping you at arms length in her waning years. Bravo for her.

People here may disagree with HOW I got toe-to-toe with you, but so far no one has disagreed with intent. (I am sure one or two of the anonymous posters will jump in...already discounted)

How does it feel to know that in almost EVERY circle of Amateur Radio you have humiliated yourself? NO ONE would want to be in the same room with you, let alone want to share a QSO with you on the repeater. Even the ONE Amateur Radio organization with which you hold some kinship doesn't want you! And when the guy who could fix it for you tried to help you, you rubbed his nose in your crap.

(L)ying (H)am-baiting (A)antagonist. That pretty well sums it up.

1697. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International levels...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 07:06:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316020651.25849.00001473@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 37742

>Subject: Re: Ending Code Requirement at International levels...
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/15/02 17:27 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020315172702.17781.00000032@mb-fl.aol.com>

>Second, I have NO "infatuation with Hitler" or any other fascist or
>dictator, living or dead. That is an outrageous statement, a total
>fabrication, a lie

You are, again, caught lying. Your favorite adjectives are such as
"jack-booted", "thug", etc. Other euphimisms are rampant.

>As one who has studied military history and technology, there
>are a number of familiar terms and titles that I have used, taken
>from the German land and air military, past and present.

You take THESE terms because in your "studies" you know them to be of the
most offesnive, abusive and denigrating of choices.

I find that AS offensive as the "f" word, or making sexually suggestive
commetns about yo mama.

>Regardless of one's religious or socio-political beliefs, the
>German military was a skilled and efficient force. History is
>ample proof of this.

Obviously not skilled and efficient enough to get it's collective ass beat
by those decadent Americans and Brits.

>Rage and hatred
>of the old enemy remains in many, even those who were never
>alive at the time...some of those use the old history (that they
>never lived through) as a rationale to vent their own personal
>frustrations over minor events.

I seeeeeeeeeee.....since this all happend "way back then", and many of us
didn't "live through it", your use of offensive and inflammatory rhetoric from
that era is OK...Do I read that right?

>My best man held W6MJN then, still
>does.

Guess he can hold a call sign longer than you can hold a wife, huh?

>I don't have any "righteous indignation," only sadness that some
>perverse little minds are so warped with personal rage and
>frustration that they feel some "right" to impugn others, to insult
>others personally far from a subject area...all because they

>cannot get their way on a particular subject in a newsgroup

POT KETTLE BLACK

>I have a touch of sadness that some are afflicted with a need to
>assume different identities that are easily seen as false, then
>assuming righteous indignation at being caught.

Such as the ONE day it took for eveyone to see through "Avery Fine",
Lennie? You denied that, too. You were so intent on being a Putz under that
screen name that you lost track of your lies and posted with your "LHA" at the
end.

Tried to deny it...got busted. Sheesh.

>I have come to accept some as having a quasi-religious belief
>system in a hobby activity the seems to feed on myths and
>exaggerations and self-defined importances.

Such as lying about being solely responsible for "sending or relaying" 1.2
million messages and then getting ahnded your hat when the math didn't add up?

>They must win at all costs. Any manner of "winning" is
>permissible in their world.

When the "winning" means showing you for the liar and fool that you are, all
I can say is we have YOU to thank for that...You make it SOOOOOOO easy!

G'nite, Putz.

1698. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 07:15:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316021521.25849.00001474@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 37743

>Subject: Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/15/02 17:27 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020315172703.17781.00000033@mb-fl.aol.com>

>Improper response from the wrong page of the Manager's charm
>school manual. The correct response would be to remain aloof
>and let any "outsider" remarks lay without comment.

Lennie-To-English translation: Keep your mouth shut, Ed. It's hard enough trying to keep up the momentum of any one good rant without you dispelling it with something as trivial as FACTS.

>Incredulity arises among those adults who have been working for any
>employer

Except in this case. ARRL is a membership organization. Ed is ALSO a member of that organization. Properly scorned by an improper termination, I bet Ed could put a serious dent in the ARRLs' membership rosters. It wouldn't make sense.

Of course, little YOU, Lennie the Limp, have to offer is true vis-a-vis the League, ergo it's highly unlikely that anything Ed could say in reference to what you have spewed would be viewed as "counter productive".

>The membership of the ARRL is still less than a quarter of all US
>amateur radio licensees despite the belief system repetitions of
>the goodness, nobility, importance, or "representation" of the ARRL.

A membership which still does not include you, Lennie. Thank GOD for small favors! (And even if you join, you'll NOT be voting any time soon!)

>Expressed contempt of non-members does not gain newcomers.

I'd have to disagree...I'd be MORE inclined to join knowing riff-raff like you were excluded.

G'nite, Putz.

1699. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 13:19:02 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <aDHk8.14692$Ex5.1320670@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37744

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020316000338.02938.00000060@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article <3C902D27.F24B4AC@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >>
> >> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >> >Just because the slaves were freed didn't mean they stopped working.
> >>
> >> Sure they did. The guilty liberals even created a Welfare State so
> >> they wouldn't have to.
> >>
> >Uhhhhh Larry, the Welfare State started about 77 years after the
> >slaves were freed. How many former slaves lived to see the New Deal?
>
> Cecil:
>
> Well, none, axeually -- but their ancestors, who never chopped a lick
> of cotton or pulled a single barge, all claim to be permanently owed a
> living based on what happened to their ancestors of several generations
> past. Now it is the hard-working, middle-class people (of all races)
who
> are the "slaves" -- who must have their wealth be re-distributed to
those
> who produce nothing out of their own choice, only because guilty
liberals--
> usually rich ones, have decided that that's how it should be for the
rest
> of us.
>
> I think it's time for the hard working people of this country to take a
> lesson from John Galt.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> Who is John Galt?
>
>

I am reminded of reading Exodus in the Laborers' Union hall while
supporting my education back in the days. At first I was ready to join
the Hagganah and storm the parapets and minarets, upon further thought I
became grandly anti-Semitic for a few days, then finally decided the

combatants deserved each other; not every problem in this world is mine. It has been said that the function of education is the creation of an infallible bullshit detector and this whole issue has mine going off big time.

First off, I am going to assume you mean AFDC when you say 'welfare' and I would suggest you look again. This was the classic Federal handout program and did indeed develop a constituency of 'advocates for the poor'. I was around for the early battles in Wisconsin led by current HHS Secretary Tommy Thompson - a very easy man to underestimate BTW. Now Tommy and Republicans in general are not above racial politics and did so; reform was sold sub rosa as a way to deliver the shaft to the niggers in Milwaukee, Racine, and Kenosha and to the gooks in LaCrosse, Eau Claire, and Wausau. No one wanted to point out that the welfare rolls were 92% Caucasian then and remain so today as for that matter does the state as a whole. I knew an old guy who worked in the county welfare office and was the one who got to deliver the word (and the reality) that you didn't make it to the 8AM Monday job-orientation, your check just got cut, and whatever the excuse I don't want to hear it; he had a grin on Tuesday morning that required turning sideways to get thru the coffee shop door. Welfare isn't the gravy train it once was and we stand around amazed the out-of-wedlock birth rate is dropping like a stone in the face of a rising fertility rate. As the ag boys long ago learned, pay for something and it will miraculously appear -- this ain't rocket science.

The reparations thing is symbolic (and stupid) but reflects several things. On one level, with Indians and Japanese getting coins, it don't hoit to ask. So we revive the Freedman's Bureau promise of '40 acres and a mule' and demand its commuted value since 1866 and the wonders of compound interest make it a tidy sum indeed. It is bullshit, Larry, and everyone knows it including the demanders. But as another Ayn Rand novel, The Fountainhead, points out the most unpopular man in the room is he who articulates what everyone else in the room already knows. We have built a PC trap that prevents it being discussed for what it is.

It is being discussed in fits and starts but the biggest element is simply economic reality: the money does not care about blackitude any more, politicians care less and less about blackitude as Asians and Hispanics become a factor. Rather than try to rehabilitate a sick culture, we just issue a few more visas or cut a bigger hole in the fence in Arizona. So the biggest part of what you are seeing is a real decline in the I Am a Black Leader biz and a few loudmouths pedalling like hell to reestablish their gravy train. That none of them could carry MLKs shorts -- his campaigns should be studied like Caesar's and Ghandi's -- is becoming increasingly apparent. The noise you hear is collapse.

That the culture in 2002 terms is sick is apparent but you and I are not going to write the book; that will go to some black professionals and it will read something like 'expect, nay demand, more of your males and quit excusing for them and enabling shitty behavior' plus 'anyone who says it ain't black to be smart and work harder gets his socks fed to him thru the

nostrils'. It is, of course, incumbent on companies etc. to properly reward those who respond as individuals not as group members and hang anyone getting skin color involved at all from the nearest convenient yardarm or lamppost. Corporations are economic golem that we have every reason and right to expect to act as economic golem, not as public nannies. Ain't nice but no one has ever been cured of dependence whether economic or alcoholic by being nice.

It will be interesting to see what comes of Hispanic (way too broad an adjective) immigrants in the US. As a people, the Mexicans we get here are a fine bunch. I will remember getting loaded with the minority affairs honcho at the U of Utah when the tube came on with something about Chicano and this bronze dude that looked like he was carved from Mt Rushmore (and had to be cruised by every gay west of Denver) said, "I hope I live long enough for us to say what we mean - Spanish speaking Indian". Well, we are now getting the chance.

The locals are well on the way to developing the support mechanisms to send their people to med school, law school, and even a few in engineering and in the meantime have damned near taken over roofing, siding, and concrete work in Omaha. Yes, watching Jose turn a Dodge Neon into a low-rider is somewhat off-putting and wheels sticking out present an interesting driving hazard but WTH. And I can get a really decent and heart-healthy meal at El Rinconcito Pupuseria y Restaurante on Thursday nite -- the classic immigrant eatery. Grandma speaks no English but cooks up a storm, mamacita does what she can, and the two kids take turns being chained to the cash register in case a gringo walks in. Tough on the kids but that is what second-generation immigrant kids have done for centuries. The only real problem they have is getting the kids to finish high school and that is being addressed right between the earlobes in no uncertain terms. They'll make it just like the other immigrant groups in South Omaha made it, it will just be 'Buenos Dias' instead of 'Jak se Ma'te'. I didn't understand the polkas in Polish or Czech and I don't understand them in Spanish. My loss.

Don't get hung up on the symbolic mice running through, Larry. There is an elephant stampede in progress.

Dick NBK

1700. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 15:14:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C93616F.69B40E98@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37745

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Our opinion differs on that point, Jim. I do not think third harmonic
> >is "adequate".
>
> My "Reference Data For Radio Engineers" says it is. You argue with the IRE ;-)

Quoting from The ARRL Handbook: "CCIR and FCC recommend ... K=5 for fading circuits when using telegraphy for aural reception." K=3 does not function well for fading circuits and is therefore IMO not adequate for ham applications.

> > I have tried to copy 13wpm CW through a 100Hz filter
> >and just could not do it.
>
> I have tried to run a 4 minute mile and just could not do it, either. Doesn't
> mean it can't be done.

We are not talking about heroic performances, Jim. We are talking about comparing average hams using PSK31 Vs CW.

> >You say 20wpm is slow CW.
>
> More bull. Produce a post where I have said that, or anything close to it.

During just the past week you said 20wpm CW is not fast CW. Separating CW into the two major catagories, fast and slow, leads us to the logical conclusion that not fast equals slow.

> > Then when I use a 20wpm example, you rag on me.
>
> All I did was show the errors in your posts.

There were no errors in my post given the boundary conditions. You cannot copy 20wpm through a 31Hz filter.

> "If it happens, it must be possible".

Again, we are talking about average hams using PSK31 Vs CW, not one in a million freak occurrences.

> The throughput of PSK31 in the case cited by W0EX was 0 wpm. CW ran rings
> around it.

Not through a 31 Hz filter, it didn't. Don't tell me you want to cheat in order to make your point. Anything that was forced upon PSK31 by the design must also be forced upon CW for the playing field to be level.

> >To be a fair comparison, 50wpm CW needs to be copied through a 31 Hz
> >filter.
>
> Why? Under the conditions W0EX experienced, the PSK31 throughput was 0 wpm. If
> it happens...

But that was irrelevant. Dick was not listening to CW after going through
the PSK31 31 Hz filter. Apples and oranges. If Dick had been listening
to CW through the PSK31 31 Hz filter, the throughput would have been equal.

> >A fair comparison includes S/N ratio, power, bandwidth, and throughput.
>
> A fair comparison also includes real-world noise conditions.

Uhhhhhhhh Jim, the 'N' in S/N ratio *is* noise.

> Ah, but the comparison was between PSK31 and CW.

Not unless the CW was squeezed through the same filter as PSK31 and it
wasn't. The comparison was NOT between CW and PSK31. Listening upstream
is cheating.

> >PACTOR II uses a wider PSK signal than PSK31 and it will run
> >circles around CW when comparing S/N ratio, bandwidth, and throughput.
>
> Maybe. Why isn't it used for EME, if it's so good?

It was not designed for EME. It is superb for the application for which
it was designed.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1701. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 15:18:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C93624B.AB9F37B9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37746

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Uhhhhh Larry, the Welfare State started about 77 years after the
> >slaves were freed. How many former slaves lived to see the New Deal?
>
> Well, none, axeually -- but their ancestors, who never chopped a lick
> of cotton or pulled a single barge, all claim to be permanently owed a
> living based on what happened to their ancestors of several generations
> past.

Uhhhhhh Larry, their ancestors were even older than they were.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1702. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 15:35:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C936627.7D2A56BC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37747

N2EY wrote:
> You say you "subtracted out the nocode techs". Without any qualifiers, that
> means all of them.

There you go railing again, Jim. I already said it was a broad brush. I
don't even know how many nocode techs there are so how can you accuse
me of subtracting out all of them?

> Not a reasonable assumption, based on how many new has DID "bother" with a
> code-tested license before Feb 14, 1991.

I'm not counting the ones who went on to General, Advanced, and Extra using
the Tech license as a stepping stone. I'm considering the number of Techs who
didn't go on to Tech+. In my experience at Intel, only 7% of Techs went on to
Tech+ and no farther.

> The 30 or so that you know are hardly a representative sample of the more than
> 200,000 that have entered US ham radio via that license.

Sampling is done all the time where 350 voters are sampled to find out what
the entire voting population is thinking. There is always a margin of error.

> Fact is, there's NO way to know what would have happened if the FCC had let
> well enough alone in 1991.

There's no way to know for sure. There is always a margin of error. That's
because the future hasn't happened yet. However, given all the possibilities,
at least one is bound to be right.

> But here's a clue: The number of US ham licenses has increased by less than
> 9000 since mid-May of 2002, despite massive reductions in both code and written
> testing. Most of that increase happened in the first year or so after the
> restructuring of 2000. I'm surprised the increase is so small.

So am I. That's why I think the future health of the ARS depends on attracting
more potential hams, not trying to chase them away.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1703. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 15:37:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9366C0.5F448BAE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37748

W1RFI wrote:
> A cellphone does not do what ham radio does.

Sometimes it does. I can talk to N5AQM in AZ for free on my cellphone.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1704. Re: It just Figures...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 15:40:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C93676F.37B07F58@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37749

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> After all, they most likely think and speak in jive "Ebonics," ...

Well Larry, you think and speak in Hambonics.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1705. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 16:50:55 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c94cbbe_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 37791

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C884BD7.C1CB1EEE@worldnet.att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Read it again, Bill. This time concentrate and try to comprehend.
> > >
> > > What I said was "Those who REFUSE to learn CPR deserve to be
overlooked
> > > just as hams who refuse to learn Morse code deserve (the same)".
> >
> > That's what we thought you said, Dick. Nice guy.
> >
>
> So you have comprehension problems all your own. No surprise. That is
NOT
> what he quoted me as having said.
> Refuse to help others and you shouldn't be too surprised to find others
not
> to anxious to help you.
>

What a wonderful example of a) being a human being, and b) a ham radio
operator who purports support of emergency communication service.

Dick, you're a fake.

Kim W5TIT

1706. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 16:58:21 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c94cd84_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 37794

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C8980AA.6E475D66@worldnet.att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > > Refuse to help others and you shouldn't be too surprised to find
others not
> > > > > to anxious to help you.
> > > >
> > > > You would ask my 89 year old father if he knows CPR and then refuse
to
> > > > perform the needed CPR on him when you found out he didn't know it.
> > > > That's why I said, "Nice guy".
> > >
> > > Cecil, you are truly out standing in your field. Outside the
ballpark.
> >
> > If you didn't mean what you said, Dick, I suggest you retract your
> > statements. The meaning was clear. Anyone who disagrees with your
> > take on reality should die rather than expect help.
>
>
> You are totally out of touch. Just because one who
> *refused* to take training
> (not someone who never had the opportunity to receive the
> training)
> *deserves* to be refused help doesn't mean that is what will
> happen to him. You're
> the kind of person who would be more likely to do that.
>
>

One can only wonder what training/knowledge you have refused, forgotten to
get, overlooked, didn't have time for, that would equate to being able to
save someone's life. Maybe one day you'll be looking up into the eyes of
someone who has knowledge you don't because you refused...as you are gasping
for breath and they are making the same value judgements you make, Dick.

Kim W5TIT

1707. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 17:02:05 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c94ce66_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 37795

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020314054801.29995.00001318@mb-cq.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > "ge om ur 579 hr in stlouis mo stlouis mo rig is 100 w to a dipole ant
es
> >name hr is dick dick bt hw cpi?"
> >
> >wouldn't make much sense to most new CW ops, it seems.
>
> I have used the Phillips code in CW conversations for the entire time I
have
> been a ham. I have never had a single person tell me that my sending
didn't
> make sense or respond in a way that led me to believe they didn't know
what I
> was saying.
>
> Your imagining the worst about these new hams has taken on a new extreme.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

I cannot see why Dick is under the impression that the above message would prove difficult for anyone, let alone a ham radio operator. Most children have played communication games with pig latin, etc., and anyone who's done that will be able to decipher most things such as the message above. Maybe people like Little Dick think that makes them really smart, who knows?

Kim W5TIT

1708. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 17:05:04 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c94cf0a_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 37796

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C89E448.4DFE1512@worldnet.att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > > Not that long ago most all routine CW conversations included much
of this
> > > > > economy of verbiage. Today it's not so common at all, seems
everyone thinks it
> > > > > all needs to be spelled out.
> > > > >
> > > > > "ge om ur 579 hr in stlouis mo stlouis mo rig is 100 w to a
dipole ant es
> > > > > name hr is dick dick bt hw cpi?"
> > > > >
> > > > > wouldn't make much sense to most new CW ops, it seems.
> > > >
> > > > And that's NOT an advantage, Dick.
> > >
> > > Tell us about it. Would it be a problem if new hams learned
> > > to use CW well?
> >
> > After 51 years as a ham, even I don't know all the CW abbreviations.
>
> >
>
> After 51 years you, particularly, don't know the CW abbreviations. Most CW
ops of long
> tenure do. Many of them don't use many of them so as not to confuse the
newer ops. I
> think they should, as a training thing.
>
>
> > How are
> > you going to force new hams to learn them?
>
> And where did I say I was, Sir Troll? But even through your fog you
should be able to
> discern that it would be helpful in the pursuit of CW.
>

Dick, I am sure Cecil is toying with you much like a cat toys around with a dead, limp mouse. Take a look at most communication that takes place in chat rooms or instant messaging over the internet, won't ya? Ham radio has no corner on the market for using shortcuts in written language. Good grief. CUL

Kim W5TIT

1709. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 17:07:02 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c94cf81_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 37797

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C89E5D9.B0E11F@worldnet.att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Just because
> > > someone doesn't deserve help for whatever reason does not mean he
won't get it.
> >
> > HUH?????????
>
> " HUH?" Still with comprehension problems? Even a child killer gets a
trial. An
> ailing
> murderer gets medical treatment. People who refuse to bother themselves to
help
> others get help themselves from other people. Most of us are that way.
Sorry you see
> it differently.
>

Dick, you don't portray yourself as one who would care enough about someone else to help. That you would even condone the message you proliferate is disgusting.

Kim W5TIT

1710. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 17:07:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C937BA8.E063D271@earthlink.net>
Source record: 37750

Martin wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > Martin wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:

> > > Yeah, and in some countries you can't criticize the govt., the national
> > > radio org or have decent QSOs.
> >
> > decent QSOs?
>
> Yeah, like shooting the breeze on the repeater, talking about the
> weather or
> just commenting on the pothole in front of the house!

Pretty serious stuff. I don't see those examples as any more "decent"
than UR 599 BT 73 ES TNX.

> > > "U R 599 in outter slobvania, name is Boris, QTH is downtown Elbonia,
> > > QSL via buro, bye bye de @@6*!^"
> >
> > > On second thought, I will take the USA and Canada, Separation of
> > > Church and State, (ARRL and FCC), is a good thing.
> >
> > Here's a buck. Now run on down the street and buy yourself a sense of
> > humor.
>
> Want a sense of Humor, come down to Louisiana for Mardi Gras.

Been there. Done that and have seen the T-shirts lifted.

> > > ARRL leaves a lot to be desired, see http://www.ares.org for
> > > how the ARRL will probably set Emergency Services back 20 yrs
> > > by not exploiting a resource and trying to dictate to
> > > the locals how to run their programs.
> >
> > I went to the site and looked through it. I was especially struck by
> > the childish response which Karen Johansen sent the ARRL.
>
> Sadly, Karen is right, this thing was handled by a complete lack of
> tact which has caused great harm to Amateur Radio by turning a lot of
> people off from ARRL. Louisiana Emergency Services were just beginning
> to warm up to Amateur Radio, we have had a rough go here due to
> the common perception of radio freaks ala Dukes of Hazard.

I don't agree with you that Karen was right. She threw a tantrum over a letter received from the ARRL. She replied in a less than mature manner, severed her organization's link with the ARRL and resigned from ARES. As I see it, the only people "turned off" to ARRL haven't thought about the reasons for the letter from the League.

> Why should
> > she or you object to the League's protecting its registered name
>
> In the beginning of SEAL ARES, INC. (we are also a non-profit org
> domiciled in the Parish of Jefferson, State of Louisiana) we approached
> Rick Palm, the officer we were directed to and he assited us and gave us
> encouragement on our venture. Now Karen recieved a letter on this
> matter
> in a threatening manner instead of using a diplomatic touch which
> would have achieved the purpose. We don't object but the ground work
> should have been made clear from the start. First, each locality is
> different and these differences are what should be first addressed. The
> League should adopt a standard policy on its Logos and Such and then
> put it out for the Community to see. (amateur radio community). Did we
> (arrl)
> do that, no, it just evolved until this happened. Legal standards
> should
> be developed and quality controls insisted upon. But up front!

The League will likely do that when you submit your plans for a web site based on its ARES program up front. I read the League's letter and did not find it to be the least bit threatening. By the way, every corporate entity I know of protects its logos and registered names. How would Coca Cola, Microsoft, The March of Dimes, The American Cancer Society or CQ Magazine have reacted?

> and why
> > should it not act to prevent others from thinking that ares.org is a
> > site operated by the ARRL?
>
> The site was one of the best sites on the WEB for ARES. ARRL blew their
> chance when they acted like a bull in a china shop.

How did the League blow its chance? What chance are you speaking of? How did the League act like a bull in a china shop?

> ARRL had no
> objection to the site years ago, why now. I researched the ACRONYM
> "ARES" and found it in use by many other groups-most not even remotely
> connected with Amateur Radio. BTW-go threaten them, it would be
> interesting
> to see that, maybe even be good entertainment, talk about a sense of
> HUMOR.

While Rick Palm may have known about the site, it is pretty clear that other League officials did not. I'll agree that you likely found other uses of the term "ARES"--probably something to do with rams at stud.

Do they use the League's ARES logo and did they launch a web site about
amateur radio emergency services?

> I won't let facts or rationality stand in the
> > way of your rage at the League's audacity.
>
> I don't have have rage, I have disappointment.

Feel free to substitute the word "disappointment" in my comment above.

Dave K8MN

1711. Re: Would Morse Code die without the testing requirement?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 17:11:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316121151.15084.00000037@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 37601

In article <20020303131243.17460.00001494@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY):
>
>>>I estimate about 20% of hams have useable proficiency in Morse code.
>
>>I would say it's much higher.
>
>I was including all licensed hams in my WAG. This includes no-code techs
>(and
>their equivalents in other countries), inactive hams who haven't touched
>their
>rig in years (and are renewing for whatever reason), no-code techs, etc.

Ah, OK.
>
>All things considered, I think that 20% might be a bit high. The Japanese
>no-code hams skew that number way down.
>
Japan is an interesting case. Check out their license stats on

http://www.ah0a.org

The interesting numbers are what has happened to station license totals since the mid-90s. Not a pretty picture. New hams per year is way down. Do not be fooled by the huge numbers of operator licenses, because JA operator licenses never expire. JA operator license numbers are an accurate indicator of how many people have been issued license since the end of WW2, not how many hold them currently.

Also note JARL membership as a percentage of total hams.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1712. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 17:11:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316121151.15084.00000036@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 37602

In article <20020310132627.08770.00000653@mb-mk.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
>> I agree completely "Why the ARRL BoD 'refarming' initiative?"
>> I think it's a stupid, ill-advised idea aimed at pandering to the
>> SSB-only crowd.
>
>The Novice/Tech+ segments are virtually unused. The ARRL proposal pretty
>much
>divvies them up 50-50 vs phone/image and CW/digital.

Right now they are 100% CW digital, tho.

So the point is this: The proposal is based on the idea that the phone/image folks need a more space and the CW/digital folks can make do with less.
>
>Why is not it a stupid, ill-advised idea aimed at pandering to the CW-only
>crowd? Or the image-only crowd? Or the digital-only crowd?

Seems to me that it works like this:

- Carl sees digital as the future of ham radio, and reducing the space available to digital shortchanges the future. He also sees enormous difficulty in getting the rules changed in the future as the demand for digital space increases.

- The ARRL BoD sees more current and future need for phone/image space, and so seeks to meet those needs.

- I don't understand the use of terms like "stupid, ill-advised idea" and "pandering to the SSB-only crowd" if the desired result is a better future for the ARS.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1713. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 17:11:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316121152.15084.00000038@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 37603

In article <3C92922A.2CDB38B3@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >Not for everyone, Jim. I have used it for decades and still cannot
>> >head copy words with four or more letters. I also cannot repeat a
>> >telephone number back to you. I seem to have a very small buffer
>> >for things I hear.
>>
>> Then how do you understand a word with four or more syllables, a sentence
>with
>> four or more words, or an equation with four or more terms?
>
>I don't have trouble with written items but I have a lot of trouble with a
>spoken equation. It is some sort of disability. If someone gives me a fast
>food list of more than three items, I have to write them down.
>--
Then how do you understand a spoken word with four or more syllables or a
spoken sentence with four or more words or concepts?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1714. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 17:11:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316121153.15084.00000039@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 37604

In article <20020315232540.06039.00001537@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
>> es=is
>
>Actually, "es" in Morse-ese means "and." It is from French.

Hmmm, all the references I've seen say it derives from the American Morse for the symbol "&". dit-dididit
>
>> here=hr
>
>That one is pretty universal, and over used. The rig and name are always
>"hr,"
>as if the guy could be talking about the name somewhere else. :-)
>
I stopped doing that years ago. "......NAME JIM" is as clear as "NAME HR IS JIM"

>> Thanks=tks=tk
>
>And that could also be TX or TU.

TX = transmitter, TU = thank you

>The usual is tnx.

Yup. But TU is shorter.
>
>> There are others, but you get the point. It's not that big of a deal,
>>but I would have expected more precision.
>
>In casual conversation, no more precision is needed than in casual verbal
>communication. The range of precision in the spoken word varies all over the
>place.

As evidenced in Usenet posts!

Here's a list of "-X" abbreviations:

CX = Classic Exchange (operating activity using older equipment)
DX = distance = rare or foreign stations
FX = affects, effects
HX = handling instructions (used with formal messages)
RX = receiver

TX = transmitter
WX = weather

Maybe we should produce a whole list here.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1715. Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 17:13:19 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a6vuja$d2n$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37605

By a fairly narrow majority, members of DARC,
the Germany equivalent of ARRL voted to keep
their current code testing. The statistics are as
follows:

17455 DARC members (which is 33.8 % of all DARC members)
took part in a vote for or against keeping the CW test
for HF.

Of these, 1144 votes were invalid.

From 16311 valid votes, 8530 (that is 52.3 %) voted
for keeping the CW test in its current form.

47.7 % voted for abolishing the CW test.

The DARC (German Amateur Radio League) will respect
this vote as a member of the IARU.

If you are code test advocate you might think that's great.
If you think for a minute, however, you'll see how the
"vote" is extremely narrow...and (IMHO) the vote if
taken a year from now will get even closer, or even
go the other way. Additionally, this vote only influences
how Germany via DARC will "vote" within the IARU
process.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1716. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 17:55:32 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <oGLk8.24363$Vx1.2084391@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 37606

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
> If you are code test advocate you might think that's great.
> If you think for a minute, however, you'll see how the
> "vote" is extremely narrow.
>

The "vote" for President of the US was also extremely
narrow, but GWB is President.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1717. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 18:08:25 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <tSLk8.15135$Ex5.1357720@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37607

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020316000339.02938.00000062@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article <a6sqq5827op@enews1.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >
> > >What about Corporate Welfare? One form of this is these damned tax
> > >abatements that companies get. If corporations were to pay a very
small,
> > >say 1 or 2 percent tax like the rest of us have to, the burden on us
all
> > >would be less as opposed to soaking it from the working guy. What
about all
> > >the other funding, and many other sources of capital corporations get
from
> > >the governments?
> > >
> > >(for the record I am not a left-winger, although republicrats seem to
think
> > >there is only 2 parties or way of thinking. I would best be classified
as a
> > >independant, in other words a free thinker)
> > >
> > >
> > >--
> > >Ryan, KC8PMX
> > >FF/MFR
> >
> I'm a solid Republican when it comes to Corporate Welfare. I believe
> in it. I think the big corporations that create the jobs and produce
the
> goods and services that fuel our economy should pay absolutely
> nothing in state and federal taxes. The notion that corporations and
> businesses of all sizes don't pay any taxes is absolutely false, and
> a popular misconception among liberals. The problem is that corporate
> taxes are very high in some areas, forcing businesses to go elsewhere --
> usually overseas -- in order to be able to operate at an acceptable
> level of profitability.
>
> If you think we have a problem because corporations aren't paying
> enough taxes, then I suggest that perhaps we have too big and burdensome
> of a government overhead on our society, making demands on the tax
> base. Bottom line: People who produce wealth through their initiative
> and ingenuity deserve all the tax breaks they can get. People who

> sit back and let life pass them by with their hands out, deserve a
> lesson in nature taking it's course.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

You hit on a better question than you know re corporate taxes. Just who in hell pays them and what effect it has on the economy has been a subject of debate among economists forever. Most don't give a hoot anymore having decided that Flaubert's Law applies: taxation is like plucking a goose, the object is a maximum of feathers with a minimum of hissing.

Things like a property tax in most places can be justifed as more of a user fee, the plant gets the fire laddies and the benefit of the school system although either can be challenged either in theory or practice. To suggest that corporations and employers in general do in fact pay half of Social Security is simple political flatulence along with a number of other payroll taxes. Workers Comp is an interesting political trade-off, injured workers do get medical and a wage, the courts get cleared, and a social/economic purpose is served by required experience rating so that Attila the Hun gets no economic advantage over Dudley Doright. The interesting one is the corporate income tax.

A growing company actually can get away with little taxation because of accelerated depreciation but the real killer is the mature company spinning cash that cannot be sensibly applied to expansion in the industry. And cyclical companies can carry losses forward and back to average out taxation and incidentally provide a rich reward for the buyers of failed operations who keep the corpse propped up until the carryforward runs out. The cash-cow becomes a takeover target so it goes on an aquisition rampage and the chicken-feed company becomes the proud owner of a few hundred fast food joints that it knows nothing about running rather than return taxable dividends the stockholders do not seem to want. Even Enron is mildly attractive as a carry forward (it is due an amazing refund BTW, they were far more honest with Sam than they were with everyone else). Generally one does not like economic decisons based on taxes so in that sense we have failed.

The object is to encourage management to be honest, frugal, and prepared. When you in effect pay for about half of the excesses with tax deducts, it tends to dampen the enthusiasm for decent management and those watching managements for decency. And preparation is of less importance when stupidity has value. In a lot of respects the corporate income tax is corrosive if not cancerous.

Republicans seem to be enamored of 'capital gains' which is a word without meaning that was coined to avoid taxing the results of inflation but could be more easily handled by using the Fed's GNP deflator in asset sales. So we get golf courses etc. (drive in movies used to be popular) to pay the real estate taxes while we wait for land prices to go up and sell out to a developer. And the shoe pinches so we bellow 'Capital Gains!!!'

T'would also seem that if one really gave a damn about energy independence a tariff on imported oil would serve that purpose admirably rather than try to bail out Big Steel for the purpose of trying to pay the four retirees per worker that they are trying to do now. Aid the workers, don't aid some obsolete pile of assets. And if investment and saving are a problem, why not tax consumption rather than income? Value Added Taxes work well at this -- essentially they are a sales tax in which everyone collects it (not on exports) but deducts VAT paid on intermediate steps; imports are taxed at the border. So Bloomies pays VAT and collects it and remits the diff and the end-user gets left holding the bag.

The hard part, as the Steel Stupidity pretty clearly illustrates, is the tendency of governments, unions, and voters to attempt to enshrine the past.

Dick N&#65533;BK

1718. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 18:46:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316134636.25328.00000028@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 37608

In article <3C93616F.69B40E98@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >Our opinion differs on that point, Jim. I do not think third harmonic
>> >is "adequate".
>>
>> My "Reference Data For Radio Engineers" says it is. You argue with the IRE
>;-)
>
>Quoting from The ARRL Handbook: "CCIR and FCC recommend ... K=5 for fading
>circuits when using telegraphy for aural reception." K=3 does not function
>well for fading circuits and is therefore IMO not adequate for ham
>applications.

All amateur radio circuits are not fading circuits. QED
>
>> > I have tried to copy 13wpm CW through a 100Hz filter
>> >and just could not do it.
>>
>> I have tried to run a 4 minute mile and just could not do it, either.
>Doesn't
>> mean it can't be done.
>
>We are not talking about heroic performances, Jim.

4 minute mile isn't heroic. Heck, best I ever did was about six minutes.

>We are talking about
>comparing average hams using PSK31 Vs CW.

I know "average" runners who do marathons at six minute per mile.
>
>> >You say 20wpm is slow CW.
>>
>> More bull. Produce a post where I have said that, or anything close to it.
>
>During just the past week you said 20wpm CW is not fast CW.

Produce the post.

> Separating
>CW into the two major catagories, fast and slow, leads us to the
>logical conclusion that not fast equals slow.

Not at all. It's like saying all ice cream that is not vanilla must be
chocolate.

At the very least, there's very slow, slow, medium, fast, and very fast. Your
insistence on making everything binary is not binding on me.

>> > Then when I use a 20wpm example, you rag on me.

Rags are for chewing. I don't rag on anybody.
>>
>> All I did was show the errors in your posts.
>
>There were no errors in my post given the boundary conditions. You cannot
>copy 20wpm through a 31Hz filter.

Sure I can. Here's my filter specs:

-3 dB: 31 Hz
-6 dB: 310 Hz
-60 dB: 3100 Hz
>
>> "If it happens, it must be possible".
>
>Again, we are talking about average hams using PSK31 Vs CW, not one in
>a million freak occurrences.

Who says it's one in a million? Phase distortion on HF is a fact of life.
>
>> The throughput of PSK31 in the case cited by W0EX was 0 wpm. CW ran rings
>> around it.
>
>Not through a 31 Hz filter, it didn't.

Who cares? Removing the filter would not have helped PSK31 any. That's a fact,
Jack.

> Don't tell me you want to cheat
>in order to make your point.

Not me. I'm pure as the driven snow.

>Anything that was forced upon PSK31 by
>the design must also be forced upon CW for the playing field to be
>level.

But you don't allow the reverse to be true. The things "forced" upon CW you do
not permit to be "forced" upon PSK31. Hardly a level playing field.
>
>> >To be a fair comparison, 50wpm CW needs to be copied through a 31 Hz
>> >filter.
>>
>> Why? Under the conditions W0EX experienced, the PSK31 throughput was 0 wpm.
>If
>> it happens...
>

>But that was irrelevant.

I see. (somebody get the net)

>Dick was not listening to CW after going through
>the PSK31 31 Hz filter. Apples and oranges. If Dick had been listening
>to CW through the PSK31 31 Hz filter, the throughput would have been equal.

So the fact that CW worked and PSK31 didn't isn't relevant? Even though
removing the 31 Hz filter would not fix PSK31's problem? Hoo boy, that's a good
one.
>
>> >A fair comparison includes S/N ratio, power, bandwidth, and throughput.
>>
>> A fair comparison also includes real-world noise conditions.
>
>Uhhhhhhhh Jim, the 'N' in S/N ratio *is* noise.

Yup. I knew that in the fifth grade. "Noise" includes stuff like phase noise.
>
>> Ah, but the comparison was between PSK31 and CW.
>
>Not unless the CW was squeezed through the same filter as PSK31 and it
>wasn't. The comparison was NOT between CW and PSK31. Listening upstream
>is cheating.

No, it isn't - particularly if both modes are allowed to do it.
>
>> >PACTOR II uses a wider PSK signal than PSK31 and it will run
>> >circles around CW when comparing S/N ratio, bandwidth, and throughput.
>>
>> Maybe. Why isn't it used for EME, if it's so good?
>
>It was not designed for EME.

Neither was CW, but it's superb for EME.

>It is superb for the application for which
>it was designed.

Which is?

73 de Jim, N2EY
>cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>

1719. Re: It just Figures...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 19:10:55 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <3NMk8.5259$7x6.1089863921@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 37609

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C93676F.37B07F58@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > After all, they most likely think and speak in jive "Ebonics," ...
>
> Well Larry, you think and speak in Hambonics.

Actually, he speaks in Bigotbonics. He doesn't think much. Brian

1720. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 20:27:49 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c94fe89_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 37972

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u99j6drdk1ej84@corp.supernews.com...
> Let me clarify further:
>
> If a Ham organization has a membership consisting overwhelmingly
> of people who have passed a code test, and code testing begins to
> come under pressure, it seems to me that the job of the organization
> is to find out, as closely as possible, where the membership stands,
> in a very detailed and "beyond-any-doubt" manner. From what I have
> read here I do not believe that there has been any actual "full-up" effort
> taken in many years to determine the actual position of a true majority
> of the group, on code testing, and several other important issues.
>

A membership organization is very similar to a trade-union organization. It
is not the job of the organization to "learn" what its membership desires.
It is the responsibility of a dues-paying member to either a) have full
trust in whatever decisions are made by their organization or, to b) be sure
to continuously advise the decision makers of their [the member's] desires.

>
> That is, if it were my organization and such a hot topic was on the
> table, I would actively and thoroughly contact the membership, by
> e-mail, snail-mail, multiple-mode-mail, explaining the situation and
> stating that at such and such a time a truly serious survey would be
> taken, to which they were strongly, VERY strongly encouraged to
> reply. The goal would be MUCH more than a 50 pecent response,
> and to quite a bit more than just one simple "up-or-down" question.
>

You speak as though you believe there is a "my" in the leadership of the
ARRL? The ARRL is not an "I" organization. It is a "we" organization. I
am confused, therefore, by your use of the "if it were my organization." It
is a matter of the ARRL leadership either being allowed to do as it pleases
(by a silent membership--as most trade-unions are I might add) or doing
things at the will of a majority voice in the membership. This is one of
the shortcomings of being a member in the ARRL--there are not enough
"outspoken" members to contribute to the will and direction of the ARRL.
The result, then, is an organization that moves at the will of a few in the
leadership. However, I might add that let the ARRL make a decision that
would really upset a lot of members and they would certainly hear about it.
Therefore, due diligence dictates that the leadership understand their
boundaries, limitations, and even understand what the majority of "active"
(read: those who care) members would really want.

>
> Isn't it true that no such thing has been done in many years?
>

I don't think I have ever been asked anything by the ARRL, as far as opinion. I have been sent letters requesting that I support something--I think I recently got one requesting my support for the ARRL's opinion and moves on the CC&R issue. I do not support the ARRL's position on the CC&R issue. I was not asked what my opinion is.

>
> No doubt this would be expensive but, hey, this is IMPORTANT, is
> it not? Once again, I find the lack of precise information here more
> than a bit disturbing.
>

I don't think it's disturbing at all. If you are an ARRL member and, if something is that important to you, urge the ARRL leadership to "go your way." Another more worthwhile effort, in my opinion, is to be a voice for getting more members and for getting more members to actively get involved in the ARRL's position. That becomes rather unpopular, but it's politics--so who cares?

>
> I know I'm an outsider and currently belong now to no amateur
> organization. But I will (I hope) soon!
>
> Am I just wrong about the above?
>
> Val
>

You can belong right now, to the ARRL--although your membership (if you are not a radio amateur) is a "voiceless" one in that you have no voting power in the ARRL...Ed, correct me if I am wrong on that. However, you may at any time write directly to the FCC, your congressperson, etc.

Kim W5TIT

1721. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 20:29:05 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c94feda_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 37973

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C94DA1A.44CED6D2@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >
> > WHY, Clay, would a membership organization who traditionally
SUPPORTED
> > code testing drop it's support UNLESS there was a substantial indication
BY the
> > membership that THEY felt otherwise?
> >
> >
>
> Hi Steve,
>
> Of course you ask this question hypothetically, but I ask it
> in truth. It is clear to me there was no substantial (read
> majority?) indication by the membership that they felt code
> testing should be dropped.
>
> 73,
> Clay N4AOX

I honestly don't think there was a substantial offering on behalf of the
membership of feelings on the CW issue one way or the other, was there?

Kim W5TIT

1722. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 21:10:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316161001.09101.00000035@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 37611

In article <3C936627.7D2A56BC@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> You say you "subtracted out the nocode techs". Without any qualifiers, that
>> means all of them.
>
>There you go railing again, Jim.

"Railing"? Not me. I'm simply pointing out the logical implications of your statement.

>I already said it was a broad brush.

Too broad.

> I
>don't even know how many nocode techs there are so how can you accuse
>me of subtracting out all of them?

How can you subtract them out if you don"t know how many there are to begin with?
>
>> Not a reasonable assumption, based on how many new has DID "bother" with a
>> code-tested license before Feb 14, 1991.
>
>I'm not counting the ones who went on to General, Advanced, and Extra using
>the Tech license as a stepping stone.

How many of them are there?

>I'm considering the number of Techs who
>didn't go on to Tech+.

How many of THEM are there?

>In my experience at Intel, only 7% of Techs went on to
>Tech+ and no farther.

How many went further?
>
>> The 30 or so that you know are hardly a representative sample of the more
>than
>> 200,000 that have entered US ham radio via that license.
>
>Sampling is done all the time where 350 voters are sampled to find out what
>the entire voting population is thinking.

Those samples are scientifically chosen to be representative of the entire voting population. Your sample is not scientifically chosen, just convenient for you.

>There is always a margin of error.

Obviously. In the case you cite, it's a large one. IOW, you're mistaken in making your conclusion, because:

>
>> Fact is, there's NO way to know what would have happened if the FCC had let
>> well enough alone in 1991.
>
>> But here's a clue: The number of US ham licenses has increased by less than
>> 9000 since mid-May of 2002, despite massive reductions in both code and
>written
>> testing. Most of that increase happened in the first year or so after the
>> restructuring of 2000. I'm surprised the increase is so small.
>
>So am I.

Well, we agree on something, then.

The lack of a flood of newcomers indicates that license and test requirements are
not holding back any significant number of would-be hams. So there is no reason to reduce them further. Obviously other factors are much more important, such as publicity and CC&Rs.

Next month it will be 2 years since restructuring. Compare the growth of US license figures from 2 years before restructuring to the growth in the 2 years since restructuring.

>That's why I think the future health of the ARS depends on
>attracting
>more potential hams, not trying to chase them away.

Absolutely!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1723. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 21:10:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316161002.09101.00000036@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 37610

In article <a6vuja$d2n$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>By a fairly narrow majority, members of DARC,
>the Germany equivalent of ARRL voted to keep
>their current code testing. The statistics are as
>follows:
>---------
>17455 DARC members (which is 33.8 % of all DARC members)
>took part in a vote for or against keeping the CW test
>for HF.
>
>Of these, 1144 votes were invalid.
>
>From 16311 valid votes, 8530 (that is 52.3 %) voted
>for keeping the CW test in its current form.
>
>47.7 % voted for abolishing the CW test.
>
>The DARC (German Amateur Radio League) will respect
>this vote as a member of the IARU.
>--------
>
>If you are code test advocate you might think that's great.
>If you think for a minute, however, you'll see how the
>"vote" is extremely narrow...and (IMHO) the vote if
>taken a year from now will get even closer, or even
>go the other way. Additionally, this vote only influences
>how Germany via DARC will "vote" within the IARU
>process.
>
Interesting bit of info, Bill. Thanks for posting.

But it raises all sorts of questions. For example:

- How many hams are there in Germany?
- How many are DARC members?
- Is there a nocodetest license there? If so, how popular is it?
- Was there ever a previous survey/poll/vote? If so, how did it go?
- Why were there so many invalid votes? Why were they declared invalid? What
would the result have been if they were included?
- How much influence does DARC have on how the German vote will go at WRC 2003?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1724. Re: It just Figures...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 21:10:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316161033.15147.00001846@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 37612

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>Actually, he speaks in Bigotbonics. He doesn't think much. Brian

Gentlemen, gentlemen, isn't it pretty obvious Larry just wanted to stir the pot? He strung together every word he expected might get a reaction.

He got one.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1725. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 21:12:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316161258.15147.00001847@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 37613

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>Actually, "es" in Morse-ese means "and." It is from French.

>Hmmm, all the references I've seen say it derives from the American Morse for
>the symbol "&". dit-dididit

I believe I stand corrected. Your version makes more sense. :-) I may have
assumed it had the same origin as DE.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1726. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 21:15:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316161543.15147.00001848@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 37614

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>> One could always have played with the non-radio technology of the day
>without
>> being a ham, Cecil.
>
>Just curious, but what might that be?

Popular Electronics was full of electronics projects that didn't have a transmitter. Radio Shack, Allied and Lafayette had electronics stores across the country. There were plenty of non-amateur electronics hobbyist learning the electronic technology of the day.

>> A computer is no more high-tech for most people than a cell phone.

>I really doubt that.

Web surfing is not technology. Plug and Play was invented for darn good reason. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1727. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 21:18:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316161828.15147.00001849@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 37615

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>>No, the Capitalization makes it noble. :-)

>No, the captitalization was meant as sarcasm, both for his ridicule of
>"lesser" (in his belief system) beings, past evidence of less-than-
>good-standard professional radio explanations, and general haughty
>almost-Prussian demeanor of elitist superiority.

I stand corrected. If it was no more than sarcasm and ridicule, the
Capitalization makes it ignoble.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1728. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 21:20:31 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316162031.15147.00001850@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 37616

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>There isn't any "Manager's
>charm school manual for public conduct" so your comment is pure
>Fantasyland.

Len seems to have some inner difficulty with anyone he percieves as any kind of authority figure. From what I can tell, it is somewhat related to his concern about mind control and brainwashing, but I haven't pieced it all together.

73, Ed Hare, W1RFI

1729. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 21:27:54 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316162754.15147.00001851@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 37617

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>> Most modern rigs have keying whose rise and fall times is faster than
>> necessary. This means that there is information available in the wider
>> bandwidth that helps to define the start and stop of the element. I think
>that
>> my mental processing is adaptive, using the full bandwidth to detect start
>and
>> stop thresholds and then narrowing up on the element to help define
>duration.
>> When one method of decoding fails,the other often helps fill in the missing
>> data.
>
>Sounds like you were doing DSP in your head long before DSP was cool.

More than likely, although I know of no OOK CW decoding scheme that works as I
describe.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1730. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 21:29:38 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316162938.15147.00001852@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 37618

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> Okay, can I construct 300 word associations from the wording of the present
>> tests and have you show us how easy it is to memorize them?
>>
>
> No way, I already know too much about the material.

You misunderstand, Dick; I will give you just 300 word pairs constructed from the persent exam pool and you can show how easily they are memorized. Surely you can do that with words whose meaning you know.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1731. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 22:31:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C93C7D0.4C70F9CE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37619

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Martin wrote:
> > Want a sense of Humor, come down to Louisiana for Mardi Gras.
>
> Been there. Done that and have seen the T-shirts lifted.

The body painting was absolutely awesome. Felix the cat never
had bigger eyes.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1732. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 22:47:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C93CB8F.BD1D02B5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37620

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >During just the past week you said 20wpm CW is not fast CW.
>
> Produce the post.

I will for $25. Otherwise, I'm not going to waste my time.

> Your insistence on making everything binary is not binding on me.

I'm a digital engineer. Please stop ragging on me for seeing the world
in black and white. View the world in any manner you so choose but
please grant me the freedom to do likewise. CW that I can copy is
slow. CW that I can't copy is fast.

> Phase distortion on HF is a fact of life.

So is fading. :-) Funny how your argument turns and twists 180 degrees
depending upon which point you are arguing. Why is fading unimportant
while phase distortion is important? Because fading shoots down your
argument and phase distortion supports it?

> So the fact that CW worked and PSK31 didn't isn't relevant?

Not, it isn't to this particular argument. In the name of fairness, put
CW and PSK31 equidistant from Shannon's limit and see which one is best.
Allowing CW to use a wider bandwidth than PSK31 is comparing apples and
oranges. Allowing CW to use more average power than PSK31 is comparing
apples and oranges. Allowing CW to get away with a lower throughput
than PSK31 is comparing apples and oranges.

Why are you so afraid of comparing apples and apples?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1733. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 22:49:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C93CC05.AEEB6A9F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37621

Richard McCollum wrote:
> The hard part, as the Steel Stupidity pretty clearly illustrates, is the
> tendency of governments, unions, and voters to attempt to enshrine the
> past.

Is that akin to enshrining Morse code? :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1734. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 22:59:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C93CE49.D2ED1CD0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37622

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >I already said it was a broad brush.
>
> Too broad.

Too broad for a perfectionist like you. Just right for a black and white
digital engineer. I've lived my life that way longer than you have.

> > I
> >don't even know how many nocode techs there are so how can you accuse
> >me of subtracting out all of them?
>
> How can you subtract them out if you don"t know how many there are to begin
> with?

I told you it was a broad brush. I subtracted 150,000 hams from the present
ham population.

> >I'm considering the number of Techs who didn't go on to Tech+.
>
> How many of THEM are there?

150,000 plus or minus.

> >In my experience at Intel, only 7% of Techs went on to Tech+ and no farther.
>
> How many went further?

About half. The percentages of the different license classes at Intel
was in the ballpark to what it is overall now.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1735. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 23:00:27 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <f8Qk8.13485$tP2.1150367@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37623

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C93CC05.AEEB6A9F@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > The hard part, as the Steel Stupidity pretty clearly illustrates, is
the
> > tendency of governments, unions, and voters to attempt to enshrine the
> > past.
>
> Is that akin to enshrining Morse code? :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Actually yes. It is indefensible from a regulatory perspective but it is
fun to watch the theologians and telephone sanitizers squirm. Enshrining
the past is no big deal when you can watch a real pro at being all hat and
no cattle bellow in the present.

Dick N�BK, if it ain't happening now it ain't happening

1736. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 23:53:10 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a70m11$83b$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37624

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020316161543.15147.00001848@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>
> >> One could always have played with the non-radio technology of the day
> >without
> >> being a ham, Cecil.
> >>
> >Just curious, but what might that be?
>
> Popular Electronics was full of electronics projects that didn't have a
> transmitter. Radio Shack, Allied and Lafayette had electronics stores
across
> the country. There were plenty of non-amateur electronics hobbyist
learning the
> electronic technology of the day.

But few had the extended activity and involvement that ham radio
offered.

> >> A computer is no more high-tech for most people than a cell phone.
>
> >I really doubt that.
>
> Web surfing is not technology. Plug and Play was invented for darn good
> reason. :-)

But if asked, most people wuldn't equate the technology of
computers with that of cellphones.... IMHO :-)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1737. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 23:55:32 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a70m5f$p0q$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37625

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:oGLk8.24363$Vx1.2084391@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
> >
> > If you are code test advocate you might think that's great.
> > If you think for a minute, however, you'll see how the
> > "vote" is extremely narrow.
> >
>
> The "vote" for President of the US was also extremely
> narrow, but GWB is President.

True, but the analogy is faulty since the DARC vote
is binding on no one but DARC as an entity...and that
is only because they choose to do so.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1738. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-16 23:59:35 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a70md4$ir1$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37626

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020316161002.09101.00000036@mb-cc.aol.com...
> In article <a6vuja$d2n$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >By a fairly narrow majority, members of DARC,
> >the Germany equivalent of ARRL voted to keep
> >their current code testing. The statistics are as
> >follows:
> >---------
> >17455 DARC members (which is 33.8 % of all DARC members)
> >took part in a vote for or against keeping the CW test
> >for HF.
> >
> >Of these, 1144 votes were invalid.
> >
> >From 16311 valid votes, 8530 (that is 52.3 %) voted
> >for keeping the CW test in its current form.
> >
> >47.7 % voted for abolishing the CW test.
> >
> >The DARC (German Amateur Radio League) will respect
> >this vote as a member of the IARU.
> >--------
> >
> >If you are code test advocate you might think that's great.
> >If you think for a minute, however, you'll see how the
> >"vote" is extremely narrow...and (IMHO) the vote if
> >taken a year from now will get even closer, or even
> >go the other way. Additionally, this vote only influences
> >how Germany via DARC will "vote" within the IARU
> >process.
> >
> Interesting bit of info, Bill. Thanks for posting.
>
> But it raises all sorts of questions. For example:
>
> - How many hams are there in Germany?

I don't know.

> - How many are DARC members?

17,455 is 33.8%, the math
indicates 100% then is about 52,000

> - Is there a nocodetest license there? If so, how popular is it?
> - Was there ever a previous survey/poll/vote? If so, how did it go?
> - Why were there so many invalid votes? Why were they declared invalid?
What
> would the result have been if they were included?
> - How much influence does DARC have on how the German vote will go at WRC
2003?

Sorry, I have none of those answers...except as speculation.
DARC probably has no more impact than ARRL does on
the US delegation.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1739. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 00:10:54 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C93DF19.77204A9E@adelphia.net>
Source record: 37627

I read everything, and all I have to say is that I thought that the ARRL took a pretty benign approach to the whole thing. Since ARES is trademarked, it is their word. Try infringing on a Disney trademark and see what happens.

Her response was rather inflamed, also. She probably should have waited until she cooled down from everything. I wonder what she would have thought if the ARRL was using an acronym that she had a trademark for.

- Mike -

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Martin wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > Martin wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > > > > Yeah, and in some countries you can't criticize the govt., the national
> > > > > radio org or have decent QSOs.
> > > >
> > > > decent QSOs?
> > >
> > > Yeah, like shooting the breeze on the repeater, talking about the
> > > weather or
> > > just commenting on the pothole in front of the house!
> >
> > Pretty serious stuff. I don't see those examples as any more "decent"
> > than UR 599 BT 73 ES TNX.
> >
> > > > > "U R 599 in outter slobvania, name is Boris, QTH is downtown Elbonia,
> > > > > QSL via buro, bye bye de @@6*!^"
> > > >
> > > > > On second thought, I will take the USA and Canada, Separation of
> > > > > Church and State, (ARRL and FCC), is a good thing.
> > > >
> > > > Here's a buck. Now run on down the street and buy yourself a sense of
> > > > humor.
> > >
> > > Want a sense of Humor, come down to Louisiana for Mardi Gras.
> >
> > Been there. Done that and have seen the T-shirts lifted.

> > > > ARRL leaves a lot to be desired, see http://www.ares.org for
> > > > how the ARRL will probably set Emergency Services back 20 yrs
> > > > by not exploiting a resource and trying to dictate to
> > > > the locals how to run their programs.
> > >
> > > I went to the site and looked through it. I was especially struck by
> > > the childish response which Karen Johansen sent the ARRL.
> >
> > Sadly, Karen is right, this thing was handled by a complete lack of
> > tact which has caused great harm to Amateur Radio by turning a lot of
> > people off from ARRL. Louisiana Emergency Services were just beginning
> > to warm up to Amateur Radio, we have had a rough go here due to
> > the common perception of radio freaks ala Dukes of Hazard.
>
> I don't agree with you that Karen was right. She threw a tantrum over a
> letter received from the ARRL. She replied in a less than mature
> manner, severed her organization's link with the ARRL and resigned from
> ARES. As I see it, the only people "turned off" to ARRL haven't thought
> about the reasons for the letter from the League.
>
> > Why should
> > > she or you object to the League's protecting its registered name
> >
> > In the beginning of SEAL ARES, INC. (we are also a non-profit org
> > domiciled in the Parish of Jefferson, State of Louisiana) we approached
> > Rick Palm, the officer we were directed to and he assited us and gave us
> > encouragement on our venture. Now Karen recieved a letter on this
> > matter
> > in a threatening manner instead of using a diplomatic touch which
> > would have achieved the purpose. We don't object but the ground work
> > should have been made clear from the start. First, each locality is
> > different and these differences are what should be first addressed. The
> > League should adopt a standard policy on its Logos and Such and then
> > put it out for the Community to see. (amateur radio community). Did we
> > (arrl)
> > do that, no, it just evolved until this happened. Legal standards
> > should
> > be developed and quality controls insisted upon. But up front!
>
> The League will likely do that when you submit your plans for a web site
> based on its ARES program up front. I read the League's letter and did
> not find it to be the least bit threatening. By the way, every
> corporate entity I know of protects its logos and registered names.
> How would Coca Cola, Microsoft, The March of Dimes, The American Cancer
> Society or CQ Magazine have reacted?
>
>
> > and why
> > > should it not act to prevent others from thinking that ares.org is a

> > > site operated by the ARRL?
> >
> > The site was one of the best sites on the WEB for ARES. ARRL blew their
> > chance when they acted like a bull in a china shop.
>
> How did the League blow its chance? What chance are you speaking of?
> How did the League act like a bull in a china shop?
>
> > ARRL had no
> > objection to the site years ago, why now. I researched the ACRONYM
> > "ARES" and found it in use by many other groups-most not even remotely
> > connected with Amateur Radio. BTW-go threaten them, it would be
> > interesting
> > to see that, maybe even be good entertainment, talk about a sense of
> > HUMOR.
>
> While Rick Palm may have known about the site, it is pretty clear that
> other League officials did not. I'll agree that you likely found other
> uses of the term "ARES"--probably something to do with rams at stud.
> Do they use the League's ARES logo and did they launch a web site about
> amateur radio emergency services?
>
> > I won't let facts or rationality stand in the
> > > way of your rage at the League's audacity.
> >
> > I don't have have rage, I have disappointment.
>
> Feel free to substitute the word "disappointment" in my comment above.
>
> Dave K8MN

1740. Re: Len at the end of his rope

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 00:21:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316192128.26064.00000022@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 37628

In article <a6uf22gpn1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>, Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv) <kf2ti@arrl.net> writes:

>Len you are the best. I salute you SEIG HEIL SEIH HEIL

Why is "Adell" so infatuated with NAZIs? :-)

Why does he honor Dr. Signal Freud with a NAZI salute?

1741. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International levels...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 00:21:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316192129.26064.00000023@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 37637

In article <20020316020651.25849.00001473@mb-mw.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) shouted and screamed after running out of Prozac:

>>Second, I have NO "infatuation with Hitler" or any other fascist or
>>dictator, living or dead. That is an outrageous statement, a total
>>fabrication, a lie
>
> You are, again, caught lying. Your favorite adjectives are such as
>"jack-booted", "thug", etc. Other euphimisms are rampant.

Those who act like SA deserve the insults they get...whether
they wear brown shirts or the white robes of the KKK.

>>As one who has studied military history and technology, there
>>are a number of familiar terms and titles that I have used, taken
>>from the German land and air military, past and present.
>
> You take THESE terms because in your "studies" you know them to be of
>the most offesnive, abusive and denigrating of choices.

Well, it's a good thing that a military branch of the USA decided
that one should not remain in their service. There is a very large
gap in Robeson's military knowledge and comprehension of
tactics and warfare technology, before his lifetime as well as
during. In warfighting, the Wehrmacht did very well against
larger odds and the Luftwaffe displayed skill and courage in
defending their homeland (their ace list is higher than any UK
or USA record). It is a pity that a former military serviceman
cannot separate his bigotry and emotionalism from military
professionalism.

> I find that AS offensive as the "f" word, or making sexually suggestive
>commetns about yo mama.

? "sexually suggestive commetns [sic] about yo mama?"

My mother passed away last February. That was my only mention
of her other than both of my parents being immigrants. Does
Robeson have some morbid fascination with my mother's death?

I've never even brought up classical cellist Yo Yo Ma.

>>Regardless of one's religious or socio-political beliefs, the
>>German military was a skilled and efficient force. History is
>>ample proof of this.
>
> Obviously not skilled and efficient enough to get it's collective ass

>beat by those decadent Americans and Brits.

...not without a great cost in lives on all sides. Perhaps Robeson
still thinks of warfighting as "Grand Sport" as if it were some
gigantic bowl game? He seems to have been only on sidelines,
yelling and shouting, his "warfighting" confined to a mad waving
of a pennant and fist-shaking.

> I seeeeeeeeeee.....since this all happend "way back then", and many of
>us didn't "live through it", your use of offensive and inflammatory rhetoric
>from that era is OK...Do I read that right?

No. There is no indication that Robeson has ever read anything
calmly or dispassionately or attempted to understand any post
that was not in total agreement with his already-prejudiced views.
That is evidenciary in his "replies" to others as well as the flood of
hate rhetoric directed against me in here...and privately.

>>My best man held W6MJN then, still
>>does.
>
> Guess he can hold a call sign longer than you can hold a wife, huh?

My wife is still alive and we are happily married. :-)

A problem with the emotionally-disturbed is that they cannot
comprehend what is written. :-)

> Such as the ONE day it took for eveyone to see through "Avery Fine",
>Lennie? You denied that, too. You were so intent on being a Putz under that
>screen name that you lost track of your lies and posted with your "LHA" at
>the end.
>
> Tried to deny it...got busted. Sheesh.

I have accessed ISPs through about 9 different computers and
8 other account holders in the last 6 years. All of them with the
permission of the account holders. Since six of those account
holders have AOL as their ISP, it is possible to log on incorrectly
as a Guest on someone else's computer. I seldom log on as
Guest on my own machine. :-)

"Avery Fine" was used as an AOL screen name by a friend of mine.
It was with permission from my early use on BBSs as co-sysop
with the pseudonym "Avery Fineman" (a play on words, 'a very fine
man' for the totally humor impaired). :-)

At no time have I ever disguised myself as another identity in a
newsgroup, especially this one full of emotionally-distraught,
frustrated amateurs. :-)

> Such as lying about being solely responsible for "sending or relaying"
>1.2 million messages and then getting ahnded your hat when the math didn't add
>up?

The math added up. I did have to show the work for another pseudonym's arithmetic education. Does Robeson need help with his arithmetic? Should I post a multiplication table for his education?

Not a problem. I've had to post the rules for complex number arithmetic for the benefit of a "mathematics lecturer" at a Hawaiian community college. A multiplication table is trivial by comparison. :-)

1742. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 00:21:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316192130.26064.00000024@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 37631

In article <tSLk8.15135$Ex5.1357720@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

<large snip>

>The hard part, as the Steel Stupidity pretty clearly illustrates, is the
>tendency of governments, unions, and voters to attempt to enshrine the
>past.

A nice example of McCollumese Cynical Chic but several self-styled
Radio Kops in here have warned repeatedly about the applicability
of topics.

The last sentence is rather on-topic in "attempt to enshrine the past."
That is, to keep the testing requirements to an absolute status ultra
quo at a point when all you long-timers became licensed. :-)

1743. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 00:21:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316192131.26064.00000025@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 37635

In article <20020315232159.06039.00001536@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>Well, Ed, there are two kinds of ham radio, aren't there? :-)
>>
>>There's the amateur radio that the FCC regulates...and then there's
>>the "Real" ham radio in the world below 30 MHz...which the no-code-
>>test Technician class licensee cannot enter...and the "Real" hams
>>scorn and denigrate.
>
>I don't see two ham radios, Len. I have operated both above and below 30
>MHz, and my work has taken me above and below 30 MHz. My biggest concern
>this week is 70 cm.

So, Ed Hare is oblivious to the "Real Ham" definitions that have floated around for years?

"My work" has taken me well below MF and on up to Ku band.

I'm not concerned.

>It would be pretty silly of me to be discussing something with you and continue
>that discussion by discussing the words of others. Can you really be offering
>that I have ignored the output of those that you are characterizing as "real
>hams?"

Yes.

>For such a teeny brush, you sure do wave it around a lot...

That's a matter of perception. Small minds see small objects as gigantic.

>I have seen the entire web page, Len, and I believe that the vast majority of
>it is devoted to membership.

Is there a single page that doesn't exhort "join the ARRL?" :-)

>I log on to ARRL.org regularly from home, but why would I want to use someone
>else's account?

...to get a feeling of how newcomers view the ARRL website.

>Books and products are important to ARRL for two reasons. They provide a lot
>of good information that hams can use to do hamming. The excess of revenues

>over expenses help fund guys like me, who don't raise any significant
revenues.
>The alternative would be to have fewer guys like me, or ask members to pony up
>about $75 a year for dues.

I'd say a fairer estimate of annual membership costs, keeping those
same "member benefits" as exist now, at closer to $375 per year.

The ARRL is still asking for MORE money right now ("defense fund").

Where will it stop?

>Most seem happy.

That's unverifiable. When the ARRL controls dissemination of
incoming comments, it isn't likely to present such things to the
general public, is it? :-)

>>Membership in the ARRL is still less than a quarter of all US
>>amateur radio licensees.
>
>Yup, math hasn't changed much since you said that yesterday.

It's unlikely to change for months and months, isn't it?

Is that because "most seem happy?"

Yup, another bit of Orwellian Truthspeak from Big Brother.

1744. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 00:21:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316192132.26064.00000026@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 37633

In article <a6ul2toep1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020315231307.06039.00001534@mb-mf.aol.com...
>> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>>
>> >e.g. Cellphones, computers, and future technology. When a ham radio
>> >was the only game in town, e.g. Madisonville, TX in the 50's, it was
>> >much more attractive than it is now.
>>
>> One could always have played with the non-radio technology of the day
>> without being a ham, Cecil.
>
>Just curious, but what might that be?

I can't speak for Texans but can relate to northern Illinois of the late
1940s and early 1950s concerning electronics. High-fidelity music
systems in everything from recording to acoustics was a popular
non-radio electronics technology of that time. It was when "Hi-Fi"
came into being as a catch phrase, holding strong until "stereo"
replaced it about two decades later.

In the "radio" area of electronics of that time, television broadcasting
was just beginning to boom and the suburban to rural areas were
into a "DX" of sorts just to get a TV signal. There was a fair amount
of experimental picture projection building at a time when such
projection systems were barely out of the commercial labs. There
were the FM reception and purity of signal hobbyists of the music
system group, even the AM purists as a minority group wanting to
get the widest frequency range signal from local AM broadcast.
Radio control of models was just beginning at that time and model
hobbyists had to literally build everything from battery-powered tube
transmitters to rubber-band-powered "escapement" rotary actuators.

A few electronics hobbyists were getting started building their
own video cameras for closed-circuit TV use using electrostatic-
deflection pickup tubes, a relatively small group until vidicons
became available later. The latter required do-it-yourself
deflection coil winding.

Model railroading had a sizeable following with the beginnings
of relay logic control systems for large track layouts. There
were no digitial ICs to do that then and the few available
transistors were prohibitive in cost, vacuum tubes too simple
and large to be applicable to large gauges.

Photo-electric sensors seemed to be a sizeable electronics
experimentation area for many uses from simple entrance
door signalling to voice-on-a-lightbeam communications.

>> A cellphone does not do what ham radio does.
>
>The point being?

Cellphones can't work DX or win all kinds of certificates. :-)

>> A computer is no more high-tech for most people than a cell phone.
>
>I really doubt that.

There were no home personal computers in the USA in the
early 1950s...unless one reaches very far for an opaque
projection system designed to project a conventional sliderule
on a screen for classroom use (seen demonstrated in Chicago).
:-)

>> Ham radio IS the only game in town for someone who wants virtually
>> unlimited license to personally experience a wide range of radio technology.
>
>Agreed.

Oh? :-) Wouldn't it be more accurate to say "...to personally operate
using ready-built radios from high-MF to very low microwaves?"

>> That is what is has always been for most hams. The fear that all new hams
>> want to do is yak is, IMHO, no more founded than it always was.
>
>Agree also.

"Cellphones can't work DX." "Garage door openers can't work DX."
"Wireless baby sitter intercoms can't work DX." "Computers can't
work DX." "CB radio is trash, illegal, and #$%^&!!!" "FRS radios
can't work DX." All quotes from in here. It would seem that the
whole reason for being is to "yak" and collect wallpaper. :-)

1745. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 00:21:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316192134.26064.00000028@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 37632

In article <3C9366C0.5F448BAE@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>W1RFI wrote:
>> A cellphone does not do what ham radio does.
>
>Sometimes it does. I can talk to N5AQM in AZ for free on my cellphone.

Errr...I don't think that comparison is allowed in here, Cecil. Here
are the proper responses from others' messages -

"Cellphones always go down in an emergency, don't work..."

"Cellphones need the vast infrastructure of the telephone system
and all of amateur radio is entirely free (or words to that effect)."

"Cellphones can't work DX..." etc., etc., etc. :-)

1746. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 00:21:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316192134.26064.00000027@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 37638

In article <3C936627.7D2A56BC@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> You say you "subtracted out the nocode techs". Without any qualifiers, that
>> means all of them.
>
>There you go railing again, Jim. I already said it was a broad brush. I
>don't even know how many nocode techs there are so how can you accuse
>me of subtracting out all of them?

Cecil, if you don't stay within his exclusive boundary conditions,
you are not "right" despite logic and evidence from third-party
disinterested sources. Only the interested sources that stay
within predefined boundaries are arguable...all other conditions
are "accusable."

>> Not a reasonable assumption, based on how many new has DID "bother" with a
>> code-tested license before Feb 14, 1991.
>
>I'm not counting the ones who went on to General, Advanced, and Extra using
>the Tech license as a stepping stone. I'm considering the number of Techs who
>didn't go on to Tech+. In my experience at Intel, only 7% of Techs went on to
>Tech+ and no farther.

That doesn't fit the N2EY boundaries and are therefore discountable.
:-)

>> The 30 or so that you know are hardly a representative sample of the more
>> than 200,000 that have entered US ham radio via that license.
>
>Sampling is done all the time where 350 voters are sampled to find out what
>the entire voting population is thinking. There is always a margin of error.

You know that, I know that, major political parties know that, and
thousands involved in using polling results for decision-making
know that. The problem seems to be in the boundary conditions
wherein some unusual telepathic conditions rule. It may some
connection to "accuracy transcends speed." :-)

>> Fact is, there's NO way to know what would have happened if the FCC had let
>> well enough alone in 1991.
>
>There's no way to know for sure. There is always a margin of error. That's
>because the future hasn't happened yet. However, given all the possibilities,
>at least one is bound to be right.

The key phrase in absolutism of boundary conditions lies in "if the
FCC had left well enough alone." :-)

"Well enough" is the pre-conditioned boundary where the condition-
setter has already pronounced what is "good" and what is "bad." :-)

The FCC had, in 1990, made decisions based on citizen input and
was not swayed by the authority of a special-interest group. That is
given in NPRM FCC 90-53.

>> But here's a clue: The number of US ham licenses has increased by less than
>> 9000 since mid-May of 2002, despite massive reductions in both code and
>> written
>> testing. Most of that increase happened in the first year or so after the
>> restructuring of 2000. I'm surprised the increase is so small.
>
>So am I. That's why I think the future health of the ARS depends on
>attracting more potential hams, not trying to chase them away.

1747. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 00:21:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316192136.26064.00000030@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 37629

In article <3C92AB46.C3A803FB@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>I was never a manager in Len's eyes, just some baggy-eyed communicator
>in a small, unimportant, cashew munching country.

Dr. Signal Freud has "baggy eyes?" :-)

Guinea-Bisseau, pop. 1.2 million, chief export cashew nuts, also peanuts.

[it must have an affinity for nuts...]

>He may be on to something though. Ever since that ROWF ceremony, I've
>kept votive candles burning beneath that framed portrait of HPM.

I have NO doubt on believing that! :-)

1748. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 00:21:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316192136.26064.00000029@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 37634

In article <3C92AA1C.8E364922@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>You're as wrong on that as you are about most things having to do with
>amateur radio. This kid did about twenty trips up and down the 70 foot
>tower just last Autumn lowering the 40m yagi, installing new guy wire
>and installing a Hazer tram system.

Where are the images of this athletic achievement? Some have
already seen the "achievements" from Africa. Somebody else
on that tower there... :-)

>No, no, no, no. You only need to obtain a license in order to have many
>hams take your views much credence.

Nope. Heil's "credence claim" is only for Heil and even then he is only
using it as a reply device.

>You've blown smoke here for years without much in the way of support.

Nope. I gave up smoking some time ago. :-)

>You tend to lecture and pontificate.

...and Heil issues orders, lectures, sneers at others who don't share his
viewpoints. <shrug>

>That attitude isn't going to win over hams who have been
>on the air for decades and I don't think you are apt to gain much
>support from those who are about to become hams.

I wouldn't dream of trying to dissuade a long-time morseman. :-)

But on the second part of that sentence you were correct in
saying "you don't think." We agree on that.

>Who would go to a non-ham for advice about amateur radio.

Several have. I've tried to be obliging and have given them help
on their electronics knowledge. I don't know that any one of
them ever resented any of that help.

Unless the Universe changed very recently, amateur radio still
works by the same physical laws as all other radio service
radios. [surprising, but true]

>I think that if you've professed interest in something for several
>decades and that after all that time you've never achieved it, one could
>consider that a stunning and remarkable failure.

Heh heh heh...oh, my, Fearless Leader still sings that song!
Off-key, of course. He may need a paddling. :-)

>That little 5 wpm code test never had a chance to stump you.

That little NO WPM code test never had a chance to stump me,
either. :-)

>Your overwhelming fear of it kept
>you from even attempting something you wanted.

Oh, wow, Fearless Leader turned into Signal Freud, psycho of the
airwaves! :-)

No, Dottore Freud, there was no "fear" nor has the "want" ever
been close to strong for 49 years. Now go lay down on your
examining couch and analyze yourself.

>Whatever bile built up
>as a result has been spewed here in the form of your childish outbursts
>at anyone you perceive as "acting superior" or in lashing out at the
>ARRL who honked you off about some article you wrote in the distant
>past.

Heh heh heh.

>As an aside, Len, "Ham Radio" magazine did fail. It went under.
>It died. It is no more. It is defunct. It makes no difference that it
>was around for 22 years. It couldn't make it for the 23rd year.

Oh, my, you are REALLY resentful at some things, Dr. Freud!

Tsk, tsk, tsk...in trying to "get back" at me, you've now dishonored
Skip Tenney, the late Jim Fisk, Alf Wilson, Rich Rosen, Terry
Northrup and a number of staffers who were also licensed radio
amateurs!

Yes, you must think they were all "newcomers," brash upstarts
who could successfully start and continue an independent
amateur radio magazine in a different state away from Big
Brother!

>born a civilian. Somebody did refute your mantra that government was not
>using CW anymore. As a matter of fact, in those years government was
>using a helluva lot of CW.

...hell hath no fury like a morseman scorned... :-)

>Sorry it didn't conform to the Army way. We
>weren't in the Army and had need of doing it in a different way for a
>number of reasons.

State Department is not known for big-time radio communications
expertise OR innovation, sport. Heh, they couldn't find the passive
mikes in the Moscow embassy for eight years! After 1948 the whole
of the US military was not considering morse code modes for long-

distance HF communications in any branch.

That "your idea" (as you put it originally) somehow got translated
into "State Department Procedures!" That was bullshit then (1980s)
and is still as stinky for professionalism in radio communications.

>It chafed you then and obviously chafes you now.

No. Dr. Signal Freud is chafed and scratching, wants everyone
to tell him what a great big pro gubmint communicator. <shrug>

>As far as your attempt to belittle the job I did and the place that I did
>it, it only demonstrates what a pathetic little man you are.

Yes, isn't it awful that no one can recognize your halo and the
rays of truth and glory eminating from your beautific presence?

>...just another instance in which you've written something you know
>nothing about. Such utterings by you have become rather commonplace
>and, as Ed pointed out, are a pretty good indicator that you have run
>out of ammunition

Poor baby, got hit by stray test-firing rounds, did you?

Do you want to lock and load yet? So far, you've only been dry-firing,
madly clicking the trigger.

1749. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 00:21:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316192137.26064.00000032@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 37630

In article <3C93616F.69B40E98@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> Maybe. Why isn't it used for EME, if it's so good?
>
>It was not designed for EME. It is superb for the application for which
>it was designed.

Cecil, it's really no good trying to argue with this "engineer" on
design. He MUST set all the boundary values and be the final
arbitrator on "goodness" versus "badness."

If it doesn't fit his exclusive definition set, it "won't work." :-)

1750. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 00:21:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316192137.26064.00000031@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 37636

In article <20020316014147.25849.00001469@mb-mw.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

> Lennie, I guess you haven't been doing the math lately, but even the
>people who passively tolerated your lying bile and "defended" your "right" to
>be a liar and fool are at ends with you.

Heh heh heh. Dr. Signal Freud should analyze you..... :-)

> Even the most liberal and tolerant of voices here are tired of you.

Ah, yes, STEVIE took a "secret poll" or something... :-)

>But I
>can understand your need to be here...You probably PO'd Mrs. A with your
>King-Of-The-Hill crap years ago. I can understand her wanting to save SOME
>last vestiges of pride and self respect by keeping you at arms length in her
>waning years. Bravo for her.

STEVIE, that's a truly sick little comment you made and you really
enjoy that kind of thing, don't you? Pity you.

> People here may disagree with HOW I got toe-to-toe with you, but so far
>no one has disagreed with intent. (I am sure one or two of the anonymous
>posters will jump in...already discounted)

STEVIE should understand that some wonder about his sanity
in addition to his delusions. Since 1999.

> How does it feel to know that in almost EVERY circle of Amateur Radio you
>have humiliated yourself?

Ooooo! Every single one of them, Stevie? Or just the round ones?
:-)

>NO ONE would want to be in the same room with you,
>let alone want to share a QSO with you on the repeater.

Ah, yes, the result of another "secret poll!" :-)

>Even the ONE Amateur
>Radio organization with which you hold some kinship doesn't want you! And
>when the guy who could fix it for you tried to help you, you rubbed his nose
in
>your crap.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. I have no "kinship" with any amateur radio organization.

Is that a new requirement for newsgroupies? :-)

1751. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 00:24:44 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C93E257.55A46E73@adelphia.net>
Source record: 37639

Hmm, getting lots of feedback on this one. I've certainly heard it used
a lot for "is". Figures I'd pick it up and use it wrong (blush).

- Mike -

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
> > es=is
>
> Actually, "es" in Morse-ese means "and." It is from French.

1752. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 01:00:07 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gt36f70.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 37640

From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
> es=is
>
> Actually, "es" in Morse-ese means "and." It is from French.

Uh.... "and" in French is "et".

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1753. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 01:15:40 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C93EE26.9D225DD2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37641

If US ARS hams were allowed to "vote" in a popular vote on
their choice of to keep the code or not, they would probably
also vote to keep it, just as they have in the past. Too
bad we are not democratic like Germany, but need the
Newington Crowd, the FCC, and the influence of a small bunch
of Morse Terrorists to do our deciding for us.

73,
Clay N4AOX

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> By a fairly narrow majority, members of DARC,
> the Germany equivalent of ARRL voted to keep
> their current code testing. The statistics are as
> follows:
> ---------
> 17455 DARC members (which is 33.8 % of all DARC members)
> took part in a vote for or against keeping the CW test
> for HF.
>
> Of these, 1144 votes were invalid.
>
> From 16311 valid votes, 8530 (that is 52.3 %) voted
> for keeping the CW test in its current form.
>
> 47.7 % voted for abolishing the CW test.
>
> The DARC (German Amateur Radio League) will respect
> this vote as a member of the IARU.
> --------
>
> If you are code test advocate you might think that's great.
> If you think for a minute, however, you'll see how the
> "vote" is extremely narrow...and (IMHO) the vote if
> taken a year from now will get even closer, or even
> go the other way. Additionally, this vote only influences
> how Germany via DARC will "vote" within the IARU
> process.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

1754. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 02:24:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316212422.15862.00001569@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 37642

>Subject: Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test
>From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net
>Date: 03/16/02 20:15 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C93EE26.9D225DD2@worldnet.att.net>

>If US ARS hams were allowed to "vote" in a popular vote on
>their choice of to keep the code or not, they would probably
>also vote to keep it, just as they have in the past. Too
>bad we are not democratic like Germany, but need the
>Newington Crowd, the FCC, and the influence of a small bunch
>of Morse Terrorists to do our deciding for us.

OK, Clay...I am going to ask you to explain this one.

First of all, what do you mean we are not "democratic" like Germany?
Thier Amateur organization voted, just like ARRL does, and they acted
accordingly.

The ARRL may not have held a specific "election" on it, but they certainly
DID respond to the voiced opinion of the majority of correspondents on the
matter...If they had NOT, the ARRL would still be, I believe, staunchly
pro-code test.

That they simply decided to "not oppose" any provision to drop code
testing at the international level was the path of least resistance to
accomodate the desires of the membership.

Secondly, what "Morse Terrorists"...?!?! The code tests have already been
pared down to the minimum generally considered to be the "minimum" by
convention, and the WRC seems to be headed towards deletion of S25.5 as it
pertains to code testing.

Lastly, the last several FCC NPRM's on the matter have demonstrated a
growing "popular opinion" that code testing should be deleted or at least
minimised, which HAS happened.

The Government put it up for discussion...the people responded, they (th
feds) acted accordingly. Likewise, the League has responded in a manner
consistent with the majority opinion of it's members.

Seems to me that the system has worked just like it's supposed to. Slow,
but appropriately.

73

Steve, K4YZ

PS...All of this in the light of day...contrary to one antagonist's opinion that there is some "back room lodge hall" impropriety.

1755. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 02:28:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316212817.15862.00001570@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 37643

>Subject: Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/16/02 19:21 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020316192134.26064.00000027@mb-fr.aol.com>

>Cecil, if you don't stay within his exclusive boundary conditions,
>you are not "right" despite logic and evidence from third-party
>disinterested sources.

POT~~~KETTLE~~~BLACK

Sheesh.

Steve

1756. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 02:34:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316213445.15862.00001572@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 37644

>Subject: Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/16/02 19:21 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020316192132.26064.00000026@mb-fr.aol.com>

>Oh? :-) Wouldn't it be more accurate to say "...to personally operate
>using ready-built radios from high-MF to very low microwaves?"

Lennie, what were those pearl's of wisdom you just tried to blast Jim
Miccolis with in anothr thread about narrow definitions, etc?

You were ALMOST on a no-argument post, then you HAD to take your
obligatory swipe...Why is that?

>All quotes from in here. It would seem that the
>whole reason for being is to "yak" and collect wallpaper.

From your limited, no experience, uninformed position, it would seem so.
The truth is known to be otherwise, though.

No smiley. You were being mean again.

Steve

1757. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 02:40:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316214058.15862.00001573@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 37645

>Subject: Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)
>From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
>Date: 03/16/02 16:20 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020316162031.15147.00001850@mb-fx.aol.com>

>Len seems to have some inner difficulty with anyone he percieves as any kind
>of
>authority figure. From what I can tell, it is somewhat related to his
>concern
>about mind control and brainwashing, but I haven't pieced it all together.

Considering he's a product of the 40's and 50's, I am sure the "duck and cover" mentality prevails. I am also sure it comes from always being a day late and a dollar short with his "peers" at the professional level.

He has all the time in the world NOW to impress us with his "prowess"...Too bad he didn't do that when he was "on the job"...Perhaps his name would be a bit more popular in professional radio circles than a few by-lines in a defunct Amateur Radio magazine.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1758. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 02:49:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316214910.15862.00001574@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 37646

>Subject: Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/16/02 19:21 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020316192137.26064.00000031@mb-fr.aol.com>

>Ah, yes, STEVIE took a "secret poll" or something.

No poll necessary, Lennie. I can read what's posted here. Can you?

>>But I
>>can understand your need to be here...You probably PO'd Mrs. A with your
>>King-Of-The-Hill crap years ago. I can understand her wanting to save SOME
>>last vestiges of pride and self respect by keeping you at arms length in her
>>waning years. Bravo for her.
>
>STEVIE, that's a truly sick little comment you made and you really
>enjoy that kind of thing, don't you?

No, Lennie...I don't. But you make it apparent. Some have accosted me for
the number of anti-Lennie posts I make here, however if they add up the number
of posts YOU make, it's pretty apparent that most of your waking hours are
spent here or ginning up offline responses to what's said here.

So what does that say for how much attention you are paying to the litlle
Mrs?

>Ooooo! Every single one of them, Stevie? Or just the round ones?

Just the one's that count, Lennie. That's all it takes.

>>Even the ONE Amateur
>>Radio organization with which you hold some kinship doesn't want you! And
>>when the guy who could fix it for you tried to help you, you rubbed his nose
>in
>>your crap.
>
>Tsk, tsk, tsk. I have no "kinship" with any amateur radio organization.

Oh...?!?! No-Code International does NOT express opinions and policies
that YOU promote?

G'nite, Your Putzship.

Steve and The Boys

1759. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International levels...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 03:06:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316220656.15862.00001576@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 37647

>Subject: Re: Ending Code Requirement at International levels...
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/16/02 19:21 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020316192129.26064.00000023@mb-fr.aol.com>

>Those who act like SA deserve the insults they get...whether
>they wear brown shirts or the white robes of the KKK

Then we both agree that you get what you deserve. Thanks.

>In warfighting, the Wehrmacht did very well against
>larger odds and the Luftwaffe displayed skill and courage in
>defending their homeland (their ace list is higher than any UK
>or USA record). It is a pity that a former military serviceman
>cannot separate his bigotry and emotionalism from military
>professionalism.

No argument. They put up one hell of a fight. They didn't make it easy.
But at the end of the day, they lost. So much for thier efficiency and
technology.

>>I find that AS offensive as the "f" word, or making sexually suggestive
>>commetns about yo mama.
>
>? "sexually suggestive commetns [sic] about yo mama?"
>
>My mother passed away last February. That was my only mention
>of her other than both of my parents being immigrants. Does
>Robeson have some morbid fascination with my mother's death?

I was unaware of your mother's passing, and for the poor timing, I
apologize. May she rest in peace.

However you know what I was trying to realte. If you don't you're more
ignorant than I initially assessed.

>He seems to have been only on sidelines,
>yelling and shouting, his "warfighting" confined to a mad waving
>of a pennant and fist-shaking.

And YOU earned a CIB from your radio shack in WESTPAC, Lennie? Uh
huh.....

>No. There is no indication that Robeson has ever read anything
>calmly or dispassionately or attempted to understand any post
>that was not in total agreement with his already-prejudiced views.
>That is evidenciary in his "replies" to others as well as the flood of

>hate rhetoric directed against me in here...and privately.

Uh huh...Ohhhhhhh kay.......

>>>My best man held W6MJN then, still
>>>does.
>>
>> Guess he can hold a call sign longer than you can hold a wife, huh?
>
>My wife is still alive and we are happily married.

And if he had W6JMN since before THIS wife, I am still correct.

>A problem with the emotionally-disturbed is that they cannot
>comprehend what is written.

How can one comprehend the incomprehensible?

>>Such as the ONE day it took for eveyone to see through "Avery Fine",
>>Lennie? You denied that, too. You were so intent on being a Putz under that
>>screen name that you lost track of your lies and posted with your "LHA" at
>>the end.
>>
>> Tried to deny it...got busted. Sheesh.
>
>I have accessed ISPs through about 9 different computers and
>8 other account holders in the last 6 years. All of them with the
>permission of the account holders. Since six of those account
>holders have AOL as their ISP, it is possible to log on incorrectly
>as a Guest on someone else's computer. I seldom log on as
>Guest on my own machine.

Still doesn't accont for YOU "pretending" to be someone else or denying
that YOU were the author when you signed your own name to it in a fit of
forgetfulness as to whom you were pretending to be.

Sheesh again.

>"Avery Fine" was used as an AOL screen name by a friend of mine.
>It was with permission from my early use on BBSs as co-sysop
>with the pseudonym "Avery Fineman" (a play on words, 'a very fine
>man' for the totally humor impaired).

I bet you wre terrible at "dodge ball" as a kid, Lennie. You still don't
do it well. Poorly scripted excuse noted.

>At no time have I ever disguised myself as another identity in a
>newsgroup, especially this one full of emotionally-distraught,
>frustrated amateurs.

Uh-huh....Suuuuuuuure. WE believe it, Lennie. Suuuure we do.

>The math added up. I did have to show the work for another
>pseudonym's arithmetic education. Does Robeson need help

>with his arithmetic? Should I post a multiplication table for his
>education?

Your other poorly scripted dodge around that one is still in Google,
Lennie. We saw it. No need to try and cover it up now. The horse is out and
the barn door's-a-swingin'.

G'Night, Lennie. Sleep well trying to recover.

Steve

1760. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 03:09:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316220946.25328.00000042@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 37648

In article <20020316161258.15147.00001847@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
>>>Actually, "es" in Morse-ese means "and." It is from French.
>
>>Hmmm, all the references I've seen say it derives from the American Morse
>for
>>the symbol "&". dit-dididit
>
>I believe I stand corrected. Your version makes more sense. :-) I may have
>assumed it had the same origin as DE.
>
Some of our common abbreviations and prosigns derive from American Morse and the "number code" abbreviations used with it.

Best known are 73 and 88. But there are others. For example, the "end of QSO" prosign "dididididahdidah" (usually rendered and SK or VA with the letters run together) actually derives from the American Morse for "30" meaning "end of work".

73 de Jim, N2EY

1761. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 03:20:48 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020316222048.00695.00000042@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 37649

In article <20020316000337.02938.00000059@mb-fc.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>>Larry, the slaves were freed in the 1860's. The Welfare State
>>started with the New Deal some 77 or so years later. Most
>>of the former slaves were dead by then.
>
>Right -- but their ancestors live on, and their hands are out, and
>reaching into our pockets!
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

I seem to have had "ancestors" and "successors" mixed up last night. Please note the change.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1762. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 03:22:25 UTC
From: Martin <mdwade@mobiletel.com>
Message-ID: <3C940BF1.E73@mobiletel.com>
Source record: 37752

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Martin wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > > The membership of the ARRL is still less than a quarter of all US
> > > > amateur radio licensees despite the belief system repetitions of
> > > > the goodness, nobility, importance, or "representation" of the ARRL.
> > >
> > > Some see the glass half full. Then there's Leonard H.
> > > Did you know that in some countries, it is mandatory for a radio amateur
> > > to belong to the national radio society? Wouldn't that be nice--100%
> > > ARRL membership.
> > >
> > Yeah, and in some countries you can't criticize the govt., the national
> > radio org or have decent QSOs.
>
> decent QSOs?
>
> > "U R 599 in outter slobvania, name is Boris, QTH is downtown Elbonia,
> > QSL via buro, bye bye de @@6*!^"
>
> > On second thought, I will take the USA and Canada, Separation of
> > Church and State, (ARRL and FCC), is a good thing.
>
> Here's a buck. Now run on down the street and buy yourself a sense of
> humor.
> >
> > ARRL leaves a lot to be desired, see http://www.ares.org for
> > how the ARRL will probably set Emergency Services back 20 yrs
> > by not exploiting a resource and trying to dictate to
> > the locals how to run their programs.
>
> I went to the site and looked through it. I was especially struck by
> the childish response which Karen Johansen sent the ARRL. Why should
> she or you object to the League's protecting its registered name and why
> should it not act to prevent others from thinking that ares.org is a
> site operated by the ARRL? I won't let facts or rationality stand in the
> way of your rage at the League's audacity.
>
> > > Tell us, Leonard, what radio amateur organization has a larger

> > > percentage of U.S. hams as members than The American Radio Relay League?
>
> > NCI or FISTS? DAMFINO, the ARRL is the only game in town to protect
> > Amateur Radio. It had better start promoting AR to the School Kids,
> > Whiz kids, Soccer Moms, Hot Moms and Dot.Coms if we want the ARS
> > to stay viable in 20 to 40 yrs.
>
> That's right, Martin. The growth we have is not enough. We shouldn't
> stop until every man, woman and child in the United States is a ham!
>
> Dave K8MN

1763. Re: \Re: The tests that Real Hams took

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 03:23:12 UTC
From: Martin <mdwade@mobiletel.com>
Message-ID: <3C940C20.72B6@mobiletel.com>
Source record: 37751

```
Martin wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > Martin wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > The membership of the ARRL is still less than a quarter of all US
> > > > > amateur radio licensees despite the belief system repetitions of
> > > > > the goodness, nobility, importance, or "representation" of the ARRL.
> > > >
> > > > Some see the glass half full. Then there's Leonard H.
> > > > Did you know that in some countries, it is mandatory for a radio amateur
> > > > to belong to the national radio society? Wouldn't that be nice--100%
> > > > ARRL membership.
> > > >
> > > Yeah, and in some countries you can't criticize the govt., the national
> > > radio org or have decent QSOs.
> >
> > decent QSOs?
>
> Yeah, like shooting the breeze on the repeater, talking about the
> weather or
> just commenting on the pothole in front of the house!
> >
> > > "U R 599 in outter slobvania, name is Boris, QTH is downtown Elbonia,
> > > QSL via buro, bye bye de @@6*!^"
> >
> > > On second thought, I will take the USA and Canada, Separation of
> > > Church and State, (ARRL and FCC), is a good thing.
> >
> > Here's a buck. Now run on down the street and buy yourself a sense of
> > humor.
>
> Want a sense of Humor, come down to Louisiana for Mardi Gras.
>
> > >
> > > ARRL leaves a lot to be desired, see http://www.ares.org for
> > > how the ARRL will probably set Emergency Services back 20 yrs
> > > by not exploiting a resource and trying to dictate to
> > > the locals how to run their programs.
```

> >
> > I went to the site and looked through it. I was especially struck by
> > the childish response which Karen Johansen sent the ARRL.
>
> Sadly, Karen is right, this thing was handled by a complete lack of
> tact which has caused great harm to Amateur Radio by turning a lot of
> people off from ARRL. Louisiana Emergency Services were just beginning
> to warm up to Amateur Radio, we have had a rough go here due to
> the common perception of radio freaks ala Dukes of Hazard.
>
> Why should
> > she or you object to the League's protecting its registered name
>
> In the beginning of SEAL ARES, INC. (we are also a non-profit org
> domiciled in the Parish of Jefferson, State of Louisiana) we approached
> Rick Palm, the officer we were directed to and he assited us and gave us
> encouragement on our venture. Now Karen recieved a letter on this
> matter
> in a threatening manner instead of using a diplomatic touch which
> would have achieved the purpose. We don't object but the ground work
> should have been made clear from the start. First, each locality is
> different and these differences are what should be first addressed. The
> League should adopt a standard policy on its Logos and Such and then
> put it out for the Community to see. (amateur radio community). Did we
> (arrl)
> do that, no, it just evolved until this happened. Legal standards
> should
> be developed and quality controls insisted upon. But up front!
>
> and why
> > should it not act to prevent others from thinking that ares.org is a
> > site operated by the ARRL?
>
> The site was one of the best sites on the WEB for ARES. ARRL blew their
> chance when they acted like a bull in a china shop. ARRL had no
> objection to the site years ago, why now. I researched the ACRONYM
> "ARES" and found it in use by many other groups-most not even remotely
> connected with Amateur Radio. BTW-go threaten them, it would be
> interesting
> to see that, maybe even be good entertainment, talk about a sense of
> HUMOR.
>
> I won't let facts or rationality stand in the
> > way of your rage at the League's audacity.
>
> I don't have have rage, I have disappointment.
>
> >
> > > > Tell us, Leonard, what radio amateur organization has a larger
> > > > percentage of U.S. hams as members than The American Radio Relay League?

> >
> > > NCI or FISTS? DAMFINO, the ARRL is the only game in town to protect
> > > Amateur Radio. It had better start promoting AR to the School Kids,
> > > Whiz kids, Soccer Moms, Hot Moms and Dot.Coms if we want the ARS
> > > to stay viable in 20 to 40 yrs.
> >
> > That's right, Martin. The growth we have is not enough. We shouldn't
> > stop until every man, woman and child in the United States is a ham!
>
> Now thats the spirt. Martin N5PZJ
> >
> > Dave K8MN

1764. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International levels...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 03:29:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316222903.19805.00001623@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 37650

>>Subject: Re: Ending Code Requirement at International levels...
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 03/16/02 19:21 Eastern Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20020316192129.26064.00000023@mb-fr.aol.

>>"Avery Fine" was used as an AOL screen name by a friend of mine.
>>It was with permission from my early use on BBSs as co-sysop
>>with the pseudonym "Avery Fineman" (a play on words, 'a very fine
>>man' for the totally humor impaired).

By the way, Your Confusedness, your "Avery Fine" episode was while you
were still signing "NoCWTest" but gradually increasing your use of "lenof21"
and "lenover21"

No BBS used...just USENET.

And your obviously self appreciating appraisal of your net worth duly
noted.

Steve

1765. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 03:40:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316224055.03817.00000032@mb-de.aol.com>
Source record: 37753

In article <20020316162031.15147.00001850@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
writes:

>Len seems to have some inner difficulty with anyone he percieves as any kind
of
>authority figure. From what I can tell, it is somewhat related to his concern
>about mind control and brainwashing, but I haven't pieced it all together.

...then it is very good for you to consult with Dr. Signal Freud,
prominent radio psycho. Together you may be able to decode
your troubles. One good head-shrink deserves another... :-)

1766. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 03:40:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020316224056.03817.00000033@mb-de.aol.com>
Source record: 37754

In article <oGLk8.24363$Vx1.2084391@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
<K0HB@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>>
>> If you are code test advocate you might think that's great.
>> If you think for a minute, however, you'll see how the
>> "vote" is extremely narrow.
>
>The "vote" for President of the US was also extremely
>narrow, but GWB is President.
>
>With all kind wishes,

What an insightful observation, certainly something to keep
in mind if and when DARC or the IARU ever get to decide on
the US Presidency.

:-)

1767. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 04:06:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C9415EC.367782BA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 37755

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >There isn't any "Manager's
> >charm school manual for public conduct" so your comment is pure
> >Fantasyland.
>
> Len seems to have some inner difficulty with anyone he percieves as any kind of
> authority figure. From what I can tell, it is somewhat related to his concern
> about mind control and brainwashing, but I haven't pieced it all together.

I think there might be much more to it. Len's anti-social behavior
extends to anything which smacks of tradition. He's also suspicious of
anything which purports altruistic motivation.

Dave K8MN

1768. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 04:14:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C94183B.794CDE3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37756

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu
> >
> > es=is
> >
> > Actually, "es" in Morse-ese means "and." It is from French.
>
> Uh.... "and" in French is "et".

Only missed it by one letter.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1769. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 04:24:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C941A7F.1F0630CB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37757

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Hmm, getting lots of feedback on this one. I've certainly heard it used
> a lot for "is". Figures I'd pick it up and use it wrong (blush).

Es stands for einsteinium. :-)

> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu
> >
> > > es=is
> >
> > Actually, "es" in Morse-ese means "and." It is from French.

--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1770. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 05:40:34 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a71acf$k20$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37758

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C93EE26.9D225DD2@worldnet.att.net...
> If US ARS hams were allowed to "vote" in a popular vote on
> their choice of to keep the code or not, they would probably
> also vote to keep it, just as they have in the past.
> Too
> bad we are not democratic like Germany,

The DARC vote in no way binds Germany's
position at WRC. All that DARC has established is
that within the IARU, DARC will take the position to
retain code testing.

> but need the Newington Crowd,

The last ARRL "survey" came up with almost the same results
that the DARC "vote" did...and that was in 1957.

> the FCC,

The FCC is charged with listening to ALL input from
both ham and non-ham...and, regardless of that
input, the FCC then makes a decision based on what
the FCC believes is in the best public interest.

> and the influence of a small bunch
> of Morse Terrorists to do our deciding for us.

And just who might that be? :-) :-)

Cheers, "Morse Terrorists"...ya gotta love it..ROTFLMAO
Bill K2UNK

1771. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International levels...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 06:26:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317012624.24077.00000016@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 37759

In article <20020316222903.19805.00001623@mb-cc.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>>"Avery Fine" was used as an AOL screen name by a friend of mine.
>>>It was with permission from my early use on BBSs as co-sysop
>>>with the pseudonym "Avery Fineman" (a play on words, 'a very fine
>>>man' for the totally humor impaired).
>
> By the way, Your Confusedness, your "Avery Fine" episode was while you
>were still signing "NoCWTest" but gradually increasing your use of "lenof21"
>and "lenover21"
>
> No BBS used...just USENET.

I used "Avery Fineman" 14 years ago as sysop on a BBS. The Internet went public eleven years ago.

At no time have I ever attempted to disguise myself as someone else in the body of a message on AOL. AOL's screen names are not callsigns. AOL allows up to 7 screen names per account holder. I thought that Ratman knew this...

Poor baby, all that Radio Kop hate and rage is eating him up, no ability to keep recent history in order or do arithmetic. Tsk, tsk, tsk...

1772. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International levels...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 06:26:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317012624.24077.00000015@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 37760

In article <20020316220656.15862.00001576@mb-fy.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>>I find that AS offensive as the "f" word, or making sexually suggestive
>>>commetns about yo mama.
>>
>>? "sexually suggestive commetns [sic] about yo mama?"
>>
>>My mother passed away last February. That was my only mention
>>of her other than both of my parents being immigrants. Does
>>Robeson have some morbid fascination with my mother's death?
>
> I was unaware of your mother's passing, and for the poor timing, I
>apologize. May she rest in peace.

I made mention of it in here briefly.

I have made NO mention of cellist Yo Yo Ma.

> However you know what I was trying to realte. If you don't you're more
>ignorant than I initially assessed.

I have NO idea what you are trying to "realte" or "relate" to. You are confused again. Lay off the sauce.

> And YOU earned a CIB from your radio shack in WESTPAC, Lennie? Uh
>huh.....

I served in the Far East Command 1953 to 1956. The term "westpac" had not yet been coined/created. "FEC" was the proper acronym then.

Here, use my ASN of RA16408336 and go use some FIA excuse and see for yourself.

Then, to be fair publish your own illustrious war record...especially why your military service was terminated.

Make a website honoring yourself, give yourself medals and geegaws, exaggerate the truth as in here. Keep it off the newsgroup since nobody really cares about your marine days, do they? It is not an amateur radio policy subject, is it?

> Still doesn't accont for YOU "pretending" to be someone else or denying
>that YOU were the author when you signed your own name to it in a fit of
>forgetfulness as to whom you were pretending to be.

AOL screen names are not absolute identities. AOL allows each account user up to 7 screen names. I have never attempted to

disguise myself as another person in the body of a message.

1773. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 11:11:34 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317061134.15176.00001440@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 37761

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Phil Kane wrote:

>> From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu

>> > es=is

>> > Actually, "es" in Morse-ese means "and." It is from French.

>> Uh.... "and" in French is "et".

>Only missed it by one letter.

Okay, guys, I think I have been shamed enough on this one!

:-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1774. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 11:30:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317063018.15176.00001441@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 37762

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>>You're as wrong on that as you are about most things having to do with
>>amateur radio. This kid did about twenty trips up and down the 70 foot
>>tower just last Autumn lowering the 40m yagi, installing new guy wire
>>and installing a Hazer tram system.

>Where are the images of this athletic achievement? Some have
>already seen the "achievements" from Africa. Somebody else
>on that tower there... :-)

If I didn't know better, I would think trying to discuss Africa is an attempt
at misdirection. :-)

>>No, no, no, no. You only need to obtain a license in order to have many
>>hams take your views much credence.

>Nope. Heil's "credence claim" is only for Heil and even then he is only
>using it as a reply device.

I think Hans makes more use of his license than to reply to you on rrap.

>>You've blown smoke here for years without much in the way of support.

>Nope. I gave up smoking some time ago. :-)

Now, we DO know better. This is a blatant an attempt at misdirection as I have
ever seen! :-)
>But on the second part of that sentence you were correct in
>saying "you don't think." We agree on that.

More misdirection, unless you truly believe that he is not capable of thinking.
The fact that he can string words together in sentences, though, would make
that a rather shaky argument.

>>Who would go to a non-ham for advice about amateur radio.

>Several have. I've tried to be obliging and have given them help
>on their electronics knowledge. I don't know that any one of
>them ever resented any of that help.

Nor should they. Most of what I know about electronics technology came from
the teachings of non-hams.

>Unless the Universe changed very recently, amateur radio still
>works by the same physical laws as all other radio service
>radios. [surprising, but true]

Why would you be surprised to know that Amatuer Radio works on the same physical laws as the rest of the Universe? I don't think that most people would be surprised; I am surprised that you are.

>Heh heh heh...oh, my, Fearless Leader still sings that song!
>Off-key, of course. He may need a paddling. :-)

Shame on you, Len. That is an off-topic subject. There are other newsgroups for that sort of thing!

>That little NO WPM code test never had a chance to stump me,
>either. :-)

You cannot supply any proof that you never took and failed a ham exam, Len. I think it only fair that we hold you up to the same standards of proof that you demand of other posters. We have only your word, so we can presume that you could be lying.

>>Your overwhelming fear of it kept
>>you from even attempting something you wanted.

>Oh, wow, Fearless Leader turned into Signal Freud, psycho of the
>airwaves! :-)

It is a bit odd that someone would be interested enough in ham radio to have written articles in ham magazines and typed volumes of posts. Reasonable people will know that something is going on...

>>Whatever bile built up
>>as a result has been spewed here in the form of your childish outbursts
>>at anyone you perceive as "acting superior" or in lashing out at the
>>ARRL who honked you off about some article you wrote in the distant
>>past.

>Heh heh heh.

Hmmm, what can we infer from this titter of laughter instead of Len's actually addressing the point raised?

>>As an aside, Len, "Ham Radio" magazine did fail. It went under.
>>It died. It is no more. It is defunct. It makes no difference that it
>>was around for 22 years. It couldn't make it for the 23rd year.

>Oh, my, you are REALLY resentful at some things, Dr. Freud!

Misdirection again, Len, turning his point about ham radio back onto some imagined impression of his resentment. Did you somehow develop Freudian powers since you criticized him for having them? We seem to be oscillating here a bit, Len.

>Tsk, tsk, tsk...in trying to "get back" at me, you've now dishonored
>Skip Tenney, the late Jim Fisk, Alf Wilson, Rich Rosen, Terry
>Northrup and a number of staffers who were also licensed radio
>amateurs!

Now you are telling people that a simple statement of fact that Ham Radio is defunct dishonors those people. In doing so, you have added a lot of your words to what he said...

>Yes, you must think they were all "newcomers," brash upstarts
>who could successfully start and continue an independent
>amateur radio magazine in a different state away from Big
>Brother!

I didn't see the word "newcomer" anywhere in his post, Len. You are building a house of cards, then pointing fingers and saying that Dave stacked them up.

>No. Dr. Signal Freud is chafed and scratching, wants everyone
>to tell him what a great big pro gubmint communicator. <shrug>

Wasn't his name Sigmund? And why do you think Dr Freud is concerned with what is said on rrap? Freud has been dead for quite some time.

>>As far as your attempt to belittle the job I did and the place that I did
>>it, it only demonstrates what a pathetic little man you are.

>Yes, isn't it awful that no one can recognize your halo and the
>rays of truth and glory eminating from your beautific presence?

You forgot the capitalizations, Len. And you seem to be the only one who sees Dave asking for people to worship him. The rest of us still see him as a mere mortal. I am not a psychologist, so I can't really tell what that means, but reasonable adults can come to some sort of conclusion, I am sure.

>>...just another instance in which you've written something you know
>>nothing about. Such utterings by you have become rather commonplace
>>and, as Ed pointed out, are a pretty good indicator that you have run
>>out of ammunition

>Poor baby, got hit by stray test-firing rounds, did you?

Such misdirection usually indicates the lack of a better response.

>Do you want to lock and load yet? So far, you've only been dry-firing,
>madly clicking the trigger.

I wonder what this means.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1775. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 11:34:12 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317063412.15176.00001442@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 37763

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>>I don't see two ham radios, Len. I have operated both above and below 30
>>MHz, and my work has taken me above and below 30 MHz. My biggest concern
>>this week is 70 cm.

>So, Ed Hare is oblivious to the "Real Ham" definitions that have
>floated around for years?

I am not oblivious to them, Len. I just don't agree with them, nor do I think
those that are "real hams" in the characterization that you use are a majority
of hams. I am a bit curious as to why you do.

>"My work" has taken me well below MF and on up to Ku band.

Good for you. If you could ever set aside your resentment, there is much you
could teach others.

>>For such a teeny brush, you sure do wave it around a lot...

>That's a matter of perception. Small minds see small objects as
>gigantic.

Okay, as long as we agree that what you are offering here repesents a small
object, I will agree to accept the insult.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1776. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 11:35:09 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Nb%k8.16575$Ex5.1484841@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37764

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a71acf$k20$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
>
> > and the influence of a small bunch
> > of Morse Terrorists to do our deciding for us.
>
> And just who might that be? :-) :-)
>
> Cheers, "Morse Terrorists"...ya gotta love it..ROTFLMAO
> Bill K2UNK

C'mon Bill. Given the language used by NCI types of late, seems fair.

'Course we all know it is a bunch of Telephone Sanitizers and Theologians in full playpen rebellion taking credit for the inevitable but we'll call you terrorists so as not to dent that old self-esteem.

Would it not be hilarious if somehow the issue got sidetracked at WARC?

Dick N�BK

1777. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 11:36:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317063657.15176.00001443@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 37765

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>>I have seen the entire web page, Len, and I believe that the vast majority
>>of it is devoted to membership.

>Is there a single page that doesn't exhort "join the ARRL?" :-)

I would say that "join ARRL" is about as devoted to membership as it can get,
Len.

>>I log on to ARRL.org regularly from home, but why would I want to use
>>someone else's account?

>...to get a feeling of how newcomers view the ARRL website.

The website does not look any different to newcomers that it looks to me when I
log on as W1RFI. Some relatively small part of the site is available only to
members.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1778. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 11:41:12 UTC
From: Steve Adell - KF2TI <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a71vd5$bg0$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37766

In article <20020317063018.15176.00001441@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
says...

> >No. Dr. Signal Freud is chafed and scratching, wants everyone
> >to tell him what a great big pro gubmint communicator. <shrug>
>
> Wasn't his name Sigmund? And why do you think Dr Freud is concerned with what
> is said on rrap? Freud has been dead for quite some time.

That's OK Ed. If the Old Geezer want to refer to Dave as Signal Freud,
then we should start referring to Ol Len as..

Dr. SIMPLE FRAUD, DDD, (DR. of misdirection)with a PHD in lies,
innuendo and hearsay. :)

1779. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 11:42:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317064258.15176.00001444@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 37767

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>>Sampling is done all the time where 350 voters are sampled to find out what
>>the entire voting population is thinking. There is always a margin of error.

>You know that, I know that, major political parties know that, and
>thousands involved in using polling results for decision-making
>know that.

Of course, you also know that ARRL doesn't represent Amateur Radio because the sample size is too small...

It appears that you can tailor what you know to fit whatever point you are trying to make...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1780. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 11:49:44 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317064944.15176.00001445@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 37768

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>If US ARS hams were allowed to "vote" in a popular vote on
>their choice of to keep the code or not, they would probably
>also vote to keep it, just as they have in the past.

Do you really think that the majority of hams, the largest number of which are Technician, would vote to keep Morse code testing? Or do you think that the majority of HF-licensed hams would do so, secure in the knowledge that they had already passed the tests?

>Too bad we are not democratic like Germany...

I didn't know that Germany was a democracy. I thought they were a republic like the US.

>but need the Newington Crowd,

The ARRL HQ staff won't decide the Morse-code testing issue. ARRL's policy will be set by the ARRL Board, only one of which lives in New England. ARRL won't set the national policy either, Clay; that will be set by the FCC. ARRL won't set the interational policy, Clay; that will be done through the ITU, with the US position set by the US delegation. ARRL will have input to that process, but when the decisions are made, as a participant in that delegation, it will support the US position.

> and the influence of a small bunch of Morse Terrorists to do our deciding
>for us.

My guess is that the FCC and the ITU won't know much about the opinions of hams offered on rec.radio.amateur.policy, Clay.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1781. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 11:57:01 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317065701.15176.00001446@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 37769

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> So first you tell everyone that Morse code does not have enough value that
>> people should learn it

>> Ed, Ed, please repost any post I ever made with those words in it. Not
>> *your* interpretation but that actual statement. You cannot do it for it
>> never happened.

Dick, you have said so many times that the only reason people will learn the code is to pass a code test. I see absolutely no need to do a google search and repost what I am certain people remember.

If you want to do some seaching yourself to repost what you have said about Morse code and testing, you are welcome to do so, but I don't think you will find a single instance where you say that Morse code has enough value that people will learn it because it has usefulness and value.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1782. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 11:58:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317065840.15176.00001447@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 37770

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> >I think I've found out
>> >what I wanted to know here, about these folks, in about 48 hours.

>> Hmmm, this is starting to unravel a bit, Val. Wasn't the premise of your
>> appearance here that you had been reading this group for about a year and
>just
>> now decided to post?

>Hey, there's nothing that will confirm the opinion one forms from merely
>reading
>others' posts like engaging them in dialog that brings out front what you
>have
>learned to strongly suspect from only reading!

Hmmm, unravels a bit more. I post, and Dick responds, explaining more about why
"Val" is here...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1783. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 12:01:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317070157.15183.00001911@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 37771

From: "Richard McCollum" rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net

>Would it not be hilarious if somehow the issue got sidetracked at WARC?

I believe it has happened in the past. Morse code testing in the Amateur Radio Service is probably very near the bottom of the priority list.

OTOH, if it is in danger of getting sidetracked, they may find a way to dispose of the matter very quickly.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1784. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 14:01:03 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C94A18D.C91AAEA2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37772

See comments below:

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test
> >From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net
> >Date: 03/16/02 20:15 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3C93EE26.9D225DD2@worldnet.att.net>
>
> >If US ARS hams were allowed to "vote" in a popular vote on
> >their choice of to keep the code or not, they would probably
> >also vote to keep it, just as they have in the past. Too
> >bad we are not democratic like Germany, but need the
> >Newington Crowd, the FCC, and the influence of a small bunch
> >of Morse Terrorists to do our deciding for us.
>
> OK, Clay...I am going to ask you to explain this one.
>
> First of all, what do you mean we are not "democratic" like Germany?
> Thier Amateur organization voted, just like ARRL does, and they acted
> accordingly.

Please define "acted accordingly". the Newington crowd
did not act accordingly, IMHO.
>
> The ARRL may not have held a specific "election" on it,

If they were not going to heed the desires of the majority
of the membership, then why should they have had an
"election" on it.??

> but they certainly
> DID respond to the voiced opinion of the majority of correspondents on the
> matter...If they had NOT, the ARRL would still be, I believe, staunchly
> pro-code test.

They also responded to a threat from the FCC, and to the
cries of the VE Council. Please check the facts. They did
respond, but how did they respond?

>
> That they simply decided to "not oppose" any provision to drop code
> testing at the international level was the path of least resistance to
> accomodate the desires of the membership.

If you substitute "desires of the FCC" and "desires of the
NCI" and "desires of the VE Council, to "desires of the
membership" then I would agree.

>
> Secondly, what "Morse Terrorists"...?!?! The code tests have already been
> pared down to the minimum generally considered to be the "minimum" by
> convention, and the WRC seems to be headed towards deletion of S25.5 as it
> pertains to code testing.

I think the code tests have been pared to "below
minimum". By whose convention is it minimum? If the other
bodies voting at the WRC behave like the ARRL, unlike the
DARC, then it is most assuredly headed toward extinction.
>
> Lastly, the last several FCC NPRM's on the matter have demonstrated a
> growing "popular opinion" that code testing should be deleted or at least
> minimised, which HAS happened.

Using this logic, if I find morning glories in the
garden on Monday "a growing popular weed", even though the
stake holders in the garden want produce, I should turn the
garden over to the morning glories.
>
> The Government put it up for discussion...the people responded, they (th
> feds) acted accordingly. Likewise, the League has responded in a manner
> consistent with the majority opinion of it's members.

IMHO the league (who ever they are?) did not respond
consistent with the majority of their members. The
Newington crowd and several members of the BoD went off on
their own.

>
> Seems to me that the system has worked just like it's supposed to.

I disagree with that conclusion. But, then I may not know
how it is "supposed to".

73,
Clay N4AOX

1785. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 14:24:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317092432.15084.00000061@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 37773

In article <3C92127E.F9F22B89@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >Good Lord, Jim, We've been discussing ham radio testing in the USA.
>>
>> That means you forgot about Japan.
>
>I forget about Japan every chance I get.

How? You keep telling us you have a photographic memory. And I recall a story about a certain "gift" you received in that part of the world.

I think you want Japan's ham radio to be ignored because it disproves your claims.

>You can assume that anything
>I say is referring to the Amateur Radio Service in the USA unless I
>specifically state otherwise.

Sorry, I find it near-impossible to remember what other people assume when such assumptions do not make sense. ;-)

You'll just have to be more clear.

73 de Jim, N2EY
just have to

1786. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 14:24:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317092438.15084.00000062@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 37775

In article <a71acf$k20$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
>news:3C93EE26.9D225DD2@worldnet.att.net...
>> If US ARS hams were allowed to "vote" in a popular vote on
>> their choice of to keep the code or not, they would probably
>> also vote to keep it, just as they have in the past.
>> Too
>> bad we are not democratic like Germany,

Everyone interested in the issue (and others) was allowed to "vote" by sending
comments to the FCC on the restructuring proposal back in 1998. No membership
requirement, no license requirement, no limited choices. All comments publicly
available.

Well over 2000 individuals and organizations commented. I did, and I know K2UNK
did. Did you?

On the code test issue, a count of the comments showed that a slim majority
(54%?) wanted code
testing to remain. Also, a slightly smaller majority wanted two or more test
speeds. Almost nobody wanted
5 wpm only.

But the FCC ignored that majority and went to 5 wpm, with clear indication that
if/when the treaty requirement
is dropped, they will drop all code testing.
>
>The DARC vote in no way binds Germany's
>position at WRC. All that DARC has established is
>that within the IARU, DARC will take the position to
>retain code testing.

Yup. And within the IARU, it may well find itself in a minority position. At
the last meeting of Region 3 IARU societies
the societies all voted for nocodetest except for the ARRL. ARRL changed its
official position on the code test issue
shortly thereafter.

>> but need the Newington Crowd,
>
>The last ARRL "survey" came up with almost the same results
>that the DARC "vote" did...and that was in 1957.

Bill, I'm afraid you're mistaken.

To my knowledge there was no ARRL survey in 1957. There WAS a detailed survey of all US ARRL members in 1975,
and the results were overwhelmingly procodetest. (I received one of those surveys, filled it out and sent it back).

In 1996 there was a flawed, limited survey of both members and nonmembers. The results were still procodetest, but by
a much smaller margin than before.

It should be remembered that the ARRL BoD voted FOR a nocodetest VHF/UHF license in 1990, when the FCC proposed
such a license for the third time in 16 years (1974, 1983, 1990).
>
>> the FCC,
>
>The FCC is charged with listening to ALL input from
>both ham and non-ham...and, regardless of that
>input, the FCC then makes a decision based on what
>the FCC believes is in the best public interest.

The overwhelming majority of those who comment and propose to the FCC on amateur radio matters are, in fact, hams.

And the FCC makes mistakes. Look at some of the nonsense we have been saddled with over the years. But
right or wrong, we have to live with what they decide.
>
>> and the influence of a small bunch
>> of Morse Terrorists to do our deciding for us.
>
>And just who might that be? :-) :-)

I have no idea. Are they for or against what the FCC has decided?
>
>Cheers, "Morse Terrorists"...ya gotta love it..ROTFLMAO

Yeah, that's a good one. 'Specially since it's not clear who they are or which side they are on!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1787. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 14:24:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317092439.15084.00000063@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 37774

In article <3C93CE49.D2ED1CD0@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >I already said it was a broad brush.
>>
>> Too broad.
>
>Too broad for a perfectionist like you.

I'm not a perfectionist, Cecil. I just like accuracy.

>Just right for a black and white
>digital engineer.

Obviously, accuracy and logic rate low on your scale of values. That's OK - for
you.

> I've lived my life that way longer than you have.

Obvioulsy true, since I don't live your way.Are you suggesting that "time in
grade" makes one right?
>
>> > I
>> >don't even know how many nocode techs there are so how can you accuse
>> >me of subtracting out all of them?
>>
>> How can you subtract them out if you don"t know how many there are to begin
>> with?
>
>I told you it was a broad brush. I subtracted 150,000 hams from the present
>ham population.

So you ASSUME, with no proof, that had the FCC left well enough alone, we'd
have 150,000 fewer US hams. (where ARE those guys with the net??)
>
>> >I'm considering the number of Techs who didn't go on to Tech+.
>>
>> How many of THEM are there?
>
>150,000 plus or minus.

How do you know?
>
>> >In my experience at Intel, only 7% of Techs went on to Tech+ and no
>farther.

>>
>> How many went further?
>
>About half. The percentages of the different license classes at Intel
>was in the ballpark to what it is overall now.

That speaks pretty well for the upgrade rate, since the only reason to go
beyond Tech is if one is not satisfied with ALL amateur VHF/UHF privileges.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1788. A Look at Some Ham Populations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 15:06:15 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u99b601shvs146@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37776

Hello, all!

In looking at the QRZ site I noted that California has just about
100,000 hams. So, in the interest of beginning some statstical
analysis I assembled two other groups of about 100,000 to see
how they broke out by license class.

States Ex Ad Gen Pl Tch Nov

CA 11,400 11,300 17,000 12,500 41,500 6,300

NY
OH 14,850 12,650 21,050 13,150 30,550 6,800
PA
MO

FL
TX 11,000 14,100 22,700 12,450 33,650 5,300
NM
AZ

The last group of states above I'm calling my "retirement states"
while the second group is my "working states." California is in
a class by itself, obviously.

The Tech class is a bigger deal out there, isn't it? Interesting!

Val Germann
Columbia, Missouri
(I'll be taking the Tech test Monday next!)

**

1789. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International levels...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 15:43:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317104317.16236.00001872@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 37777

>Subject: Re: Ending Code Requirement at International levels...
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/17/02 01:26 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020317012624.24077.00000016@mb-fp.aol.com>

>I used "Avery Fineman" 14 years ago as sysop on a BBS. The Internet
>went public eleven years ago.

Avery Fineman wasn't the one we were talking about now, was it?

>At no time have I ever attempted to disguise myself as someone else
>in the body of a message on AOL.

Liar, liar, pant's on fire!

>AOL's screen names are not
>callsigns. AOL allows up to 7 screen names per account holder.
>I thought that Ratman knew this...
>

Sure...use all seven! It was your lying about who you really were that's
in question here. Never was any doubt about your failure to be truthful.

>Poor baby, all that Radio Kop hate and rage is eating him up,
>no ability to keep recent history in order or do arithmetic.
>Tsk, tsk, tsk...

The "tst, tsk, tsk" is all your's, Lennie. The ahte and rage are yours,
too. Everyone here EXCEPT you knows it.

THAT is the pity.

1790. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International levels...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 15:55:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317105546.16236.00001874@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 37778

>Subject: Re: Ending Code Requirement at International levels...
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/17/02 01:26 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020317012624.24077.00000015@mb-fp.aol.com>

>> And YOU earned a CIB from your radio shack in WESTPAC, Lennie? Uh
>>huh.....
>
>I served in the Far East Command 1953 to 1956. The term "westpac"
>had not yet been coined/created. "FEC" was the proper acronym then.
>
>Here, use my ASN of RA16408336 and go use some FIA excuse
>and see for yourself

Regardless of what it was called, Lennie, you still don't answer questions directly. Of course, WE know the answer...And I don't need t look up your service record. No CIB. By your own repetitive and tiring rants, we know this. Thanks anyway.

>Then, to be fair publish your own illustrious war record...especially
>why your military service was terminated

I am not the one claiming an "illustrious war record", Your Repetitiveness.

>Make a website honoring yourself, give yourself medals and
>geegaws, exaggerate the truth as in here. Keep it off the newsgroup
>since nobody really cares about your marine days, do they? It is
>not an amateur radio policy subject, is it?

I am not the one repetitively reposting war stories of "way back when", now am I, Lennie? However YOU are.

As for what is and is not relevent for this NG, I dare say that if a neutral third party were able to screen YOUR posts before they hit the wire, most of THEM wouldn't cut the mustard as relevent either, now would they? WESTPAC tales of message relaying heroism, character assassination, hints of ARRL conspiracy and wrongdoing, etc etc etc...

>AOL screen names are not absolute identities. AOL allows each
>account user up to 7 screen names. I have never attempted to
>disguise myself as another person in the body of a message.

You are lying, Leonard. Again.

G'Day, Your Putziness.

1791. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 16:00:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C94BDAF.7899B814@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37779

N2EY wrote:
> How? You keep telling us you have a photographic memory. And I recall a story
> about a certain "gift" you received in that part of the world.

Actually, the gift was in Korea.

> I think you want Japan's ham radio to be ignored because it disproves your
> claims.

Actually, Japan's ham radio was foreign to the subject of the thread.

> You'll just have to be more clear.

About what? You aren't being clear. It is impossible to carry the complete
context along with every sentence. There is no way for me to remedy the real
problem - your nitpicking.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1792. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 16:02:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C94BE12.745F792@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37780

W1RFI wrote:
> Hmmm, unravels a bit more. I post, and Dick responds, explaining more about why
> "Val" is here...

Sure seems to be some "inbreeding" going on there.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1793. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 16:07:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C94BF46.88FC15B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37781

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Just right for a black and white digital engineer.
>
> Obviously, accuracy and logic rate low on your scale of values. That's OK - for
> you.

It has a definite advantage, Jim. I can be right half the time by guessing.

> >150,000 plus or minus.
>
> How do you know?

How can you possibly argue with that figure? It is absolutely correct
since the plus what and minus what are left undefined.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1794. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 16:13:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317111310.16236.00001876@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 37782

>Subject: Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test
>From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net
>Date: 03/17/02 09:01 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C94A18D.C91AAEA2@worldnet.att.net>

>Please define "acted accordingly". the Newington crowd
>did not act accordingly, IMHO.

Excuse me?

Volumes of mail at the ARRL offering an opinion that they DO support the reduction or removal of the code test, and then the ARRL drops it's efforts to KEEP it, and you are still suggesting that theyhave not "acted accordingly".? What do you want them to do, Clay? Find a descendant of Mr. Morse and lynch them?

>The ARRL may not have held a specific "election" on it,
>
>If they were not going to heed the desires of the majority
>of the membership, then why should they have had an
>"election" on it.??

They HAVE followed the actions of the majority of the correspondents on this Clay. I think you are fighting yourself.

>> but they certainly
>> DID respond to the voiced opinion of the majority of correspondents on the
>> matter...If they had NOT, the ARRL would still be, I believe, staunchly
>> pro-code test.
>
>They also responded to a threat from the FCC, and to the
>cries of the VE Council. Please check the facts. They did
>respond, but how did they respond?

A "threat" from the FCC over the code test issue? When was this?

>> That they simply decided to "not oppose" any provision to drop code
>> testing at the international level was the path of least resistance to
>> accomodate the desires of the membership.
>
>If you substitute "desires of the FCC" and "desires of the
>NCI" and "desires of the VE Council, to "desires of the
>membership" then I would agree.

Sorry..can't add those folks in if you are talking about what the ARRL does/doesn't do. The FCC's "wishes" are to be done with it so the whining of those who oppose code testing will cease, and NCI is an independent

organization with no horse in the race at Newington.

Unfortunately the FCC's hands are tied and have been due to treaties that they are not allowed to unilaterally ignore due to the flak they'd take from Congress, and ARRL respoonds to ARRL membership...NOT NCI. I am sure there are many NCI folks who are both and express themselves accordingly, but there is no requirement that ARRL take ANY heed from NCI policy or practice.

>I think the code tests have been pared to "below
>minimum"

Oh? Five WPM is less than most other nations of the world? Seems to me MOST nations that have had code testing used 5WPM as thier minimum too.

>By whose convention is it minimum?

The common practice of other ITU signatories.

>If the other
>bodies voting at the WRC behave like the ARRL, unlike the
>DARC, then it is most assuredly headed toward extinction.

What's headed towards extinction? The ARRL? Code testing? The WRC itself?

>Using this logic, if I find morning glories in the
>garden on Monday "a growing popular weed", even though the
>stake holders in the garden want produce, I should turn the
>garden over to the morning glories.

Huh? What in the heck are you talking about?

>IMHO the league (who ever they are?) did not respond
>consistent with the majority of their members. The
>Newington crowd and several members of the BoD went off on
>their own.

You have access tot he ARRL's mail? To thier e mail? To thier phone operators who field questions/comments from the membership?

WHY, Clay, would a membership organization who traditionally SUPPORTED code testing drop it's support UNLESS there was a substantial indication BY the membership that THEY felt otherwise?

>>Seems to me that the system has worked just like it's supposed to.
>
>I disagree with that conclusion. But, then I may not know
>how it is "supposed to".

The members express an opinion and the organization responds accordingly. How much simpler could THAT be?

73

Steve, K4YZ

1795. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 16:14:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C94C0EC.D684B2F7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37783

Valentine Germann wrote:
> In looking at the QRZ site I noted that California has just about
> 100,000 hams. So, in the interest of beginning some statstical
> analysis I assembled two other groups of about 100,000 to see
> how they broke out by license class.

Val, charts done in proportional fonts don't line up for a lot
of viewers. The netnews guidelines say charts should be done
in a fixed font like Courier.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1796. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 16:29:09 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317112909.07168.00001769@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 37784

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>The Tech class is a bigger deal out there, isn't it? Interesting!

Yes, it certainly is. But don't EVER call it an entry-level license on rrap.
Len will call you to task for it. :-)

>(I'll be taking the Tech test Monday next!)

You will do just fine, but good luck!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1797. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 16:37:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317113720.07168.00001771@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 37786

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>The
>Newington crowd and several members of the BoD went off on
>their own.

Headquarters staff is not permitted to set ARRL policy, Clay. The ARRL BoD is responsible for that. The staff in Newington carries out the directives of the Board.

You keep getting hung up on this "Newington" thing. Does it somehow make your argument sound better to try to convince people that such decisions are not made by people from all areas of the country?

If you feel the majority of hams in your Division do not agree with ARRL's code-test policy positions, run for Division Director on that plank.

For the record, ARRL's code test policy wrt US regulations has not changed. ARRL has not changed the policy that it supports the retention of Morse code for HF access with US amateur licenses. They did change the international policy to state that ARRL will not oppose the reduction or elimination of the international treaty requiring Morse code testing for HF amateur licensing.

If you must rant, rant accurately.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1798. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 16:40:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317114018.07168.00001772@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 37787

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)

> Unfortunately the FCC's hands are tied and have been due to treaties that
>they are not allowed to unilaterally ignore due to the flak they'd take from
>Congress, and ARRL respoonds to ARRL membership...NOT NCI. I am sure there
>are
>many NCI folks who are both and express themselves accordingly, but there is
>no
>requirement that ARRL take ANY heed from NCI policy or practice.

ARRL and NCI had radically different positions. I am sure that NCI's comments
and reply comments were a significant part of ARRL's decision to do an Ex Parte
presentation to the FCC.

Clay's allegation that ARRL supported the NCI position vis a vis restructuring
is pure fantasy.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1799. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 16:41:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317114128.21609.00000055@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 37788

In article <3C902949.1606506E@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Looks like I stumped ya on those engineering questions, Cecil.
>
>Huh? I thought we were discussing question formats.

As I suspected, Cecil is stumped but cannot admit it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1800. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 16:41:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317114129.21609.00000056@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 37789

In article <3C93CB8F.BD1D02B5@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >During just the past week you said 20wpm CW is not fast CW.
>>
>> Produce the post.
>
>I will for $25. Otherwise, I'm not going to waste my time.

HAW! That's a GOOD one, Cecil!

You claim I wrote something, then want ME to pay YOU to back up your own claim.

That joke is almost worth the money!
>
>> Your insistence on making everything binary is not binding on me.
>
>I'm a digital engineer.

So? I'm an electrical engineer.

Your insistence on oversimplification deosn't mean I have to accept them. What is wrong with live and let live?

>Please stop ragging on me for seeing the world
>in black and white.

Where have I "ragged on you"? All I do is point out that the world is more complex than black and white. You don't have to agree or live that way. What is wrong with live and let live?

>View the world in any manner you so choose but
>please grant me the freedom to do likewise.

Then grant me the freedom to disagree with your oversimplifications.

> CW that I can copy is
>slow. CW that I can't copy is fast.

To you, Cecil, not to everyone.

>> Phase distortion on HF is a fact of life.
>
>So is fading. :-)

Exactly. Why take fading as an absolute but phase distortion as "one in a million"?

>Funny how your argument turns and twists 180 degrees
>depending upon which point you are arguing.

180 degree shifts are called binary phase shift - the basis for BPSK. I would expect a digital engineer to recognize the validity of such.

>Why is fading unimportant
>while phase distortion is important? Because fading shoots down your
>argument and phase distortion supports it?

Fading was not reported to be an issue in the cited case.

Why is phase distortion unimportant while fading is important? Because phase distortion shoots down your argument and fading supports it? Sure seems that way.

>> So the fact that CW worked and PSK31 didn't isn't relevant?
>
>Not, it isn't to this particular argument.

Ah OK. Now I understand. What works is unimportant if it violates your boundary conditions, which are only set after the fact.

>In the name of fairness, put
>CW and PSK31 equidistant from Shannon's limit and see which one is best.

Depends on what factors are considered. If the consideration is wpm per occupied Hz, PSK31 wins. If the consideration is wpm in the face of phase distortion, CW wins.

Given a fixed amount of fuel, a Chevette outruns a Corvette.

>Allowing CW to use a wider bandwidth than PSK31 is comparing apples and
>oranges.

Not considering phase distortion is comparing oranges and grapes.

>Allowing CW to use more average power than PSK31 is comparing
>apples and oranges.

Ignoring the fact that one mode worked and the other didn't is comparing fresh oranges to rotten apples. Or sour grapes.

>Allowing CW to get away with a lower throughput
>than PSK31 is comparing apples and oranges.

Considering 0 wpm as being more throughput than 12 wpm is illogical.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1801. Re: It just Figures...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 16:53:08 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <UR3I8.26915$Vx1.2301301@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 37790

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote

>
> >With all kind wishes for a speedy recovery,
>
> From what?
>

From your horrible case of CRI (Cranial-Rectal Inversion).

73, de Hans, K0HB

PS: The proctologist called. Your head is ready.

1802. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 16:55:13 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u99hia9ur15df4@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37785

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>The members [of ARRL] express an opinion and the organization
>responds accordingly. How much simpler could THAT be?

I really have a lot of trouble with this.

What percentage of ARRL members have passed a code test?
Could it really be that if a TRUE, full-up plebiscite, one that was
designed to get the MAXIMUM response, would come NOT end
up with a strong majority FOR retaining a code provision? I have
a hard time believing that code would NOT be strongly supported
under those conditions. Something here does NOT smell right
in that I don't see any actual recent DATA on this. That is, could
it be that ARRL did not WANT to know the real story here?

That is, if it were MY organization I would seek to find out what
a TRUE majority IS on the subject and not stumble around with
half measures . . . which is what has happened, it seems to me.

The whole thing is very strange, isn't it?

Val Germann
Columbia, Missouri

1803. Early in the third quarter, the score is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 17:04:40 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <I04I8.26935$Vx1.2303431@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 37792

Just past half-time, Cecil has seemingly overcome his
sluggishness of past months and holds an impressive lead.
Will momentum carry him, or can Dick and Ed rally to close
the gap in the second half?

Kim has dropped out of sight, but newcomer Valentine
has already moved into the standings in his first month.

RRAP Top Ten Users, March 2002 (As of 3/16)

[305] CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> 17.0%
[265] Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> 14.8%
[253] W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> 14.1%
[119] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 6.6%
[94] Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> 5.2%
[76] Steve Robeson K4YZ <k4yz@aol.com> 4.2%
[68] Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> 3.8%
[63] Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> 3.5%
[61] Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net> 3.4%
[47] Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> 2.6%

1804. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 17:23:01 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u99j6drdk1ej84@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37793

Let me clarify further:

If a Ham organization has a membership consisting overwhelmingly
of people who have passed a code test, and code testing begins to
come under pressure, it seems to me that the job of the organization
is to find out, as closely as possible, where the membership stands,
in a very detailed and "beyond-any-doubt" manner. From what I have
read here I do not believe that there has been any actual "full-up" effort
taken in many years to determine the actual position of a true majority
of the group, on code testing, and several other important issues.

That is, if it were my organization and such a hot topic was on the
table, I would actively and thoroughly contact the membership, by
e-mail, snail-mail, multiple-mode-mail, explaining the situation and
stating that at such and such a time a truly serious survey would be
taken, to which they were strongly, VERY strongly encouraged to
reply. The goal would be MUCH more than a 50 pecent response,
and to quite a bit more than just one simple "up-or-down" question.

Isn't it true that no such thing has been done in many years?

No doubt this would be expensive but, hey, this is IMPORTANT, is
it not? Once again, I find the lack of precise information here more
than a bit disturbing.

I know I'm an outsider and currently belong now to no amateur
organization. But I will (I hope) soon!

Am I just wrong about the above?

Val

1805. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 18:02:21 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C94DA1A.44CED6D2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37798

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>
> WHY, Clay, would a membership organization who traditionally SUPPORTED
> code testing drop it's support UNLESS there was a substantial indication BY the
> membership that THEY felt otherwise?
>
>

Hi Steve,

Of course you ask this question hypothetically, but I ask it
in truth. It is clear to me there was no substantial (read
majority?) indication by the membership that they felt code
testing should be dropped.

73,
Clay N4AOX

1806. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 18:09:19 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c94dc09_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 37799

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020311062846.06075.00000764@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> I don't believe that 1/3 of all hams could accurately handle formal
traffic
> >> under ideal band conditions.
>
> > I see you have your navel, too. :-) I DO believe everything above that
you
> >don't.
> >So I have mine, too.
>
> Dick, you can't be serious. I doubt that 1/3 of hams know the formal NTS
> procedures. Nowhere near 1/3 of hams have participated in formal traffic
> handling. Are you really suggesting that people could just jump right in
and
> handle formal traffic with absolutely no practice or skill?
>
> I disagree.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed,

Additionally, how does Dick KNOW that you have a navel?

One must wonder if he's been peeking in your bathroom
window or something ... :-)

Carl - wa6vse

1807. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 18:34:48 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c94e20d_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 37800

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020317114018.07168.00001772@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>
> > Unfortunately the FCC's hands are tied and have been due to
treaties that
> >they are not allowed to unilaterally ignore due to the flak they'd
take from
> >Congress, and ARRL respoonds to ARRL membership...NOT NCI. I am
sure there
> >are
> >many NCI folks who are both and express themselves accordingly, but
there is
> >no
> >requirement that ARRL take ANY heed from NCI policy or practice.
>
> ARRL and NCI had radically different positions. I am sure that
NCI's comments
> and reply comments were a significant part of ARRL's decision to do
an Ex Parte
> presentation to the FCC.

And, conversely, the ARRL's comments and position were a
significant factor in NCI's decision to do an Ex Parte to the
FCC. Obvioulsy our presentation was more compelling when
one considers that the outcome was what NCI recommended,
rather than what the ARRL recommended :-)

> Clay's allegation that ARRL supported the NCI position vis a vis
restructuring
> is pure fantasy.

I agree completely ... ARRL did NOT support the NCI position,
but instead tried very hard to convince the FCC to retain 12 wpm
for Advanced and Extra ... NCI asked for a maximum of 5 wpm
for General and Extra ... and a reduction to 3 classes of license
instead of 4 ...

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast.net> [personal and NCI-related mail]
<mailto:wa6vse-shack@fast.net> [sked, QSO/QSL, and usenet related
messages ONLY, please]

<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPJThvpe+N6+q84HiEQITyQCeKhTAFuFCGRd/IIYRk2jfgVyTcRcAn37Z
01looqCyFFufATe9wYsa6JFp
=pbCb
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

1808. Re: Early in the third quarter, the score is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 18:39:33 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c94e32c_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 37952

Hans,

If memory serves me correctly, I was in 10th place in
your last report ... Bill and Larry seem to be slacking
off, considering that I was away on business for a
week and just now VERY selectively read and responded
to a VERY small number of the almost 900 posts I found
waiting upon my return :-)

However, this is just an obseration ... I really don't
give a darn about such "rankings." :-)

73,
Carl - wa6vse

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:I04l8.26935$Vx1.2303431@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> Just past half-time, Cecil has seemingly overcome his
> sluggishness of past months and holds an impressive lead.
> Will momentum carry him, or can Dick and Ed rally to close
> the gap in the second half?
>
> Kim has dropped out of sight, but newcomer Valentine
> has already moved into the standings in his first month.
>
> RRAP Top Ten Users, March 2002 (As of 3/16)
>
> [305] CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> 17.0%
> [265] Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> 14.8%
> [253] W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> 14.1%
> [119] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 6.6%
> [94] Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> 5.2%
> [76] Steve Robeson K4YZ <k4yz@aol.com> 4.2%
> [68] Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> 3.8%
> [63] Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> 3.5%
> [61] Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net> 3.4%
> [47] Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> 2.6%
>
>
>

1809. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 18:40:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C94E2F2.2D058A32@earthlink.net>
Source record: 37951

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3C92AA1C.8E364922@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >You're as wrong on that as you are about most things having to do with
> >amateur radio. This kid did about twenty trips up and down the 70 foot
> >tower just last Autumn lowering the 40m yagi, installing new guy wire
> >and installing a Hazer tram system.
>
> Where are the images of this athletic achievement? Some have
> already seen the "achievements" from Africa. Somebody else
> on that tower there... :-)

You still doing research on that book you're writing about me, Len?
Is this simply another case of, "I haven't seen it so it can't have
happened"? I think you can obtain an affadavit from N8NN. He was the
official observer during the antenna project.

> >No, no, no, no. You only need to obtain a license in order to have many
> >hams take your views much credence.
>
> Nope. Heil's "credence claim" is only for Heil and even then he is only
> using it as a reply device.

Maybe you'll explain in great detail what constitutes a "reply device".

> >You've blown smoke here for years without much in the way of support.
>
> Nope. I gave up smoking some time ago. :-)

...but you haven't given up blowing.

> >You tend to lecture and pontificate.
>
> ...and Heil issues orders, lectures, sneers at others who don't share his
> viewpoints. <shrug>

What order have I issued, Len? What lecture have I given? How would
you know if I was sneering at others?

> >That attitude isn't going to win over hams who have been
> >on the air for decades and I don't think you are apt to gain much
> >support from those who are about to become hams.
>
> I wouldn't dream of trying to dissuade a long-time morseman. :-)

Oh, you could dream about--you just couldn't accomplish it.

> But on the second part of that sentence you were correct in
> saying "you don't think." We agree on that.

I'm also happy that come around toward supporting my view. I was
pleased when you typed, "you were correct".

> >Who would go to a non-ham for advice about amateur radio.
>
> Several have. I've tried to be obliging and have given them help
> on their electronics knowledge. I don't know that any one of
> them ever resented any of that help.

> Unless the Universe changed very recently, amateur radio still
> works by the same physical laws as all other radio service
> radios. [surprising, but true]

Did you explain to these folks about how QSOs are conducted, help them
brush up on their morse, explain about the ins and outs of working DX in
a pileup, polish up their traffic handling skills and the like? Where's
the documentation on these claimed feats? You're always big on
documentation.

> >I think that if you've professed interest in something for several
> >decades and that after all that time you've never achieved it, one could
> >consider that a stunning and remarkable failure.
>
> Heh heh heh...oh, my, Fearless Leader still sings that song!
> Off-key, of course. He may need a paddling. :-)

You have a desire to spank me, Len? That's kinky even by California
standards.

> >That little 5 wpm code test never had a chance to stump you.
>
> That little NO WPM code test never had a chance to stump me,
> either. :-)

...even better.

> >Your overwhelming fear of it kept
> >you from even attempting something you wanted.
>
> Oh, wow, Fearless Leader turned into Signal Freud, psycho of the
> airwaves! :-)
>
> No, Dottore Freud, there was no "fear" nor has the "want" ever
> been close to strong for 49 years. Now go lay down on your
> examining couch and analyze yourself.

How can you explain away decades of inaction on something you wanted,
Len?

> >Whatever bile built up
> >as a result has been spewed here in the form of your childish outbursts
> >at anyone you perceive as "acting superior" or in lashing out at the
> >ARRL who honked you off about some article you wrote in the distant
> >past.
>
> Heh heh heh.

No denial, just "Heh heh heh".

> >As an aside, Len, "Ham Radio" magazine did fail. It went under.
> >It died. It is no more. It is defunct. It makes no difference that it
> >was around for 22 years. It couldn't make it for the 23rd year.
>
> Oh, my, you are REALLY resentful at some things, Dr. Freud!

Resentful, Len? I just stated a fact.

> Tsk, tsk, tsk...in trying to "get back" at me, you've now dishonored
> Skip Tenney, the late Jim Fisk, Alf Wilson, Rich Rosen, Terry
> Northrup and a number of staffers who were also licensed radio
> amateurs!

How are they dishonored, Len? They produced a fine publication. It
still failed. Ham Radio never enjoyed the readership numbers of other
magazines.

> Yes, you must think they were all "newcomers," brash upstarts
> who could successfully start and continue an independent
> amateur radio magazine in a different state away from Big
> Brother!

They weren't newcomers. I did not so state. They did not all start the
magazine. There are other independent magazines. "73", "CQ" and
"Worldradio" survive. "Ham Radio" failed.

> >born a civilian. Somebody did refute your mantra that government was not
> >using CW anymore. As a matter of fact, in those years government was
> >using a helluva lot of CW.
>
> ...hell hath no fury like a morseman scorned... :-)

You mean you can't counter the truth, don't you?

> >Sorry it didn't conform to the Army way. We
> >weren't in the Army and had need of doing it in a different way for a
> >number of reasons.
>
> State Department is not known for big-time radio communications
> expertise OR innovation, sport. Heh, they couldn't find the passive
> mikes in the Moscow embassy for eight years! After 1948 the whole
> of the US military was not considering morse code modes for long-
> distance HF communications in any branch.

What vast experience with Department of State communications led you to make such a pronouncement? Do you believe that State's communicators are charged with CI functions?

> That "your idea" (as you put it originally) somehow got translated
> into "State Department Procedures!" That was bullshit then (1980s)
> and is still as stinky for professionalism in radio communications.

It is quite amazing that you still state that I claimed the use of morse on State circuits in various African countries was my idea. You've not produced any substantiation. You did not understand the rationale behind the use of CW by State then. You don't understand it now.

> >It chafed you then and obviously chafes you now.
>
> No. Dr. Signal Freud is chafed and scratching, wants everyone
> to tell him what a great big pro gubmint communicator. <shrug>

Where and when have I ever made such a statement (or even a complete similar statement)?

> >As far as your attempt to belittle the job I did and the place that I did
> >it, it only demonstrates what a pathetic little man you are.
>
> Yes, isn't it awful that no one can recognize your halo and the
> rays of truth and glory eminating from your beautific presence?

Naw, Len. This just illustrates your envy of anyone who has done something you haven't done. Get over it. You aren't a ham and you haven't worked for State. You still have a chance to do one of them. You're too old for the other.

> >...just another instance in which you've written something you know
> >nothing about. Such utterings by you have become rather commonplace
> >and, as Ed pointed out, are a pretty good indicator that you have run
> >out of ammunition
>
> Poor baby, got hit by stray test-firing rounds, did you?

What are you testing firing, Len? Are you zeroing in for the big kill?

> Do you want to lock and load yet? So far, you've only been dry-firing,
> madly clicking the trigger.

Lock and load, Len? Is this now war? I'll be watching the papers for news on the big clash between California and West Virginia.

Dave K8MN

1810. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 18:42:38 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a72obneto1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37953

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C94A18D.C91AAEA2@worldnet.att.net...
> See comments below:
>
> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> >
> > >Subject: Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test
> > >From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net
> > >Date: 03/16/02 20:15 Eastern Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <3C93EE26.9D225DD2@worldnet.att.net>
> >
> > >If US ARS hams were allowed to "vote" in a popular vote on
> > >their choice of to keep the code or not, they would probably
> > >also vote to keep it, just as they have in the past. Too
> > >bad we are not democratic like Germany, but need the
> > >Newington Crowd, the FCC, and the influence of a small bunch
> > >of Morse Terrorists to do our deciding for us.
> >
> > OK, Clay...I am going to ask you to explain this one.
> >
> > First of all, what do you mean we are not "democratic"
> > like Germany?
> > Thier Amateur organization voted, just like ARRL does,
> > and they acted accordingly.
>
> Please define "acted accordingly". the Newington crowd
> did not act accordingly, IMHO.

Just what di the Newington crowd do (or not do)
that gives you cause to state that they (ARRL)
"did not act accordingly"?

> > The ARRL may not have held a specific "election" on it,
>
> If they were not going to heed the desires of the majority
> of the membership, then why should they have had an
> "election" on it.??

The directors are elected by the memebership. Once so elected
they vote as they see fit. That's the SAME way the USA
legislative process works.

> > but they certainly
> > DID respond to the voiced opinion of the majority of
> > correspondents on the matter...If they had NOT, the

> > ARRL would still be, I believe, staunchly pro-code test.
>
> They also responded to a threat from the FCC, and to the
> cries of the VE Council. Please check the facts. They did
> respond, but how did they respond?

They responded as elected directors and each voted according to
what they believed was the right thing to do.

> >That they simply decided to "not oppose" any provision to
> > to drop code testing at the international level was the
> > path of least resistance to
> > accomodate the desires of the membership.
>
> If you substitute "desires of the FCC" and "desires of the
> NCI" and "desires of the VE Council, to "desires of the
> membership" then I would agree.

As a director of NCI, I am unaware of any pressures,
discussions with or agreements between NCI and ARRL
that could be indicative of ARRL "accomodating the
desires of NCI." If you are aware of any evidence, I'd
love to see it.

> > Secondly, what "Morse Terrorists"...?!?!
> > The code tests have already been
> > pared down to the minimum generally considered to be
> > the "minimum" by convention, and the WRC seems to be
> > headed towards deletion of S25.5 as it pertains to code testing.
>
> I think the code tests have been pared to "below
> minimum". By whose convention is it minimum?

Are you saying that the 5 wpm test has been wrong for
all these decades? 5 wpm has been a fixed staple of the
test requirements since the 1950s. Seems it was good enough
for 1/2 a century for the FCC.

> If the other
> bodies voting at the WRC behave like the ARRL, unlike the
> DARC, then it is most assuredly headed toward extinction.

The test will go to extinction. Code USE will survive because
it does have a following and, I believe, always will. As long as there
is one exotic prefix out there running morse, there will
be new code users.

> >Lastly, the last several FCC NPRM's on the matter have
> > demonstrated a growing "popular opinion" that code testing
> > should be deleted or at least minimised, which HAS happened.
>
> Using this logic, if I find morning glories in the
> garden on Monday "a growing popular weed", even though the

> stake holders in the garden want produce, I should turn the
> garden over to the morning glories.

It depends on what you want. Since neither you nor anyone
else has been able to convince the FCC that code testing
MUST continue based on one or more clear and compelling
reasons to keep it, then the analogy you suggest is illogical.

> >The Government put it up for discussion...the people responded,
> > they (the feds) acted accordingly.
> > Likewise, the League has responded in a manner
> > consistent with the majority opinion of it's members.
>
> IMHO the league (who ever they are?) did not respond
> consistent with the majority of their members.

ARRL pushed for 5 wpm AND 12 wpm. What SHOULD
the ARRL position have been in your opinion?

> The Newington crowd and several members of the BoD
> went off on their own.

Again...
What SHOULD the ARRL position have been in your opinion?

> >Seems to me that the system has worked just like it's
> > supposed to.
>
> I disagree with that conclusion. But, then I may not know
> how it is "supposed to".

Tell us how you THINK it is supposed to work and
we can discuss or comment.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1811. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 18:48:44 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a72oi8mhb1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37954

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020317114018.07168.00001772@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>
> > Unfortunately the FCC's hands are tied and have been due to treaties
> > that they are not allowed to unilaterally ignore due to the flak they'd
> >take from Congress, and ARRL respoonds to ARRL
> >membership...NOT NCI. I am sure there are
> >many NCI folks who are both and express themselves
> >accordingly, but there is no requirement
> >that ARRL take ANY heed from NCI policy or practice.
>
> ARRL and NCI had radically different positions.

Indeed we did.

> I am sure that NCI's comments
> and reply comments were a significant part of
> ARRL's decision to do an Ex Parte
> presentation to the FCC.

As was the same decision made by NCI to do our own
Ex Parte to the FCC.

> Clay's allegation that ARRL supported the NCI position
> vis a vis restructuring is pure fantasy.

Yep...I am really amused that a number of people
now hove NCI and ARRL in bed together on the
code testing issue. Times sure have changed :-) :-)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1812. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 18:51:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C94E5CD.D4A9F51F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37955

N2EY wrote:
> Your insistence on oversimplification deosn't mean I have to accept them.

I'm not asking you to accept them. I'm asking you to allow me to live
my life the way I see fit. What is wrong with live and let live?

> Where have I "ragged on you"? All I do is point out that the world is more
> complex than black and white.

To me, it not more complex than black and white. What is wrong with
live and let live?

> Then grant me the freedom to disagree with your oversimplifications.

No, you are not free to try to change my lifestyle. What is wrong
with live and let live?

> Exactly. Why take fading as an absolute but phase distortion as "one in a
> million"?

I didn't say that, Jim.

> Fading was not reported to be an issue in the cited case.

Fading was reported as an issue by the FCC in trying to copy manual code
without the fifth harmonic being present. That was another cited case.

> Ah OK. Now I understand. What works is unimportant if it violates your boundary
> conditions, which are only set after the fact.

Ok, Jim, have it your way. From now on, when someone says CW gets through
when SSB fails, I will say, "Not when SSB is at 1000 watts and CW is at
one watt." After all, if you don't believe in leveling the playing field
when comparing modes, then you shouldn't object to unleveling all playing
fields. If you don't mind comparing 1000 watts of SSB to one watt of CW
and neglecting the bandwidth, who am I to object?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1813. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 18:52:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C94E60B.2A37783E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37956

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> Looks like I stumped ya on those engineering questions, Cecil.
> >
> >Huh? I thought we were discussing question formats.
>
> As I suspected, Cecil is stumped but cannot admit it.

I didn't read the questions, Jim, I just glanced at the format.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1814. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 18:57:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C94E735.1D3A9735@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37957

Valentine Germann wrote:
> Something here does NOT smell right
> in that I don't see any actual recent DATA on this. That is, could
> it be that ARRL did not WANT to know the real story here?

How could a rank newcomer such as yourself possibly have enough knowledge
to ask such a question?

> The whole thing is very strange, isn't it?

What is strange is the necessary breadth of knowledge a rank newcomer has
developed in order to conclude that "The whole thing is very strange".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1815. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 19:00:26 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a72qakjsg1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37965

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u99hia9ur15df4@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >The members [of ARRL] express an opinion and the organization
> >responds accordingly. How much simpler could THAT be?
>
>
> I really have a lot of trouble with this.
>
> What percentage of ARRL members have passed a code test?
> Could it really be that if a TRUE, full-up plebiscite, one that was
> designed to get the MAXIMUM response, would come NOT end
> up with a strong majority FOR retaining a code provision? I have
> a hard time believing that code would NOT be strongly supported
> under those conditions. Something here does NOT smell right
> in that I don't see any actual recent DATA on this. That is, could
> it be that ARRL did not WANT to know the real story here?

The only data close to what you may be looking for
is a survey ARRL did 5 years ago. At that time support
for code in the USA was (I think) about 60%. On the
issue of an international test requirement, the vote was (I think)
about 50% or so to let each country decide on their own (i.e.
that would support ending the S25.5 treaty requirement).

> That is, if it were MY organization I would seek to find out what
> a TRUE majority IS on the subject and not stumble around with
> half measures . . . which is what has happened, it seems to me.

Most large organizations operate on a director basis
and do NOT put every policy position up to a full
vote of the membership. The ARRL bylaws do NOT call
for any such direct voting to take place.

> The whole thing is very strange, isn't it?

Not at all when you look at most clubs and organizations.
The elected leadership usually has wide discretion in
setting policy.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

> Val Germann
> Columbia, Missouri
>
>
>

1816. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 19:06:55 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a72qaljsg2@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37964

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u99j6drdk1ej84@corp.supernews.com...
> Let me clarify further:
>
> If a Ham organization has a membership consisting overwhelmingly
> of people who have passed a code test, and code testing begins to
> come under pressure, it seems to me that the job of the organization
> is to find out, as closely as possible, where the membership stands,
> in a very detailed and "beyond-any-doubt" manner.

Why? ARRL didn't violate any by-laws in taking the action
they did.

> From what I have
> read here I do not believe that there has been any actual "full-up" effort
> taken in many years to determine the actual position of a true majority
> of the group, on code testing, and several other important issues.

There was no need to do so.

> That is, if it were my organization and such a hot topic was on the
> table, I would actively and thoroughly contact the membership, by
> e-mail, snail-mail, multiple-mode-mail, explaining the situation and
> stating that at such and such a time a truly serious survey would be
> taken, to which they were strongly, VERY strongly encouraged to
> reply.

The ARRL magazine, QST, carried considerable
information over the years.

> The goal would be MUCH more than a 50 pecent response,
> and to quite a bit more than just one simple "up-or-down" question.

Goals are nice, but they aren't attainable just because
the goal is set.

> Isn't it true that no such thing has been done in many years?

See my other post with info on a survey done about 5 years ago.
Note - That was, therefore, fairly recent in terms of the ARRL
position going into 1998's FCC restructuring NPRM 98-143.

> No doubt this would be expensive but, hey, this is IMPORTANT, is
> it not? Once again, I find the lack of precise information here more
> than a bit disturbing.

I think you give the issue more concern than
most hams do.

> I know I'm an outsider and currently belong now to no amateur
> organization. But I will (I hope) soon!
> Am I just wrong about the above?

Not wrong, just unaware of some info (IMHO).
We can discuss and debate.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1817. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 19:06:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C94E952.5D0D58A3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37958

Valentine Germann wrote:
> ... I do not believe that there has been any actual "full-up" effort
> taken in many years to determine the actual position of a true majority
> of the group, on code testing, and several other important issues.

The ARRL did a survey a number of years ago. Approximately 2/3 of the
respondees used CW "rarely" or "never", if I remember the survey words
correctly. The other 1/3 said they "often" use CW. Many of the hams
who answered "often" also "voted" to end the Morse code requirement.
I wonder if the results of that survey are published anywhere on the
web so you could take a look.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1818. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 19:10:42 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a72qamjsg3@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37967

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C94DA1A.44CED6D2@worldnet.att.net...
>
> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> > WHY, Clay, would a membership organization who traditionally
> > SUPPORTED code testing drop it's support UNLESS there was
> > a substantial indication BY the membership that THEY felt otherwise?
>
> Hi Steve,
> Of course you ask this question hypothetically, but I ask it
> in truth. It is clear to me there was no substantial (read
> majority?) indication by the membership that they felt code
> testing should be dropped.

Nor was there any substantial majority that felt
code testing should be mandated for ALL countries.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1819. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 19:14:51 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a72qapjsg4@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37966

"Richard McCollum" <rmcollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:Nb%k8.16575$Ex5.1484841@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:a71acf$k20$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> >
> > > and the influence of a small bunch
> > > of Morse Terrorists to do our deciding for us.
> >
> > And just who might that be? :-) :-)
> >
> > Cheers, "Morse Terrorists"...ya gotta love it..ROTFLMAO
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> C'mon Bill. Given the language used by NCI types of late,
> seems fair.

What language? But if it floats your boat to use such
extremist and, obviously stupid, labels...so be it.
Your reliance on the perjorative is self explainatory as
to your credibility.

> 'Course we all know it is a bunch of Telephone Sanitizers and Theologians
> in full playpen rebellion taking credit for the inevitable but we'll call
> you terrorists so as not to dent that old self-esteem.

I really haven't a friggin clue what you are babbling about.

> Would it not be hilarious if somehow the issue
> got sidetracked at WARC?

I suppose that's your best hope.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1820. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 19:15:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020317141557.12652.00000182@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 37961

In article <a70m5f$p0q$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> > If you are code test advocate you might think that's great.
>> > If you think for a minute, however, you'll see how the
>> > "vote" is extremely narrow.
>> >
>>
>> The "vote" for President of the US was also extremely
>> narrow, but GWB is President.
>
>True, but the analogy is faulty since the DARC vote
>is binding on no one but DARC as an entity...and that
>is only because they choose to do so.
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK

Bill:

If DARC wants to keep code testing, I'm sure the Deutsche Bundespost
will vote that way at whatever WRC gets to decide the issue. You see,
unlike the U.S. FCC, the Bundespost has no problem with the bureaucratic
burden of code testing prospective radio amateurs. And Germans (like
myself) aren't a bunch of lazy whiners. They get the job done.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1821. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 19:15:58 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020317141558.12652.00000184@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 37960

In article <a6vuja$d2n$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>17455 DARC members (which is 33.8 % of all DARC members)
>took part in a vote for or against keeping the CW test
>for HF.
>
>Of these, 1144 votes were invalid.
>
>From 16311 valid votes, 8530 (that is 52.3 %) voted
>for keeping the CW test in its current form.
>
>47.7 % voted for abolishing the CW test.
>
>The DARC (German Amateur Radio League) will respect
>this vote as a member of the IARU.
>--------
>
>If you are code test advocate you might think that's great.
>If you think for a minute, however, you'll see how the
>"vote" is extremely narrow...and (IMHO) the vote if
>taken a year from now will get even closer, or even
>go the other way. Additionally, this vote only influences
>how Germany via DARC will "vote" within the IARU
>process.
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK

Bill:

You're probably right...I'm sure this DARC thing is just an anomoly,
and we'll eventually get the completely dumbed-down ARS you'd prefer, as a
result of the elimination of code testing.

73 de Larry, K3LT
Former DARC Member
Ex: DA1RZ, DA1ZW

1822. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 19:15:58 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020317141558.12652.00000183@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 37962

In article <20020316161002.09101.00000036@mb-cc.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>
>- How many hams are there in Germany?

Jim:

About 150K when I was there, including their No-code glorified CB-ers.

>- How many are DARC members?

Not many, much less than half of the licensed hams.

>- Is there a nocodetest license there? If so, how popular is it?

Yes, they have a Technician-equivalent, and it seemed to be quite
popular during my tours in Germany (1983-1985 and 1987-1989).

>- Was there ever a previous survey/poll/vote? If so, how did it go?
>- Why were there so many invalid votes? Why were they declared invalid? What
>would the result have been if they were included?

They may have been declared invalid as a result of not being properly
authenticated. This is a big thing with Germans. If every "i" is not
dotted and every "t" crossed, they'll toss their paperwork in the bonfire
and pretend it never existed.

>- How much influence does DARC have on how the German vote will go at WRC
>2003?

The Deutsche Bundespost pretty much rubber-stamps any DARC
recommendations with regard to the ARS in Germany.

73 de Larry, K3LT
Former DARC Member
Ex: DA1RZ, DA1ZW

1823. Re: It just Figures...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 19:15:59 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020317141559.12652.00000185@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 37959

In article <3C93676F.37B07F58@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> After all, they most likely think and speak in jive "Ebonics," ...
>
>Well Larry, you think and speak in Hambonics.

Cecil:

I'll admit to that. Also, as a former musician, I also speak trombonics.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1824. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 19:20:58 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <u06l8.14817$tP2.1295024@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37963

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020317070157.15183.00001911@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "Richard McCollum" rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net
>
> >Would it not be hilarious if somehow the issue got sidetracked at WARC?
>
> I believe it has happened in the past. Morse code testing in the
Amateur Radio
> Service is probably very near the bottom of the priority list.
>
> OTOH, if it is in danger of getting sidetracked, they may find a way to
dispose
> of the matter very quickly.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

When the plate is full, you dump the dessert into a potted palm. If it is not settled in the bars of Geneva and the hospitality rooms before the session, it is dead. If the Russian delegate even threatens to make a speech on the subject, he won't have to bother to write one.

But like you, I suspect that it will be swept up for a unanimous head nod by some backroom deal. Just who cares enough about the issue to spend any brie and stilton on it is the real question.

Dick NBK

1825. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 19:24:09 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a72qkl$3hc$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37968

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020317141557.12652.00000182@mb-mq.aol.com...
> In article <a70m5f$p0q$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> > If you are code test advocate you might think that's great.
> >> > If you think for a minute, however, you'll see how the
> >> > "vote" is extremely narrow.
> >> >
> >>
> >> The "vote" for President of the US was also extremely
> >> narrow, but GWB is President.
> >
> >True, but the analogy is faulty since the DARC vote
> >is binding on no one but DARC as an entity...and that
> >is only because they choose to do so.
> >
> >Cheers,
> >Bill K2UNK
>
> Bill:
>
> If DARC wants to keep code testing, I'm sure the Deutsche Bundespost
> will vote that way at whatever WRC gets to decide the issue. You see,
> unlike the U.S. FCC, the Bundespost has no problem with the bureaucratic
> burden of code testing prospective radio amateurs. And Germans (like
> myself) aren't a bunch of lazy whiners. They get the job done.

Hey Larry,

As to how the Deutsche Bundespost will vote, I have
no idea as I don't know the process that leads to
Germany reaching their own policy position for WRC.

And...
For what its worth to you, my ancestry is 3/4 German.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1826. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 19:35:27 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C94EFEB.4B452C0B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37969

Bill Sohl wrote:
>

>
> Are you saying that the 5 wpm test has been wrong for
> all these decades? 5 wpm has been a fixed staple of the
> test requirements since the 1950s. Seems it was good enough
> for 1/2 a century for the FCC.
>

Your question and answer about 5 wpm shows you may have been
less than experienced with HF morse operation. The 5 wpm
was the entry level just to allow one to get a CW Keyed rig
on the air in the novice subbands to begin to get ones speed
up to a "minimum" level suitable for operation in the larger
portions of spectrum outside the novice subbands. 5 wpm was
for entry level novices. Historically, 5 wpm was never
intended to be an on-going minimum. Historically, it took
10 to 13 wpm to be introduced to general use in the
international arena of code not only amateur, but ship to
ship, ship to shore, and other commercial use. 13 wpm was
judged by many to be the minimum operating speed where one
could say one had developed the ear/wetware modem
coordination required for proper utilization of CW Morse.

Of course now these facts will all be declared fabrications,
and mythology by NCIists, ARRL Zombies, etc., in order to
justify their beliefs and actions. Isn't it funny how
historical revisionism works?

73,
Clay N4AOX

1827. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 19:39:35 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Xh6l8.14853$tP2.1297317@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37970

```
"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a72qap$jsg$4@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:Nb%k8.16575$Ex5.1484841@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:a71acf$k20$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > >
> > >
> > > > and the influence of a small bunch
> > > > of Morse Terrorists to do our deciding for us.
> > >
> > > And just who might that be? :-) :-)
> > >
> > > Cheers, "Morse Terrorists"...ya gotta love it..ROTFLMAO
> > > Bill K2UNK
> >
> > C'mon Bill. Given the language used by NCI types of late,
> > seems fair.
>
> What language? But if it floats your boat to use such
> extremist and, obviously stupid, labels...so be it.
> Your reliance on the perjorative is self explainatory as
> to your credibility.
>
> > 'Course we all know it is a bunch of Telephone Sanitizers and
Theologians
> > in full playpen rebellion taking credit for the inevitable but we'll
call
> > you terrorists so as not to dent that old self-esteem.
>
> I really haven't a friggin clue what you are babbling about.
>
> > Would it not be hilarious if somehow the issue
> > got sidetracked at WARC?
>
> I suppose that's your best hope.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Bill, I am more or less one of the good guys because I have long since
seen the day coming with or without NCI. But having been accused of
```

everything short of pedophelia by your minions and lackeys you guys are way down on the list these days.

I don't hope one way or the other. My interest is seeing a lot of NCI rabble howl like stuck hogs and not for revenge but for the utter surrealism it would bring about. It would be funnier than a Mel Brooks movie and wierder than a Dali painting.

Remember, even the Telephone Sanitizers ultimately proved useful; now the Theologians might be another story.

If it happens, you can join me and Jim in a chorus of Springtime for Hitler and I am sure we can quickly teach you the French Mistake.

Dick N&#65533;BK

1828. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 19:45:42 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C94F252.6F316B79@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37971

CAM wrote:
>
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > ... I do not believe that there has been any actual "full-up" effort
> > taken in many years to determine the actual position of a true majority
> > of the group, on code testing, and several other important issues.
>
> The ARRL did a survey a number of years ago. Approximately 2/3 of the
> respondees used CW "rarely" or "never", if I remember the survey words
> correctly. The other 1/3 said they "often" use CW. Many of the hams
> who answered "often" also "voted" to end the Morse code requirement.
> I wonder if the results of that survey are published anywhere on the
> web so you could take a look.

This sure is a fuzzy answer for a "black and white" logic
purist.;-) If "Many" means most, say 2/3, then 2/3 of 1/3 =
2/9 of those responding. So does 2/9 carry the day?
Are you responding to the question about a "full-up" effort
by your recollections of this survey?

Since Morse testing was only required for HF operations, why
not survey the HF operators?

73,
Clay N4AOX

1829. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 21:09:18 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C9505E8.2DA9954D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37974

As someone has pointed out, the last survey was 1975 and it
was clear (to me but not to some others by some twisted
reasoning) that the majority of the membership of the ARRL
at that time wanted to keep the code testing. Unfortunately
the survey did not ask the right questions to make the
results and conclusions unmistakeably clear. If there were
other surveys "to the point" since then I am not aware.

73,
Clay N4AOX

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C94DA1A.44CED6D2@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >
> > Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > WHY, Clay, would a membership organization who traditionally
> SUPPORTED
> > > code testing drop it's support UNLESS there was a substantial indication
> BY the
> > > membership that THEY felt otherwise?
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Hi Steve,
> >
> > Of course you ask this question hypothetically, but I ask it
> > in truth. It is clear to me there was no substantial (read
> > majority?) indication by the membership that they felt code
> > testing should be dropped.
> >
> > 73,
> > Clay N4AOX
>
> I honestly don't think there was a substantial offering on behalf of the
> membership of feelings on the CW issue one way or the other, was there?
>
> Kim W5TIT

1830. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 21:17:22 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C9507EE.8219D6A5@adelphia.net>
Source record: 37975

yeah...thats it! thats what I really meant! ;^) Thanks for the out
Cecil!

- Mike -

CAM wrote:
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
> >
> > Hmm, getting lots of feedback on this one. I've certainly heard it used
> > a lot for "is". Figures I'd pick it up and use it wrong (blush).
>
> Es stands for einsteinium. :-)
>
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > >
> > > From: mike coslo mjc5@psu.edu
> > >
> > > > es=is
> > >
> > > Actually, "es" in Morse-ese means "and." It is from French.
>
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1831. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 21:32:44 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020317163244.06313.00001438@mb-mo.news.cs.com>
Source record: 37976

>Well over 2000 individuals and organizations commented. I did, and I know
>K2UNK
>did. Did you?
>
>On the code test issue, a count of the comments showed that a slim majority
>(54%?) wanted code
>testing to remain. Also, a slightly smaller majority wanted two or more test
>speeds. Almost nobody wanted
>5 wpm only.
>
>But the FCC ignored that majority and went to 5 wpm, with clear indication
>that
>if/when the treaty requirement
>is dropped, they will drop all code testing.

Sounds like it's time to write some elected representatives and ask how one of this country's founding principles can be so easily ignored. I really didn't have much of a position on this matter at the time. But after "getting it done," it's hard to defend the "barrier" stance.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

1832. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 21:35:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317163537.04214.00000049@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 37977

In article <a72obneto1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Are you saying that the 5 wpm test has been wrong for
>all these decades?

Actually, I think it was a mistake. Hindsight is 20-20, of course, and it's
really a moot point now.

By making the lowest test speed 5 wpm, the myth was created that the way to
learn code was to start off at that speed and work up to 13 or 20 wpm, rather
than starting off at 13-15 wpm. The trouble is that many methods used to learn
5 wpm induce bad habits, which then must be unlearned. The work of Koch
(published in 1936) showed better ways to learn the code, but were largely
ignored in this country for decades.

>5 wpm has been a fixed staple of the
>test requirements since the 1950s. Seems it was good enough
>for 1/2 a century for the FCC.

For minimal HF privileges, yes. For full privileges, 13 wpm was required for 17
of the past 51 years, and 20 wpm for 31 of the past 51 years.

The total elimination of code testing may actually be a good thing for code USE
because it may allow better methods of learning to come to the fore.

Check out:

http://www.qsl.net/n9bor/n0hff.htm

for an excellent free online book on the subject.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1833. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 21:35:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317163538.04214.00000050@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 37979

In article <u99j6drdk1ej84@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>If a Ham organization has a membership consisting overwhelmingly
>of people who have passed a code test, and code testing begins to
>come under pressure, it seems to me that the job of the organization
>is to find out, as closely as possible, where the membership stands,
>in a very detailed and "beyond-any-doubt" manner.

I agree.

>From what I have
>read here I do not believe that there has been any actual "full-up" effort
>taken in many years to determine the actual position of a true majority
>of the group, on code testing, and several other important issues.

That is correct.
>
>That is, if it were my organization and such a hot topic was on the
>table, I would actively and thoroughly contact the membership, by
>e-mail, snail-mail, multiple-mode-mail, explaining the situation and
>stating that at such and such a time a truly serious survey would be
>taken, to which they were strongly, VERY strongly encouraged to
>reply. The goal would be MUCH more than a 50 pecent response,
>and to quite a bit more than just one simple "up-or-down" question.
>
>Isn't it true that no such thing has been done in many years?

To my knowledge, the last time a non-government large-scale systematic survey
of amateur attitudes towards the license tests and structure was done was 1975.

The ARRL sent a detailed questionnaire to every licensed US member at that
time, and displayed the results in QST. This survey was in response to the
FCC's late-1974 proposal to radically restructure the US license system,
including a nocodetest "Communicator" license.

There was a small survey done by the ARRL in 1996 or 1997, which I described in
another post.

No other amateur organization has done any sort of survey on anyhting like that
scale.

Surveys, however, are not the only input to the ARRL BoD, who actually make
such policy decisions. They also look at email and letters from members and
nonmembers, opinions received from conversations with the FCC and
telecommunications industry officials, and trends in other countries.

In all cases the ARRL proposals have stayed fairly close to the majority membership opinion.

When the FCC proposes to make major rules changes, there is usually a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) issued. All interested parties, licensed or not, are invited to comment. Those NPRM comments are viewable at the FCC website.

http://www.fcc.gov

One could say that the comments represent a "free-form survey" of opinion on the issues raised by the NPRM.
>
>No doubt this would be expensive but, hey, this is IMPORTANT, is
>it not? Once again, I find the lack of precise information here more
>than a bit disturbing.

Me too, but it's a bit late now. FCC's response to NPRM 98-143 made it pretty clear that the FCC sees "no regulatory purpose" in continuing code testing for ANY ham license. The only thing that keeps 5 wpm alive is the ITU treaty requirement.

I'm not happy about it, but them's the facts, and FCC is not likely to change their mind. FCC has wanted out of code testing for a LONG time, and has gradually brought it to reality. Only the last step remains, and as K4YZ correctly says, FCC's hands are tied until the treaty changes.
>
>I know I'm an outsider and currently belong now to no amateur
>organization. But I will (I hope) soon!

ARRL is the largest and most representative organization we have for the ARS. It
is well worth joining. I don't agree with every ARRL policy position but I do agree with most. IMO without the ARRL, ham radio be slowly but surely legislated and restricted out of existence. Some ARRL critics would like that, I think.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1834. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 21:35:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317163539.04214.00000051@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 37978

In article <3C94E952.5D0D58A3@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Valentine Germann wrote:
>> ... I do not believe that there has been any actual "full-up" effort
>> taken in many years to determine the actual position of a true majority
>> of the group, on code testing, and several other important issues.
>
>The ARRL did a survey a number of years ago.

1996. The survey was flawed in many ways, which were discussed here ad nauseum.

The surveys were sent to 1100 ARRL members and a similar number of nonmembers. Only licensed US hams were surveyed, and the surveys were sent to 200 Extras, 200 Advanceds, 200 Generals, 200 Tech Pluses, 200 Techs and 100 Novices - even though the number of hams in each class is not distributed so equally.

> Approximately 2/3 of the
>respondees used CW "rarely" or "never", if I remember the survey words
>correctly. The other 1/3 said they "often" use CW.

Nope.

There was one question about how often the respondent actually used CW. There were 3 choices: "Never", "Rarely", "Regularly". About 1/3 (plus or minus) chose each.

However, there were no questions about how much the amateur used other modes, and no definition of "regularly" or "rarely".

>Many of the hams
>who answered "often" also "voted" to end the Morse code requirement.

Most of the hams who responded to the survey, regardless of how they answered other questions, "voted" to KEEP the Morse code test requirement.

>I wonder if the results of that survey are published anywhere on the
>web so you could take a look.

Way back in 1997-98 I started to sytematically analyze each question, the results and the flaws of the survey here on rrap. Those posts are still in the archives, like google.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1835. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 21:39:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C950CF4.88B4A74C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37980

Clay N4AOX wrote:
> 5 wpm was for entry level novices.

Also for permanent technicians. The Techs of the 50's were issued calls
identical to the Generals.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1836. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 21:45:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C950E7F.4FEDBB8F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37981

N2EY wrote:

> CAM wrote:

> The surveys were sent to 1100 ARRL members and a similar number of nonmembers.
> Only licensed US hams were surveyed, and the surveys were sent to 200 Extras,
> 200 Advanceds, 200 Generals, 200 Tech Pluses, 200 Techs and 100 Novices - even
> though the number of hams in each class is not distributed so equally.

Didn't all members of the ARRL receive that survey in their QST's?

> > Approximately 2/3 of the
> >respondees used CW "rarely" or "never", if I remember the survey words
> >correctly. The other 1/3 said they "often" use CW.
>
> Nope.
>
> There was one question about how often the respondent actually used CW. There
> were 3 choices: "Never", "Rarely", "Regularly". About 1/3 (plus or minus) chose
> each.

Assuming "regularly" means "often", my statement was accurate.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1837. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 22:13:58 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Gy8l8.15128$tP2.1315934@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37982

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020317163537.04214.00000049@mb-mr.aol.com...
> In article <a72obneto1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Are you saying that the 5 wpm test has been wrong for
> >all these decades?
>
> Actually, I think it was a mistake. Hindsight is 20-20, of course, and
it's
> really a moot point now.
>
> By making the lowest test speed 5 wpm, the myth was created that the way
to
> learn code was to start off at that speed and work up to 13 or 20 wpm,
rather
> than starting off at 13-15 wpm. The trouble is that many methods used to
learn
> 5 wpm induce bad habits, which then must be unlearned. The work of Koch
> (published in 1936) showed better ways to learn the code, but were
largely
> ignored in this country for decades.
>
> >5 wpm has been a fixed staple of the
> >test requirements since the 1950s. Seems it was good enough
> >for 1/2 a century for the FCC.
>
> For minimal HF privileges, yes. For full privileges, 13 wpm was required
for 17
> of the past 51 years, and 20 wpm for 31 of the past 51 years.
>
> The total elimination of code testing may actually be a good thing for
code USE
> because it may allow better methods of learning to come to the fore.
>
> Check out:
>
> http://www.qsl.net/n9bor/n0hff.htm
>
> for an excellent free online book on the subject.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Might you as well have come to the conclusion that Morse was never the real issue to begin with?

1838. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 22:24:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317172403.16055.00000075@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 37987

In article <20020317064944.15176.00001445@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net
>
>>If US ARS hams were allowed to "vote" in a popular vote on
>>their choice of to keep the code or not, they would probably
>>also vote to keep it, just as they have in the past.
>
>Do you really think that the majority of hams, the largest number of which
>are Technician, would vote to keep Morse code testing?

While the Technician class has the largest percentage of all US amateur radio licensees, that class is not a majority. Yet.

>Or do you think that the
>majority of HF-licensed hams would do so, secure in the knowledge that they
>had already passed the tests?

That would be an accurate opinion with some qualifications.

There are no "HF-licensed hams" in the US. The General and extra classes have privileges for transmission below 30 MHz. General and extra classes may also operate on MF bands allocated to US radio amateurs.

>>Too bad we are not democratic like Germany...
>
>I didn't know that Germany was a democracy. I thought they were a republic
>like the US.

Clay means "democratic" as in "democratic principles." He was not referring to a governmental organization.

>>but need the Newington Crowd,
>
>The ARRL HQ staff won't decide the Morse-code testing issue.

ARRL Hq staff control all the wording and imaging in publications sent and presented to the rest of the country. That is a one-way media condition.

>ARRL's policy will
>be set by the ARRL Board, only one of which lives in New England.

When all of the output of the ARRL comes from a few miles SW of Hartford, CT, the rest of the country gets the picture of a "New England crowd."

>ARRL won't set the national policy either, Clay; that will be set by the FCC.

ARRL both sets and influences national ARS policy...as it sees fit.
The FCC regulates US civil radio by law.

>ARRL won't
>set the interational policy, Clay; that will be done through the ITU, with
>the US position set by the US delegation.

The ARRL clearly tries to influence IARU decisions. Neither the
ARRL nor IARU have any VOTING power at any ITU-R function;
they are considered only as an "advisory" groups or organizations.

The ONLY voting power at the ITU-R is held by government
administrations. For the USA administration that is the
Department of State, the FCC, and the NTIA.

>ARRL will have input to that process,
>but when the decisions are made, as a participant in that delegation, it will
>support the US position.

There is NO "direct participation" by the ARRL in decisions made
by the US adminstration at any WRC. The ARRL is an "observer"
(official ITU-R title) and may act in an advisory capacity only. The
US administration may accept or reject the ARRL's advice.

Please do not rephrase the organizational format of the ITU-R
to imply that the ARRL has any profound effect on the US
administration delegation or has "direct participation" in US
decisions.

It is only common sense that the ARRL supports US federal law
on amateur radio regulations. There is no such supposition that
the ARRL "supports the US decisions [at WRCs]" although your
wording implies that it does.

>> and the influence of a small bunch of Morse Terrorists to do our deciding
>>for us.
>
>My guess is that the FCC and the ITU won't know much about the opinions of
>hams offered on rec.radio.amateur.policy, Clay.

The US administration is made up of State, FCC, and NTIA. Both
the FCC and NTIA accept input from US citizens and US
organizations; the NTIA must consider other US government
agencies since it is the regulator for US governmental radio use.

If the United States is to continue with democratic principles (see
the First Amendment of the US Constitution) then the US
government must also accept US citizen input. It should not be
solely influenced by special interest groups nor should special
interest groups be a sole intermediary "representative" between
US citizens and their government.

The ARRL is a special interest group. The public record on commentary concerning FCC 98-143 shows a strong correlation to the various opinions on amateur radio issues argued within this newsgroup.

Abrupt dismissal of opinions expressed in here show an elitist attitude as if only the ARRL knows what is good for US amateur radio.

1839. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 22:24:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317172404.16055.00000076@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 37984

In article <3C94A18D.C91AAEA2@worldnet.att.net>, Clay N4AOX
<wyn@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>See comments below:

>> The Government put it up for discussion...the people responded, they
>(th
>> feds) acted accordingly. Likewise, the League has responded in a manner
>> consistent with the majority opinion of it's members.
>
>IMHO the league (who ever they are?) did not respond
>consistent with the majority of their members. The
>Newington crowd and several members of the BoD went off on
>their own.

There is NO way to tell if the ARRL is true or untrue in "using
democratic principles" for "representation" of the membership.

The ARRL sets up the conditions, the ARRL advises its
membership on issues.
The ARRL says they take in opinions but the ARRL has
complete control on what they wish the ARRL membership
should know about membership input.
The ARRL directly controls the majority of print and visual
media available to US radio amateurs and others on all
subjects of amateur radio interest.
The ARRL says it is honest and true and good.

It is a Belief System in complete control of the Beliefs.

True believers do not understand that skeptics question
this absolute Belief System. Many of them openly scorn,
despise, and dishonor skeptics as heretics and inferiors
for not Believing as they, the True Believers, do. It has
come down to a minor intellectual jihad of the True
Believers against the Infidels (skeptics, unbelievers).

>> Seems to me that the system has worked just like it's supposed to.
>
>I disagree with that conclusion. But, then I may not know
>how it is "supposed to".

Clay, "supposed to" is easily answered: It is whatever the
True Believers believe. :-)

1840. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 22:24:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317172405.16055.00000077@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 37985

In article <20020317113720.07168.00001771@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net
>
>>The
>>Newington crowd and several members of the BoD went off on
>>their own.
>
>Headquarters staff is not permitted to set ARRL policy, Clay. The ARRL BoD is
>responsible for that. The staff in Newington carries out the directives of the
>Board.
>
>You keep getting hung up on this "Newington" thing. Does it somehow make your
>argument sound better to try to convince people that such decisions are not
>made by people from all areas of the country?

Please present third-party disinterested PROOF that the
ARRL (wherever it is located) decisions are made by
"people from all areas of the country."

So far, the only "proof" has come from the ARRL itself.

This is one of those "True Belief" things, isn't it?

>If you feel the majority of hams in your Division do not agree with ARRL's
>code-test policy positions, run for Division Director on that plank.

Is this one of those "belief" things again? As in "if you are not an
insider, shut up?"

Here's the self-defining mechanism of this "insider" business:

1. One cannot be a director without having a voting membership.
2. Voting membership is defined by the grant of an amateur
license.
3. The ARRL controls the voting process.
4. The ARRL controls announcement of "winners."

The basic flaw is that there is no way to ascertain that voting
went according to democratic principles. As a private
organization, the ARRL is NOT bound by the same laws that
apply to US government elected officials or legislative matters.
There is NO equivalent to the Federal Register or to any sort
of C-SPAN like recording of the happenings nor is there any
third-party observation of the process or of directors' meetings.

The second flaw is that the ARRL seeks to establish controling influence on federal regulations regarding amateur radio licensing...by those who are already licensed and, in most directors' cases, long-time licensees holding maximum-privilege license classes granted under old regulations.

By all the recorded history and empirical evidence of human behavior, those in control of some personal activity are likely to both retain that control and seek a continuation of their personal desires. All the apologia of "altruism" on the part of the controllers takes on the distinct flavor of plain rationalization if continually repeated by the controllers.

>If you must rant, rant accurately.

If you must act the apologist and rationalizer, please try for some originality. There are a great many skeptics out there who are not of the True Belief.

1841. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 22:24:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317172406.16055.00000078@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 37983

In article <20020317064258.15176.00001444@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>>Sampling is done all the time where 350 voters are sampled to find out what
>>>the entire voting population is thinking. There is always a margin of
>error.
>
>>You know that, I know that, major political parties know that, and
>>thousands involved in using polling results for decision-making
>>know that.
>
>Of course, you also know that ARRL doesn't represent Amateur Radio because
>the sample size is too small...

The ARRL says it "represents all of amateur radio."

Who am I to argue with Big Brother?

The demographics of the ARRL membership do not appear to fit
the entire US amateur radio licensees, either.

>It appears that you can tailor what you know to fit whatever point you are
>trying to make...

Are you in stitches over that remark? I'm not trying to cover
anyone's eyes with rationalization fabrications out of whole
cloth...or wool.

Skeptics ask questions. True Believers hate skeptics. Is this
one of those "true belief" things?

1842. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 22:24:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317172407.16055.00000079@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 37986

In article <20020317063412.15176.00001442@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>>I don't see two ham radios, Len. I have operated both above and below 30
>>>MHz, and my work has taken me above and below 30 MHz. My biggest >>>concern
this week is 70 cm.
>
>>So, Ed Hare is oblivious to the "Real Ham" definitions that have
>>floated around for years?
>
>I am not oblivious to them, Len. I just don't agree with them, nor do I think
>those that are "real hams" in the characterization that you use are a
>majority of hams. I am a bit curious as to why you do.

No, I disagree that you are "a bit curious." That's often a "polite" rewording of a rebuke in the making.

I have a life experience of exposure to a large number of radio amateurs, radio hobbyists, and electronics experimenters in addition to having completed (not quite) a career in the industry. Since I don't have an imprimateur or badge or title of anything in some Organization in/of/about ham radio in front of a number of organized events so my life experience represents a random sampling in many environments.

It's been my observation that approximately a third of all such "samples" represents the "Real Ham" variety wherein regulations should be frozen to the point of regulations as they were when those began their hobby. In addition, those "Real Hams" want a continuation of tradition and formalcy and rigid adherence to jargon and procedure "in the ham bands" (meaning the HF bands). They put their own particular accomplishments as "models" for others to emulate without regard for others. They resent the new, the different, and generally prefer to be "led" by other self-styled "Real Hams."

>>"My work" has taken me well below MF and on up to Ku band.
>
>Good for you. If you could ever set aside your resentment, there is much you
>could teach others.

I have no "resentment" your majesty. I don't have any warm regard for the "Real Ham" environment.

I don't have any warm regard for those who find comfort in a pseudo-military service concept of a hobby. Certainly not for those who wish to wrap themselves in patriotic bunting and proclaim their hobby activity as some self-enobling "national service." Citizenship doesn't need self-serving jingoism, titles, impressive "credentials" flaunted as if they were some divine gift. A hobby is a hobby. No more, no less.

I don't have any warm regard for those judgemental types who strut around and proclaim "this is what hams DO!" when it is really their own personal preference with a large amount of self-puffery. They abhor the individualist and experimenters who go beyond their own rigid codes of conduct and established procedure.

Yes, I suppose I could "teach" something about technology of electronics after a career in the industry and a longer period as a hobbyist. It's an interesting avocation as well as occupation. That isn't to say I'm "expert" or "exhalted" in any area...I'm not but it would appear that some experience might seem "rocket science" to those multi-credentialed hobbyists who cannot understand the basics of radio or electronics.

Long ago I and a few hundred thousand others have discovered that electrons aren't influenced at all by credentials, personal opinions, personal desires, threats or entreaties. Everyone obeys the laws of physics on electrons' terms. No exceptions. Totalitarian situation? You betcha, but that's how the universe goes down.

All the rest is a man-made construct whether its regulations or fraternal orders. Regulations are needed to keep order in the EM spectrum among the many and varied radio services. All the rest of it is an artificiality based largely on the straw piled up by long-ago first-timers, politics of one group vying for control against competitors, egos manifesting their nobility and righteousness in self-defined majesty, machismo running amok in a predominantly white male avocation proclaiming their "realness." :-)

"Resentment?" Hardly. Humor certainly. If electrons and EM waves had emotions they would be having a ball over the antics of "superior" humans with all those "credentials." :-)

Now you come on back after completing the summer school re-doing Psychology 101. I won't chide you for failing the first go-around.

1843. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 22:24:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317172410.16055.00000080@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 37988

In article <20020317063018.15176.00001441@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>>You're as wrong on that as you are about most things having to do with
>>>amateur radio. This kid did about twenty trips up and down the 70 foot
>>>tower just last Autumn lowering the 40m yagi, installing new guy wire
>>>and installing a Hazer tram system.
>
>>Where are the images of this athletic achievement? Some have
>>already seen the "achievements" from Africa. Somebody else
>>on that tower there... :-)
>
>If I didn't know better, I would think trying to discuss Africa is an attempt
>at misdirection. :-)

Call it what you will. That was a long-running thread originated a
long time ago by someone who tried to pull off an "I am the
expert here!" snow job and ran head-on into someone who had
already been doing HF comm before him.

>>>No, no, no, no. You only need to obtain a license in order to have many
>>>hams take your views much credence.
>
>>Nope. Heil's "credence claim" is only for Heil and even then he is only
>>using it as a reply device.
>
>I think Hans makes more use of his license than to reply to you on rrap.

? I'm sure Hans Brakob has other hobbies and he loves nature.
Fine by me. He likes to communicate by radio. Fine.

>>>You've blown smoke here for years without much in the way of support.
>
>>Nope. I gave up smoking some time ago. :-)
>
>Now, we DO know better. This is a blatant an attempt at misdirection as I
>have ever seen! :-)

How? Is smoking okay now?

You could just as well make the entreaty "Don't be controversial or
nobody in here will like you." Oh, boo-hoo.

>>>Who would go to a non-ham for advice about amateur radio.
>

>>Several have. I've tried to be obliging and have given them help
>>on their electronics knowledge. I don't know that any one of
>>them ever resented any of that help.
>
>Nor should they. Most of what I know about electronics technology came from
>the teachings of non-hams.

Most of what I've learned about civility, comportment, and standing
up for what I've believed in came from humans with NO certificates.

Most of what I've learned about ham came from butcher shops,
cook books, doing cooking myself, and eating. No pig ever
taught me anything about technology.

Read those two preceding sentences very carefully and try to find
insults on/of/about amateur radio. Odds are in my favor that
some idiot will be outraged and "reply" in fury.

You are also free to say "some of your best friends are <insert
minority group of choice>." There are also several other
standard phrases, almost boilerplate, that can be used to
comment. None of those apply either...

>Why would you be surprised to know that Amatuer Radio works on the same
>physical laws as the rest of the Universe? I don't think that most people
>would be surprised; I am surprised that you are.

Someone else made the snarly comment that no ham would
ever take advice of a non-ham. He may think that physical
laws are "different" for amateur radio as opposed to every
other radio. More likely he assumed that "everyone else"
had the same experiences and desires and personal
preferrences that he does.

>You cannot supply any proof that you never took and failed a ham exam, Len.
>I think it only fair that we hold you up to the same standards of proof that
>you demand of other posters.

You have it confused. Someone else made the charge that I've
"failed" obtaining an amateur radio license. HE must supply the
proof of a test failure. There's no record anywhere.

Who can prove a non-existant thing?

That person's statement DEMANDED an amateur certificate "to
have credibility." That's one of the incredible "requirements" which
is, as the French might say it, merde.

>It is a bit odd that someone would be interested enough in ham radio to have
>written articles in ham magazines and typed volumes of posts. Reasonable
>people will know that something is going on...

Well, then, you just work on this terrible "conspiracy" thing.

I have written about politics, national and local, without ever holding any political office or degree in politics. I have written about US foreign policy without any desire to work at the Department of State. I have written about civil aviation avionics but don't have a pilot's license. I have written about outer space but I've never been there. I have written about espionage without once having been a spy. I have written about electronics that hadn't been built or tested before they were actually built and tested. I have written about human behavior without having any degree in psychology. I have written about cats but cannot be one. I have properly directed the flow of electrons yet I am unable to sense one. I have operated a transmitter legally IN an allocated ham band yet I have never had an amateur radio license. Most done outside this newsgroup

By the "Hare-y" logic regulation given above, "reasonable" people might "know something else is going on." Pfui. Truly reasonable people will come to a proper conclusion that I've written a lot of words and expressed a number of thoughts over the last half century. If you don't like those words, don't read them. Nobody is forcing you to read.

>>Tsk, tsk, tsk...in trying to "get back" at me, you've now dishonored
>>Skip Tenney, the late Jim Fisk, Alf Wilson, Rich Rosen, Terry
>>Northrup and a number of staffers who were also licensed radio
>>amateurs!
>
>Now you are telling people that a simple statement of fact that Ham Radio is
>defunct dishonors those people. In doing so, you have added a lot of your
>words to what he said...

No, I was making a sarcastic statement about that other person's use. The word "defunct" is defined as "no longer existing; dead or extinct." The semicolon is a separator of two uses of the word. The implication that Heil clearly made was towards "dead or extinct." HR lives on in CD-ROM, the old HR Bookstore incorporated into CQ's.

You will try to rationalize your way out of that so I direct you to the porcine sentences I gave above. Words can be arranged to result in all sorts of reactions in readers.

>>No. Dr. Signal Freud is chafed and scratching, wants everyone
>>to tell him what a great big pro gubmint communicator. <shrug>
>
>Wasn't his name Sigmund? And why do you think Dr Freud is concerned with what
>is said on rrap? Freud has been dead for quite some time.

Signal Freud is a third cousin four times removed who once got hertzed, became partially psychotic, and joined a foreign service...and may have become intellectually dead in his powers of psychoanalysis. We aren't discussing the same

individual.

Try ebay for a sense of humor. I hear they sell all kinds of
things cheap...

>mortal. I am not a psychologist, so I can't really tell what that means, but
>reasonable adults can come to some sort of conclusion, I am sure.

Reasonable people can also come to the conclusion that you
are yanking mightily on chains. Those chains aren't attached
to me. Go back to the smoky mountains of apologia in ARRL
country. It better suits you.

1844. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 22:53:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317175323.23139.00000076@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 37989

In article <3C94E5CD.D4A9F51F@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Your insistence on oversimplification deosn't mean I have to accept them.
>
>I'm not asking you to accept them.

You keep ragging on me to accept your oversimpliications, Cecil.

> I'm asking you to allow me to live
>my life the way I see fit.

How am I stopping you from doing that?

>What is wrong with live and let live?

A question I asked you first.
>
>> Where have I "ragged on you"? All I do is point out that the world is more
>> complex than black and white.
>
>To me, it not more complex than black and white.

Then you are disconnected from reality. Sorry.

>> Then grant me the freedom to disagree with your oversimplifications.
>
>No, you are not free to try to change my lifestyle.

How is my disagreement "changing your lifestyle"?

>> Exactly. Why take fading as an absolute but phase distortion as "one in a
>> million"?
>
>I didn't say that, Jim.

You described W0EX's experience as a "one in a million"...
>
>> Fading was not reported to be an issue in the cited case.
>
>Fading was reported as an issue by the FCC in trying to copy manual code
>without the fifth harmonic being present. That was another cited case.

But not the case cited first.
>
>> Ah OK. Now I understand. What works is unimportant if it violates your
>boundary
>> conditions, which are only set after the fact.

>
>Ok, Jim, have it your way.

It's not just "my way" - it's reality.

>From now on, when someone says CW gets through
>when SSB fails, I will say, "Not when SSB is at 1000 watts and CW is at
>one watt."

And you may be mistaken.

>After all, if you don't believe in leveling the playing field
>when comparing modes, then you shouldn't object to unleveling all playing
>fields.

I don't object to "leveling the playing fields". I object to "leveling" them in such a way
that 0 wpm is supposed to be more than 12 wpm.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1845. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 23:19:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a738e1aei1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37990

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c94fe89_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> news:u99j6drdk1ej84@corp.supernews.com...
> > Let me clarify further:
> >
> > If a Ham organization has a membership consisting overwhelmingly
> > of people who have passed a code test, and code testing begins to
> > come under pressure, it seems to me that the job of the organization
> > is to find out, as closely as possible, where the membership stands,
> > in a very detailed and "beyond-any-doubt" manner. From what I have
> > read here I do not believe that there has been any actual "full-up"
effort
> > taken in many years to determine the actual position of a true majority
> > of the group, on code testing, and several other important issues.
>
> A membership organization is very similar to a trade-union organization.
It
> is not the job of the organization to "learn" what its membership desires.
> It is the responsibility of a dues-paying member to either a) have full
> trust in whatever decisions are made by their organization or, to b) be
sure
> to continuously advise the decision makers of their [the member's]
desires.

Good analogy.

> > That is, if it were my organization and such a hot topic was on the
> > table, I would actively and thoroughly contact the membership, by
> > e-mail, snail-mail, multiple-mode-mail, explaining the situation and
> > stating that at such and such a time a truly serious survey would be
> > taken, to which they were strongly, VERY strongly encouraged to
> > reply. The goal would be MUCH more than a 50 pecent response,
> > and to quite a bit more than just one simple "up-or-down" question.
>
> You speak as though you believe there is a "my" in the leadership of the
> ARRL? The ARRL is not an "I" organization. It is a "we" organization. I
> am confused, therefore, by your use of the "if it were my organization."
It
> is a matter of the ARRL leadership either being allowed to do as it
pleases
> (by a silent membership--as most trade-unions are I might add) or doing
> things at the will of a majority voice in the membership.

Agree.

> This is one of
> the shortcomings of being a member in the ARRL--there are not enough
> "outspoken" members to contribute to the will and direction of the ARRL.

Such is the plight or the reality of almost any organization.
There is but 10-15% of the membership that takes on any
interest level beyond getting the monthly newsletter. Fewer
still that get involved as leaders. In contrast, there's always
a subset of complainers who never offer a constructive
word or advice and/or offer to help. I learned as president
of a national antique car club that the best thing to do was
listen with a friendly ear and then keep doing what I thought
was best. I also learned the fastest way to shut someone
up was to tell that person..."Hey, you have a point there, how
about you leading a committee to investigate further and get
back to us in a couple of months." Boy does that silence
the loudmouths who can only critisize.

> The result, then, is an organization that moves at the will of a few in
the
> leadership.

Been that way in every organization I've been in. Car clubs,
Boy Scouts, church groups, etc.

> However, I might add that let the ARRL make a decision that
> would really upset a lot of members and they would certainly
> hear about it.

Another factoid... If no one is complaining, then everyone is
relatively happy. If a handful of people are complaining...BUT no
one is saying good job...you can still be certain that MOST people
are relatively happy. If the membership rises up en mass...then
you got unhappy members. Sadly, few people take the time to say
"well done" while in contrast, someone "ticked off" will write or
complain in a heart beat.

> Therefore, due diligence dictates that the leadership understand their
> boundaries, limitations, and even understand what the majority of
> "active" (read: those who care) members would really want.

Agree.

> > Isn't it true that no such thing has been done in many years?
>
> I don't think I have ever been asked anything by the ARRL, as far as
> opinion.

As noted in other emails. There WAS a survey about 1996.
Some (Jim N2EY) believe the methodology was flawed.
Notwithstanding that point, that's one that comes to mond.

<SNIP of CC&R opinion reference>

> > No doubt this would be expensive but, hey, this is IMPORTANT, is
> > it not? Once again, I find the lack of precise information here more
> > than a bit disturbing.
>
> I don't think it's disturbing at all.

Nor do I. It is more just "business as usual".

> If you are an ARRL member and, if
> something is that important to you, urge the ARRL leadership to
> "go your way."

Speak now or forever hold your peace.

> Another more worthwhile effort, in my opinion,
> is to be a voice for getting more members and for getting more
> members to actively get involved in the ARRL's position.

Agree.

> That becomes rather unpopular, but it's
> politics--so who cares?

Why should it be unpopular...unless in the doing you get
in other people's face...i.e. a bit of overdoing it.

> > I know I'm an outsider and currently belong now to no amateur
> > organization. But I will (I hope) soon!
> >
> > Am I just wrong about the above?
>
> You can belong right now, to the ARRL--although your membership (if you
are
> not a radio amateur) is a "voiceless" one in that you have no voting power
> in the ARRL.

That only impacts actual voting. Val could certainly voice
his opinion to ARRL leadership. Indeed, there is on
occasion letters/correspondence reported via QST from both
full members and "associate" members.

> ..Ed, correct me if I am wrong on that. However, you may at any
> time write directly to the FCC, your congressperson, etc.

Yep, God Bless America, land of the free!

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1846. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 23:22:30 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a738jhulp1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37991

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C94F252.6F316B79@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Valentine Germann wrote:
> > > ... I do not believe that there has been any actual "full-up" effort
> > > taken in many years to determine the actual position of a true
majority
> > > of the group, on code testing, and several other important issues.
> >
> > The ARRL did a survey a number of years ago. Approximately 2/3 of the
> > respondees used CW "rarely" or "never", if I remember the survey words
> > correctly. The other 1/3 said they "often" use CW. Many of the hams
> > who answered "often" also "voted" to end the Morse code requirement.
> > I wonder if the results of that survey are published anywhere on the
> > web so you could take a look.
>
> This sure is a fuzzy answer for a "black and white" logic
> purist.;-) If "Many" means most, say 2/3, then 2/3 of 1/3 =
> 2/9 of those responding. So does 2/9 carry the day?
> Are you responding to the question about a "full-up" effort
> by your recollections of this survey?
>
> Since Morse testing was only required for HF operations, why
> not survey the HF operators?

Oh, I get it now. If you can't get a majority of licensed hams
to support continued morse testing requirements,
then narrow the field of eligibility of those that should count to
only HF licensed hams. Sheesh...where will it end?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1847. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 23:24:36 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a738ng$tu2$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37992

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C950E7F.4FEDBB8F@IEEE.org...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > CAM wrote:
>
> > The surveys were sent to 1100 ARRL members and a similar number of
nonmembers.
> > Only licensed US hams were surveyed, and the surveys were sent to 200
Extras,
> > 200 Advanceds, 200 Generals, 200 Tech Pluses, 200 Techs and 100
Novices - even
> > though the number of hams in each class is not distributed so equally.
>
> Didn't all members of the ARRL receive that survey in their QST's?

Yes.

> > > Approximately 2/3 of the
> > >respondees used CW "rarely" or "never", if I remember the survey words
> > >correctly. The other 1/3 said they "often" use CW.
> >
> > Nope.
> >
> > There was one question about how often the respondent actually used CW.
There
> > were 3 choices: "Never", "Rarely", "Regularly". About 1/3 (plus or
minus) chose
> > each.
>
> Assuming "regularly" means "often", my statement was accurate.

Logically that is correct.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1848. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 23:30:14 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a73922bdk1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37993

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C9505E8.2DA9954D@worldnet.att.net...
> As someone has pointed out, the last survey was 1975 and it
> was clear (to me but not to some others by some twisted
> reasoning) that the majority of the membership of the ARRL
> at that time wanted to keep the code testing. Unfortunately
> the survey did not ask the right questions to make the
> results and conclusions unmistakeably clear.

Assuming they were clear. Of what value today is a
survey from 1975?

> If there were
> other surveys "to the point" since then I am not aware.

1996...depending on your personal opinion of the
methodology and the questions asked...see other posts
by Jim N2EY.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1849. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 23:36:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C952877.DF5F0B3D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37994

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

> You keep ragging on me to accept your oversimpliications, Cecil.

I'm not asking you to accept them for you, Jim. I am asking you to
accept that I function that way, in my life. That's the choice I made.
If the nocode Tech license had never existed, the ham population would
either have declined or it wouldn't have. That's black and white. I
believe it would have declined. There are only two real possibilities,
decline or not.

> How am I stopping you from doing that?

You're trying to talk me into a more complex pattern of thought.

> >What is wrong with live and let live?

> A question I asked you first.

I've been asking that question for 15 years. Why are you trying to
change my thinking patterns that I have developed over 64 years?

> >To me, it not more complex than black and white.

> Then you are disconnected from reality. Sorry.

It has worked for me for 64 years. Sorry. We each make our own reality.
What other possibility is there besides the ham population declining
or not declining? I can't think of any.

> How is my disagreement "changing your lifestyle"?

What are you trying to accomplish except to try to get me to change my
thought patterns to match your more complex ones?

> You described W0EX's experience as a "one in a million"...

Well, exactly how many Homo sapiens have copied the CW ID of PSK31
when PSK31 couldn't be copied? And the problem may have been in the
way Dick mistuned the PSK31 signal. Since the same equipment was
not being used for each reception, the validity of the observation
is of limited utility. I'll bet my IC-756pro with ClearSpeechï¿½
receives SSB better than my 38-special receives CW.

Here's another example: I can raise a PACTOR II mailbox when I cannot
even hear the PACTOR II signal or any CW signals. I have the volume
control turned all the way down. Is that a reasonable comparison?

> But not the case cited first.

The case cited first was the creation of the heavens and the earth.
What difference does it make which case was cited first?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1850. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 23:38:32 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a739hnntb1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37995

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020317172405.16055.00000077@mb-bh.aol.com...
> In article <20020317113720.07168.00001771@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
(W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net
> >
> >>The
> >>Newington crowd and several members of the BoD went off on
> >>their own.
> >
> >Headquarters staff is not permitted to set ARRL policy, Clay. The ARRL
BoD is
> >responsible for that. The staff in Newington carries out the directives
of the
> >Board.
> >
> >You keep getting hung up on this "Newington" thing. Does it somehow make
your
> >argument sound better to try to convince people that such decisions are
not
> >made by people from all areas of the country?
>
> Please present third-party disinterested PROOF that the
> ARRL (wherever it is located) decisions are made by
> "people from all areas of the country."
>
> So far, the only "proof" has come from the ARRL itself.

Len,
Simple but serious question...
Do you NOT believe the published meeting minutes of
the ARRL Board?

> >If you feel the majority of hams in your Division do not agree with
ARRL's
> >code-test policy positions, run for Division Director on that plank.
>
> Is this one of those "belief" things again? As in "if you are not an
> insider, shut up?"

Should every volunteer organization be subject to
some outside "third party" audit to satisfy people
who are NOT members? If yes, WHY?

> Here's the self-defining mechanism of this "insider" business:
>
> 1. One cannot be a director without having a voting membership.
> 2. Voting membership is defined by the grant of an amateur
> license.
> 3. The ARRL controls the voting process.
> 4. The ARRL controls announcement of "winners."
>
> The basic flaw is that there is no way to ascertain that voting
> went according to democratic principles. As a private
> organization, the ARRL is NOT bound by the same laws that
> apply to US government elected officials or legislative matters.

NOR is any other private organization. Why is that so
hard for you (Len) to understand.?

> There is NO equivalent to the Federal Register or to any sort
> of C-SPAN like recording of the happenings nor is there any
> third-party observation of the process or of directors' meetings.

Ditto my last.

> The second flaw is that the ARRL seeks to establish controling
> influence on federal regulations regarding amateur radio
> licensing...by those who are already licensed and, in most
> directors' cases, long-time licensees holding maximum-
> privilege license classes granted under old regulations.

So? Is that effort in any aspect illegal? Does the Detroit
auto industry not pursue similar efforts to influence
legislation favorable to its own end?

> By all the recorded history and empirical evidence of human
> behavior, those in control of some personal activity are
> likely to both retain that control and seek a continuation of
> their personal desires.

Human nature...nothing new there.

> All the apologia of "altruism" on the
> part of the controllers takes on the distinct flavor of plain
> rationalization if continually repeated by the controllers.

Unhappy about that? Start your own game.

> >If you must rant, rant accurately.
>
> If you must act the apologist and rationalizer, please try for
> some originality. There are a great many skeptics out there
> who are not of the True Belief.

YOU keep talking of skeptics but offer none other
than your own self.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1851. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 23:47:52 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a73a33$3u0$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37996

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C94EFEB.4B452C0B@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > Are you saying that the 5 wpm test has been wrong for
> > all these decades? 5 wpm has been a fixed staple of the
> > test requirements since the 1950s. Seems it was good enough
> > for 1/2 a century for the FCC.
>
> Your question and answer about 5 wpm shows you may have been
> less than experienced with HF morse operation. The 5 wpm
> was the entry level just to allow one to get a CW Keyed rig
> on the air in the novice subbands to begin to get ones speed
> up to a "minimum" level suitable for operation in the larger
> portions of spectrum outside the novice subbands.

Not true...since 5 wpm has been a permanent license requirement
for techs.

> 5 wpm was
> for entry level novices.

And still was until 4/2000.

> Historically, 5 wpm was never
> intended to be an on-going minimum.

It only lasted on that basis for about 10 years. Sometime
in the 60s it became permanent (since Novice license
became renewable) and may have been even before
that for Techs who where allowed on HF novice segments.

> Historically, it took
> 10 to 13 wpm to be introduced to general use in the
> international arena of code not only amateur, but ship to
> ship, ship to shore, and other commercial use.

Are you saying novices and techs couldn't/wouldn't
operate internationally? As for ship-to-ship-shore
or commercial...who cares...that's not amateur and
even so, all that has ended.

> 13 wpm was
> judged by many to be the minimum operating speed where one
> could say one had developed the ear/wetware modem
> coordination required for proper utilization of CW Morse.

And that means what TODAY? And to whom is it of any
importance?

> Of course now these facts will all be declared fabrications,
> and mythology by NCIists, ARRL Zombies, etc., in order to
> justify their beliefs and actions. Isn't it funny how
> historical revisionism works?

No revisions needed. There indeed was a Once upon a time...
No one denies that morse had a valid reason for being if you
go back in time...BUT the times they are a change in...

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1852. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-17 23:55:28 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a73ant$g59$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37997

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020317163244.06313.00001438@mb-mo.news.cs.com...
> >Well over 2000 individuals and organizations commented. I did, and I know
> >K2UNK
> >did. Did you?
> >
> >On the code test issue, a count of the comments showed that a slim
majority
> >(54%?) wanted code
> >testing to remain. Also, a slightly smaller majority wanted two or more
test
> >speeds. Almost nobody wanted
> >5 wpm only.
> >
> >But the FCC ignored that majority and went to 5 wpm, with clear
indication
> >that
> >if/when the treaty requirement
> >is dropped, they will drop all code testing.
>
> Sounds like it's time to write some elected representatives and ask how
one of
> this country's founding principles can be so easily ignored.

No principle's were ignored. The FCC is charged with
doing what is best for the public good. The FCC is
not charged (as any aspect of founding principles) to
follow a path passed solely on a count of the comments
pro/con on any particular issue.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1853. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 00:43:16 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020317194316.17544.00001742@mb-mm.news.cs.com>
Source record: 37998

>> >But the FCC ignored that majority and went to 5 wpm, with clear
>indication
>> >that
>> >if/when the treaty requirement
>> >is dropped, they will drop all code testing.
>>
>> Sounds like it's time to write some elected representatives and ask how
>one of
>> this country's founding principles can be so easily ignored.
>
>No principle's were ignored. The FCC is charged with
>doing what is best for the public good. The FCC is
>not charged (as any aspect of founding principles) to
>follow a path passed solely on a count of the comments
>pro/con on any particular issue.

1. The FCC isn't always correct.

2. Can't hurt to try.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

1854. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 01:04:03 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9ae72c22bna7a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37999

N2EY wrote, concerning an ARRL survey taken in 1996:

>There was one question about how often the respondent actually
>used CW. There were 3 choices: "Never", "Rarely", "Regularly".

Ooooops!

Folks, this looks strongly like a question taken from a "survey" that was designed to go where the conductor of the survey secretly (or not so secretly) wanted to go!

That is, show THIS question to any REAL pollster and then ask about it's, er, ah, scientific usefulness!

Val

1855. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 01:09:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317200954.23139.00000082@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 37801

In article <Gy8l8.15128$tP2.1315934@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020317163537.04214.00000049@mb-mr.aol.com...
>> In article <a72obneto1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >Are you saying that the 5 wpm test has been wrong for
>> >all these decades?
>>
>> Actually, I think it was a mistake. Hindsight is 20-20, of course, and
>it's
>> really a moot point now.
>>
>> By making the lowest test speed 5 wpm, the myth was created that the way
>to
>> learn code was to start off at that speed and work up to 13 or 20 wpm,
>rather
>> than starting off at 13-15 wpm. The trouble is that many methods used to
>learn
>> 5 wpm induce bad habits, which then must be unlearned. The work of Koch
>> (published in 1936) showed better ways to learn the code, but were
>largely
>> ignored in this country for decades.
>>
>> >5 wpm has been a fixed staple of the
>> >test requirements since the 1950s. Seems it was good enough
>> >for 1/2 a century for the FCC.
>>
>> For minimal HF privileges, yes. For full privileges, 13 wpm was required
>for 17
>> of the past 51 years, and 20 wpm for 31 of the past 51 years.
>>
>> The total elimination of code testing may actually be a good thing for
>code USE
>> because it may allow better methods of learning to come to the fore.
>>
>> Check out:
>>
>> http://www.qsl.net/n9bor/n0hff.htm
>>
>> for an excellent free online book on the subject.
>>

>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Might you as well have come to the conclusion that Morse was never the
>real issue to begin with?

I think that for a long time Morse was the issue. At least into the 1960-70s, Morse was in wide use in both the US military and commercial services. Particularly the seagoing folks.

There was also the "Sputnik effect" .

Here's a theory for you:

Since the early 1970s, the FCC has had a tiger by the tail in the form of pirate/freeband folks. Perhaps FCC thinks that making ham licenses easier to get will induce these folks to be licensed, therefore making them easier to control.

That may sound "out in left field" at first, but look at FCC's actions since 1976 or so.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1856. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 01:09:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020317200955.23139.00000083@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 37802

In article <3C950E7F.4FEDBB8F@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> CAM wrote:
>
>> The surveys were sent to 1100 ARRL members and a similar number of
>nonmembers.
>> Only licensed US hams were surveyed, and the surveys were sent to 200
>Extras,
>> 200 Advanceds, 200 Generals, 200 Tech Pluses, 200 Techs and 100 Novices -
>even
>> though the number of hams in each class is not distributed so equally.
>
>Didn't all members of the ARRL receive that survey in their QST's?

Sure. I copied it and sent it in, along with comments. But those who did so
were
not part of the official survey, and their responses were not included in the
tabulation.
>
>> > Approximately 2/3 of the
>> >respondees used CW "rarely" or "never", if I remember the survey words
>> >correctly. The other 1/3 said they "often" use CW.
>>
>> Nope.
>>
>> There was one question about how often the respondent actually used CW.
>There
>> were 3 choices: "Never", "Rarely", "Regularly". About 1/3 (plus or minus)
>chose
>> each.
>
>Assuming "regularly" means "often", my statement was accurate.

I don't accept that assumption.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1857. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 01:20:39 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9af5varfke737@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38000

Bill Sohl wrote:

>No principle's were ignored. The FCC is charged with
>doing what is best for the public good. The FCC is
>not charged (as any aspect of founding principles) to
>follow a path passed solely on a count of the comments
>pro/con on any particular issue.

I hardly think this issue has anything to do with the
"public good" as that expression is commonly understood.
It's purely an internal (to the ARS) matter. And based on the
atttudes toward government, and government regulation,
commonly displayed by those opposing code testing, I rather
imagine that if the FCC were suddenly to reverse course about
code testing, we'd VERY soon be hearing very LITTLE about
how the agency is NOT to take into consideration the positions of
those being regulated! Indeed, if such a thing should take place
I think those opposing code testing would be VERY hard pressed
to believe that such an attitude on the part of the FCC would in
ANY way be coincident with ANY public good at ALL! :-)

Val

1858. Re: FA: McKay Dymek AM7 TUNER - AM / Long Wave Tuner

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 02:03:14 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C954AEE.76DC8C19@adelphia.net>
Source record: 37803

Man, are you in the wrong neighborhood!

- Mike -

Daniel Simpson wrote:
>
> FA: McKay Dymek AM7 TUNER - AM / Long Wave Tuner.
>
> A AM7 tuner is basically a AM5 with the addition of the Long Wave Band.
> Used in Europe. That you can receive along the east and west coast of
> the US. (See Information Below)

<snip>

1859. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 02:23:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C954F95.2BC74E2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 37804

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20020317063018.15176.00001441@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >
> >>>You're as wrong on that as you are about most things having to do with
> >>>amateur radio. This kid did about twenty trips up and down the 70 foot
> >>>tower just last Autumn lowering the 40m yagi, installing new guy wire
> >>>and installing a Hazer tram system.
> >
> >>Where are the images of this athletic achievement? Some have
> >>already seen the "achievements" from Africa. Somebody else
> >>on that tower there... :-)
> >
> >If I didn't know better, I would think trying to discuss Africa is an attempt
> >at misdirection. :-)
>
> Call it what you will. That was a long-running thread originated a
> long time ago by someone who tried to pull off an "I am the
> expert here!" snow job and ran head-on into someone who had
> already been doing HF comm before him.

Fess up, Len. Nobody pulled any "I am the expert" routine here except
for you and perhaps Carl. You made a claim and were called on it. The
fact that you've been involved with HF communications before me will,
according to actuarial tables, even out. Just think, Len--if you obtain
an amateur license, I'll have a 38 year head start on you.

> You could just as well make the entreaty "Don't be controversial or
> nobody in here will like you." Oh, boo-hoo.

This is one time that YOU can make the claim, "been there; done that;
got the T-shirt".

> >>>Who would go to a non-ham for advice about amateur radio.
> >
> >>Several have. I've tried to be obliging and have given them help
> >>on their electronics knowledge. I don't know that any one of
> >>them ever resented any of that help.
> >
> >Nor should they. Most of what I know about electronics technology came from
> >the teachings of non-hams.
>

> Most of what I've learned about civility, comportment, and standing
> up for what I've believed in came from humans with NO certificates.

Maybe you should have gone to accredited schools. I'm sure the results
would have been better.

> Most of what I've learned about ham came from butcher shops,
> cook books, doing cooking myself, and eating. No pig ever
> taught me anything about technology.

Tell me, Len, just how did you go about cooking yourself?

> >Why would you be surprised to know that Amatuer Radio works on the same
> >physical laws as the rest of the Universe? I don't think that most people
> >would be surprised; I am surprised that you are.
>
> Someone else made the snarly comment that no ham would
> ever take advice of a non-ham. He may think that physical
> laws are "different" for amateur radio as opposed to every
> other radio. More likely he assumed that "everyone else"
> had the same experiences and desires and personal
> preferrences that he does.

Amateur radio does not consist solely of radio theory.

> >You cannot supply any proof that you never took and failed a ham exam, Len.
> >I think it only fair that we hold you up to the same standards of proof that
> >you demand of other posters.
>
> You have it confused. Someone else made the charge that I've
> "failed" obtaining an amateur radio license. HE must supply the
> proof of a test failure. There's no record anywhere.

Actually, failing to obtain an amateur license is not the same as
failing the exam. If someone fails to meet his goals, he does not fail
an exam.

> Who can prove a non-existant thing?

...or even a non-existent thing (mater, mater, mater).

> That person's statement DEMANDED an amateur certificate "to
> have credibility." That's one of the incredible "requirements" which
> is, as the French might say it, merde.

I've never DEMANDED anything of you at any time, Len. That'd make your
statement merde de bull.

> >It is a bit odd that someone would be interested enough in ham radio to have
> >written articles in ham magazines and typed volumes of posts. Reasonable
> >people will know that something is going on...
>
> Well, then, you just work on this terrible "conspiracy" thing.
>

> I have written about politics, national and local, without ever
> holding any political office or degree in politics. I have written
> about US foreign policy without any desire to work at the
> Department of State. I have written about civil aviation
> avionics but don't have a pilot's license. I have written about
> outer space but I've never been there. I have written about
> espionage without once having been a spy. I have written
> about electronics that hadn't been built or tested before they
> were actually built and tested. I have written about human
> behavior without having any degree in psychology. I have
> written about cats but cannot be one. I have properly
> directed the flow of electrons yet I am unable to sense one.
> I have operated a transmitter legally IN an allocated ham
> band yet I have never had an amateur radio license. Most
> done outside this newsgroup

Gee, you've written about a lot of other things you've never been or
done. That makes your frequent spiels here much easier to understand.
Writing on something is not an indicator of expertise in a subject.
By the way, was most of your other stuff fiction?

> By the "Hare-y" logic regulation given above, "reasonable"
> people might "know something else is going on." Pfui.
> Truly reasonable people will come to a proper conclusion
> that I've written a lot of words and expressed a number of
> thoughts over the last half century. If you don't like those
> words, don't read them. Nobody is forcing you to read.

Yep, Len. You've apparently got an opinion on most everything whether
you know anything about it or not.

Let's try another game. Let's go ahead and read your material and then
feel ourselves free to dismiss them as bunk.

> >>Tsk, tsk, tsk...in trying to "get back" at me, you've now dishonored
> >>Skip Tenney, the late Jim Fisk, Alf Wilson, Rich Rosen, Terry
> >>Northrup and a number of staffers who were also licensed radio
> >>amateurs!
> >
> >Now you are telling people that a simple statement of fact that Ham Radio is
> >defunct dishonors those people. In doing so, you have added a lot of your
> >words to what he said...
>
> No, I was making a sarcastic statement about that other person's
> use. The word "defunct" is defined as "no longer existing; dead or
> extinct." The semicolon is a separator of two uses of the word.
> The implication that Heil clearly made was towards "dead or
> extinct." HR lives on in CD-ROM, the old HR Bookstore
> incorporated into CQ's.

Len, "Ham Radio" magazine does not exist. Living on in CD-ROM or in
dusty bookshelves isn't the same as publishing a new issue each month.

"Ham Radio" only lives in the same sense that Walt Disney lives. He, by the way, is also defunct, dead, has ceased being. That statement of fact does not dishonor Walt or the other dead.

> You will try to rationalize your way out of that so I direct you to
> the porcine sentences I gave above. Words can be arranged to
> result in all sorts of reactions in readers.

They certainly can. I especially liked that part where you cooked yourself.

Dave K8MN

1860. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 03:17:58 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c96ae1f_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 37892

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020317230711.04235.00000195@mb-fo.aol.com...
> In article <u99b601shvs146@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
> <vgermann@socket.net> writes:
>
> >
> > >Val Germann
> > >Columbia, Missouri
> > >(I'll be taking the Tech test Monday next!)
>
> Val:
>
> Is that anything like "next Monday?" The only people who say "Monday
next"
> are people doing an imitation of upper-crust British homosexuals. Anyone
in
> America who says that just wishes he was one. Perhaps (notice I didn't
say
> "methinks?") you've seen one too many episodes of "Masterpiece Theatre."
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

Your ignorance is showing again, Larry. Expressions such as "Monday next"
are used quite a bit down here in the South.

Kim W5TIT

1861. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 03:21:46 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c96af0c_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 37893

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020318072114.29962.00001873@mb-cq.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > but you have
> >> accused me of being a mind reader so many times that I now take your
words
> >> literally and respond only to them.
> >
> > It isn't so, Ed and it is clear to readers. You have consistently
misstated
> >my
> >posts and attributed things to me I didn't say. Looks like you insert
what
> >you
> >WISH I had said so you can criticize it.
>
> Rather than either of us having to go back and do a google search to see
what
> you said and what I said you said, let's do this. If I do what you say I
do,
> say so in your reply post. We can then keep track of what percentage of
the
> posts I make about what you say you believe mis-state what you said.
>
> Sound fair?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

All I can say is thank goodness there are other people who see "searching"
old posts as a terrible waste of time...LOL

Kim W5TIT

1862. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 03:22:50 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c96af43_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 37894

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020318073223.29962.00001876@mb-cq.aol.com...
> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >Is that anything like "next Monday?" The only people who say "Monday
next"
> >are people doing an imitation of upper-crust British homosexuals.
Anyone in
> >
> >America who says that just wishes he was one.
>
> As I said, Larry is stirring the pot.
>
> It is unfortunate that apparently all he has left to say amounts to peeing
in
> the sandbox.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

'S all he's got. 'S all he ever had...

Kim W5TIT

1863. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 03:24:34 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c96afaa_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 37895

A Hearty WELCOME, Valentine! You'll enjoy, I'm sure!

Kim W5TIT

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9darbppq9om73@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all!
>
> Well, I ** did ** pass the Technician test this evening,
> with 100 percent. I was in competition with another
> fellow (we're both long-time members of the local
> astronomy club) and he got 100 percent as well. If
> I had missed one, well, I never would have heard the
> end of it, just because . . .
>
> We both took the test seriously and studied hard.
>
> My neighbor down the street, the guy who started me
> down this road, took my dues for the local club last
> week and they voted me in a few days ago, on his
> word that I would pass. So, the heat was REALLY on!
>
> I'm very happy to at last be a ham and have already
> started on the General book and the CW. Also, the
> amateur satellite programs have a lot of interest for
> me, particularly because I give fifteen to twenty
> programs per year on astronomy, about half of them
> to schools. Now, I can have a radio component in
> those programs!
>
> Val Germann
> Columbia, Missouri
> (waiting for a call sign on the QRZ site!)
>
> **
>
>
>
>

1864. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 03:29:05 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a73n3deja1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37805

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020317194316.17544.00001742@mb-mm.news.cs.com...
> >> >But the FCC ignored that majority and went to 5 wpm, with clear
> >indication
> >> >that
> >> >if/when the treaty requirement
> >> >is dropped, they will drop all code testing.
> >>
> >> Sounds like it's time to write some elected representatives and ask
how
> >one of
> >> this country's founding principles can be so easily ignored.
> >
> >No principle's were ignored. The FCC is charged with
> >doing what is best for the public good. The FCC is
> >not charged (as any aspect of founding principles) to
> >follow a path passed solely on a count of the comments
> >pro/con on any particular issue.
>
> 1. The FCC isn't always correct.

Fair enough...Tell us then nn what point(s) have they been wrong?

> 2. Can't hurt to try.

It's a free country.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1865. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 03:40:22 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a73oq4rrc1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37806

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9af5varfke737@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >No principle's were ignored. The FCC is charged with
> >doing what is best for the public good. The FCC is
> >not charged (as any aspect of founding principles) to
> >follow a path passed solely on a count of the comments
> >pro/con on any particular issue.
>
> I hardly think this issue has anything to do with the
> "public good" as that expression is commonly understood.
> It's purely an internal (to the ARS) matter.

The amateur radio service IS a public matter.

> And based on the
> atttudes toward government, and government regulation,
> commonly displayed by those opposing code testing,

Huh? Exactly where have we (those that oppose code
testing) displayed any attitude "against" gov't, gov't regulation)?

> I rather
> imagine that if the FCC were suddenly to reverse course about
> code testing, we'd VERY soon be hearing very LITTLE about
> how the agency is NOT to take into consideration the positions of
> those being regulated!

While a "turnaround" would not make me happy,
you are misguided if you think we would abondon
the reasoning used so far. Such a "turnaround"
would be most difficult to justify given the public
record and reasoning so far.

> Indeed, if such a thing should take place
> I think those opposing code testing would be VERY hard pressed
> to believe that such an attitude on the part of the FCC would in
> ANY way be coincident with ANY public good at ALL! :-)

You have offered NO reason for any "turnaround".

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1866. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 04:03:56 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MGdl8.18065$Ex5.1614940@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37807

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020317200954.23139.00000082@mb-ct.aol.com...
> In article <Gy8l8.15128$tP2.1315934@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020317163537.04214.00000049@mb-mr.aol.com...
> >> In article <a72obneto1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >Are you saying that the 5 wpm test has been wrong for
> >> >all these decades?
> >>
> >> Actually, I think it was a mistake. Hindsight is 20-20, of course,
and
> >it's
> >> really a moot point now.
> >>
> >> By making the lowest test speed 5 wpm, the myth was created that the
way
> >to
> >> learn code was to start off at that speed and work up to 13 or 20
wpm,
> >rather
> >> than starting off at 13-15 wpm. The trouble is that many methods used
to
> >learn
> >> 5 wpm induce bad habits, which then must be unlearned. The work of
Koch
> >> (published in 1936) showed better ways to learn the code, but were
> >largely
> >> ignored in this country for decades.
> >>
> >> >5 wpm has been a fixed staple of the
> >> >test requirements since the 1950s. Seems it was good enough
> >> >for 1/2 a century for the FCC.
> >>
> >> For minimal HF privileges, yes. For full privileges, 13 wpm was
required
> >for 17
> >> of the past 51 years, and 20 wpm for 31 of the past 51 years.
> >>
> >> The total elimination of code testing may actually be a good thing
for

> >code USE
> >> because it may allow better methods of learning to come to the fore.
> >>
> >> Check out:
> >>
> >> http://www.qsl.net/n9bor/n0hff.htm
> >>
> >> for an excellent free online book on the subject.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >Might you as well have come to the conclusion that Morse was never the
> >real issue to begin with?
>
> I think that for a long time Morse was the issue. At least into the
1960-70s,
> Morse was in wide use in both the US military and commercial services.
> Particularly the seagoing folks.
>
> There was also the "Sputnik effect" .
>
> Here's a theory for you:
>
> Since the early 1970s, the FCC has had a tiger by the tail in the form
of
> pirate/freeband folks. Perhaps FCC thinks that making ham licenses
easier to
> get will induce these folks to be licensed, therefore making them easier
to
> control.
>
> That may sound "out in left field" at first, but look at FCC's actions
since
> 1976 or so.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

You been reading my old posts??? The great unanswered question in a lot of this is what is expected of the ARS by the FCC (love those TLA's). Certainly in the Cold War/ Sputnik era we were expected to provide a pool of CW ops; I was hustled by NSA and was not licensed at the time having let them lapse for the Nam. Not wanting to spend much time in a tin shack in Alaska copying Russian fishing boats into a Cyrillic typewriter at 12 wpm, I graciously told them to take a hike.

Since then piracy has indeed become a problem more on Marine freqs really than CB; there has been a group of bootleggers in the Air freqs below 40 meters since WW2. The broadcast pirates below 40 have better programming than the local Clear Channel Communications outlet (or K1MAN for that matter) so there are those who are for letting them do it. It does indeed appear the Commission is all for filling HF before the pirates do. They

assign US SWB to Fixed Freqs outside the normal SW bands which have themselves been expanding and of course there is the small matter of 60 meters. One wonders if Gene Scott's mission in life is to occupy the military and NASA freqs until they are needed; KAIJ has been on an oddessy as has Brother Stair on WWCR. And some of the 26 MHz studio-transmitter links program reggae to keep their freq from being freebanded. Not half bad actually.

CB is an interesting mess because of the cast of characters which really needs to be sorted out to make any sense out of it. You have the legal band/idiotic power level folks on Channel 6 that sounds like the low end of 20 in the AM days and assorted channel masters and headcases. You have SSB freebanders who are by and large pretty civilized and have flowed into the ARS forever without incident. Then you have the AMers who are by and large scum. It reminds you of Mississippi: anyone with intelligence or ambition left years ago leaving some pretty fragrant garbage including a certain minority leader and federal judge. The truckers who are our nemesis on ten are more refugees than combatants just looking for a home. And there are a pretty fair number of Techs who freeband in preference to taking a code test when the spots are up and as they have someone to shoot DX to, one would assume this is pretty worldwide.

So yes, the code test stands in the way of making honest HF amateurs out of the great unwashed to be led in righteous paths by an examination ritual of more form than substance and by us OTs thru the Dudley Doright Effect -- fine non-fingernail biting gentlemen that we are. It is sure consistent with previous actions inside and outside the Amateur Service, not the least of which is opening 10 meters to anyone who can pass a code test.

It is a pretty fair bet that code testing will disappear if possible for precisely the reasons you state so quickly the doors of the FCC will be sucked shut by the venturi effect of all the rushing around.

But I question again whether the issue at 5wpm is the Code or the simple requirement to actually DO something no matter how trivial as part of the process. I have come to believe it is the latter. It could be doing a box-step to the Wienerschnizel Waltz for 15 seconds and we'd have No Waltz International in a heartbeat with the same old horseshit and anti-personnel barrage.

If indeed this is the case then we can expect it to be a giant marketing game where instead of the standard 5 rigs before putting the last CB into the garage, we go thru a few transceivers with AM grafted on before letting the ticket expire and people cycling thru radio like the visitors to Lenin's tomb. And it actually will not stop most piracy.

It will sell some gear in the short run and it will reward some people although not the NCI poobahs who having served their purpose will more than likely get stabbed in the back. As Stalin put it, you can't make an omelet without breaking eggs. I note one of them in an appropriate speech with all sorts of martial struggles etc is resigning to let someone else

lead the the inevitable victory, yada yada yada; he probably noted the purchase order for whetstones.

So yes, I think the major function of the ARS in Washington is indeed to be a weapon against piracy. I also think it will fail miserably.

Dick N&#65533;BK

1867. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 04:07:10 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020317230710.04235.00000194@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 37809

In article <20020317163537.04214.00000049@mb-mr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>
>The total elimination of code testing may actually be a good thing for code
>USE because it may allow better methods of learning to come to the fore.

Jim:

Do you really actually *believe* that nonsense, or are you just parroting a bunch of mealy-mouthed, politically-correct nonsense so nobody in your local radio club will hate you?

When the code testing requirements are zeroed-out, then code use will be on it's way out as well. Right now it has reached a plateau which will remain stable for around ten years or so, as present old-timer CW users start to die out, total on-the-air CW usage will decline at a steady rate, perhaps a bit flatter than the typical bell-shaped curve. There will be occasional new users of CW, but they will not get on-the-air in the kind of numbers that will keep the mode "alive" in a form recognizable to present-day hams. In fact, by the 2020 - 2025 time frame, I would expect to see on-the-air CW usage to be pretty much gone, assuming that ham radio itself lasts that long. In other words, we'll be able to enjoy CW for the rest of our lifetimes, but when we die, we'll be taking it with us.

If you think you can "sell" CW to newcomer hams based solely on it's merits, then, my friend, you don't have a single moment to waste posting on this, or any other, newsgroup. You've got to put on that checkered jacket and get out there on the sales floor! Good luck!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1868. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 04:07:11 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020317230711.04235.00000195@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 37808

In article <u99b601shvs146@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>
>Val Germann
>Columbia, Missouri
>(I'll be taking the Tech test Monday next!)

Val:

Is that anything like "next Monday?" The only people who say "Monday next"
are people doing an imitation of upper-crust British homosexuals. Anyone in
America who says that just wishes he was one. Perhaps (notice I didn't say
"methinks?") you've seen one too many episodes of "Masterpiece Theatre."

73 de Larry, K3LT

1869. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 04:18:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a73ptv$1ak$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37810

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020317230711.04235.00000195@mb-fo.aol.com...
> In article <u99b601shvs146@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
> <vgermann@socket.net> writes:
>
> >
> > >Val Germann
> > >Columbia, Missouri
> > >(I'll be taking the Tech test Monday next!)
>
> Val:
> Is that anything like "next Monday?" The only people who say "Monday
next"
> are people doing an imitation of upper-crust British homosexuals. Anyone
in
> America who says that just wishes he was one. Perhaps (notice I didn't
say
> "methinks?") you've seen one too many episodes of "Masterpiece Theatre."
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Val,

Isn't it great to have friends :-) The above from
one of the esteemed Pro-code Test Advocates.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1870. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 05:05:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8DB8D3.648D61A8@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37811

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > In a specific setting when one mode works, and it
> > happens to be the mode theoretically lesser in efficiency than the mode which won't
> > work, you would just shut down the station and declare that Shannon decrees it isn't
> > to be.
>
> "Work" is not a scientific observation, Dick. "Work" is subjective.

I certainly agree, "function" would have been a better descriptive.

> I see a lot
> of hams who say a 75m Hamstick "works" great. You say the CW ID works great compared
> to PSK31. That is not a scientific comparison.

Uh, Cecil, ham radio on the air isn't always about "scientific" comparisons, it has to do with
diagramming what works and what doesn't under the instant circumstances. It's what separates the operators from the lids, or didn't you pick up on that?

> You must compensate the measurements
> for bandwidth, throughput, and power for it to be a scientific comparison.

Yeah, as I suggested, why don't you just go right ahead with all that, meanwhile I 'll carry on, on the air with CW when I find that it's the mode that holds up and *functions* when PSK31 has tanked. See, just be a happy injurneer and I'll be a happier ham.
Shannon will forgive us both.

1871. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 05:05:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8DBA89.E087F342@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37812

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > All I ever said was that CW worked in a set of identical
> > circumstances where PSK31 wouldn't.
>
> That's a falsehood, Dick. The circumstances were NOT identical. PSK31 was being
> squeezed through a 31 Hz filter and CW wasn't.

That's YOUR story. I found that small group of stations on the air and had no way whatever to prove that. Do you?

>
> > I found that to be novel in view of your bragging
> > about efficiencies of later digital modes. You, the theorist, would insist that the
> > circumstances be altered, "flatten the tires" so that neither mode would work. I said
> > nonsense. You use what works.
>
> Dick, The PSK31 31 Hz filter is akin to flattening the tires on the Chevy. Unlike PSK31,
> PACTOR II is a serious mode that uses QPSK through a 500 Hz filter and it will run
> circles around CW.
>

Sure didn't work at all through my 500 cycle filter on the Icom. Or should I say it didn't *function*. Performance is what the we want, fella, you can keep your theoretical stuff in the lab.
Bring it out when you have something to show us. All the verbiage is so much mush.
We know what Shannon said. But you nor anyone else but MY GEAR set the parameters for the communications channel that early morning. I know that Shannon would be sensible enough to agree, even if you aren't.

1872. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 05:05:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8DBB0E.AE811822@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37813

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Recognition of words without gaining insight into their meaning doesn't constitute
> > > learning.
>
> You can't have it both ways, Dick. When potential American hams memorize English
> words, they are likely to have at least a feel for the meanings. It is virtually
> impossible to memorize words in one's native language without gaining some insight
> into their meaning.

Sure. "Gee, this stuff MUST apply to ham radio, after all it's part of the license exam".

1873. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 05:05:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8DBB8A.92A3B5F0@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37814

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Sure is ON OF my favorites, though, and nothing else is quite like it. Too
> > bad that most people have to be shoved into it to ever have the experience.
>
> Too bad you are shoving newcomers away from CW by telling them they won't
> learn Morse code if they are not required to do so.

I sit here wondering if you have a rectum for a nose, the way you always get everything bassackwards. I tell none one nothing, they have been telling ME, loud and clear, via the likes of NCI officialdom et al.

1874. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 05:05:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8DBCD3.85866A61@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37815

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Recognition of words without gaining insight into their meaning doesn't
> >constitute
> >learning.
>
> If one doesn't know the meaning of an English word and doesn't know the meaning
> of a Russian word, what is the difference? If you feel they are picking words
> in the question pool whose meaning they don't know and then using some form of
> association to somehow link the question and correct answer, they could do the
> same thing if the entire pool was in Russian.
>
> How would this technique you feel people are using to pass their exams so they
> won't learn anything work if someone knew the meaning of every word in a
> question and the correct answer?
>

Is that a real, serious question? Cecil claims that sort of perfection. On every test he ever took. That is, except CW test. I imagine that might explain why he hates it so. The test, that is. He claims to love the mode, yet is obtuse enough to believe that serious numbers of newcomers will want to study and learn it when it isn't part of the test.

1875. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 05:05:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8DBD5F.5CDB7895@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37816

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> Dick, do you wear a turban while performing your mind reading act?
> > >
> > > No way-he said what he said, but it's clear that you, Bill and Ed do when
> > >reading my posts.
>
> To the contrary, Dick. We respond to your posts as written. I often feel that
> you really mean something different than what you actually said, but you have
> accused me of being a mind reader so many times that I now take your words
> literally and respond only to them.

It isn't so, Ed and it is clear to readers. You have consistently misstated my posts and attributed things to me I didn't say. Looks like you insert what you WISH I had said so you can criticize it.

1876. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 05:05:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8DBE75.E9782650@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37817

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020315054939.06040.00001527@mb-dd.aol.com...
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > > Recognition of words without gaining insight into their meaning doesn't
> > >constitute
> > >learning.
> >
> > If one doesn't know the meaning of an English word and doesn't know the
> meaning
> > of a Russian word, what is the difference? If you feel they are picking
> words
> > in the question pool whose meaning they don't know and then using some
> form of
> > association to somehow link the question and correct answer, they could do
> the
> > same thing if the entire pool was in Russian.
>
> For the last 50 years...questions as follows:
>
> What is the unit of measurment for....
> Current flow - Amperes
> Electomotive Force - Volts
> Electrical Resistence - Ohms

> There's NOTHING more necessary than memorization
> to "leanr" those questions. I did it as a teen in the late
> 50s. Did I know what the concepts behind it all were
> and the why of Ohm's law? Not at all, but there was
> no need to understand it to pass the test.
>

Oh.... Did you find those on your Extra Lite? We long ago stipulated that the entry level exams always were and should be basic and easy.

What I find curious is that all you "license class doesn't matter" types have jumped right onto the Extra Lite even though you wouldn't be caught dead on CW.

1877. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 06:16:11 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a74rr981906@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 37837

Maybe... Maybe not.... I have no intentions of using it as a regular form of communications. I only have pursued any knowledge of it because it is a requirement at this point.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020315093632.25967.00000265@mb-mw.aol.com...
> In article <a6ptir01qf@enews1.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >I would have to agree that the morse code would also need 100% undivided
> >attention from me also.
>
> Most people are like that when they first learn it. Remember when you
first
> learned to drive a car or ride a bike? Probably took all your
concentration at
> first,
> then gradually became almost automatic. Morse is the same way.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

1878. For Discussion: ARRL Fee's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 06:37:45 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a74rra91906@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 37838

Since it has been brought up here so many times in arguments and debates that only 1/4 of the licensed population of hams are ARRL members, would it stand to reason that it may be of benefit to the ARRL to create an incentive membership rate for licensee's who never had a membership before? (for long-time licensees or newbies both) I was thinking something like $20 for the FIRST YEAR ONLY and then the second year and on are normal rates. Again this is for licensees who are pursuing a FIRST TIME MEMBERSHIP.
Granted, some are of the mind that they will never pursue membership ever......

Is this something that may encourage more growth in their numbers? (They didn't have these people beforehand so it is actually a gain in some respects.)

Is this something that "may" encourage these people possibly to stay after the first year?

Your ideas and thoughts....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

1879. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 07:45:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020318024501.16195.00002526@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 37818

>Subject: Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test
>From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>Date: 03/17/02 11:55 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <u99hia9ur15df4@corp.supernews.com>

>I really have a lot of trouble with this

I thought as much.

>What percentage of ARRL members have passed a code test?

What does it matter? It's not the percentage that HAVE passed a code test
that matters here, it's what thier OPINION is of the tests NOW. Is the ARRL
supposed to alter it's policy based on the test's passed, or the opinion of the
members?

>Could it really be that if a TRUE, full-up plebiscite, one that was
>designed to get the MAXIMUM response, would come NOT end
>up with a strong majority FOR retaining a code provision? I have
>a hard time believing that code would NOT be strongly supported
>under those conditions.

Why don't you buy the ARRL's mailing list and conduct your own poll? That
way it's not "colored" by ARRL politics and you would know for yourself.

>Something here does NOT smell right
>in that I don't see any actual recent DATA on this. That is, could
>it be that ARRL did not WANT to know the real story here?

Val, how long do you think it would take those disaffected members to vote
with their feet if the ARRL was doing something significantly contrary to thier
wishes?

Do you really need to have some poll done? This matter has been going
around and around for the three decades I have been involved in Amateur Radio.
While I wouldn't care to hazard a guess on exact percentages, I am sure that
the present "no code/slow code" opinion is shared by the majority.

>The whole thing is very strange, isn't it?

Nope.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1880. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 07:46:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020318024622.16195.00002527@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 37819

>Subject: Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test
>From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>Date: 03/17/02 12:23 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <u99j6drdk1ej84@corp.supernews.com>

>If a Ham organization has a membership consisting overwhelmingly
>of people who have passed a code test, and code testing begins to
>come under pressure, it seems to me that the job of the organization
>is to find out, as closely as possible, where the membership stands,
>in a very detailed and "beyond-any-doubt" manner.

And as I said in the other reply, It's been around for decades. There's
nothing strange about it at all.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1881. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 07:55:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020318025545.16195.00002528@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 37820

>Subject: Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/17/02 17:24 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020317172405.16055.00000077@mb-bh.aol.com>

>Please present third-party disinterested PROOF that the
>ARRL (wherever it is located) decisions are made by
>"people from all areas of the country."
>
>So far, the only "proof" has come from the ARRL itself.
>
>This is one of those "True Belief" things, isn't it?

No, it's the truth. Not "what Lennie Made Up" truth...REAL truth

>1. One cannot be a director without having a voting membership.
>2. Voting membership is defined by the grant of an amateur
> license.
>3. The ARRL controls the voting process.
>4. The ARRL controls announcement of "winners.

His Royal Hindass now accusing ARRL of misconduct in it's electorial
processes. More balck helicopter stuff.

>If you must act the apologist and rationalizer, please try for
>some originality. There are a great many skeptics out there
>who are not of the True Belief.

Or you could just be a lying scumbag named Leonard H. Anderson.

(PS...that's my LIBERAL opinion...)

1882. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 07:58:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020318025841.16195.00002529@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 37821

>Subject: Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test
>From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>Date: 03/17/02 18:38 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <a739hnntb1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>

>
>NOR is any other private organization. Why is that so
>hard for you (Len) to understand.?

He understands just fine, Bill. He can't be insulting, antagonistic and
vile without making such allegations, and that would ruin his day.

>YOU keep talking of skeptics but offer none other
>than your own self.

Bingo.

73
Steve, K4YZ

1883. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 08:15:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020318031511.16195.00002531@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 37822

>Subject: Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 03/17/02 13:40 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C94E2F2.2D058A32@earthlink.net

>> Tsk, tsk, tsk...in trying to "get back" at me, you've now dishonored
>> Skip Tenney, the late Jim Fisk, Alf Wilson, Rich Rosen, Terry
>> Northrup and a number of staffers who were also licensed radio
>> amateurs!
>
>How are they dishonored, Len? They produced a fine publication. It
>still failed. Ham Radio never enjoyed the readership numbers of other
>magazines.

The dishonor is Lennies.

Personally, I'd be jumping mad to be one of those folks or thier survivors and know that someone who had once been an "insider" in "Ham Radio" magazine now uses his previous association with it to somehow "justify" his vile and revolting antagonistic stand against all things involved with it.

How cowardly to do so and invoke the name of the deceased as a cover for such rantings.

>Lock and load, Len? Is this now war? I'll be watching the papers for
>news on the big clash between California and West Virginia.

I'll take 10 West Virginians with rifles against the entire California National Guard and State Military Reserve. Just aim below the spike dyed hair and above the nipple rings. Sure kill every time.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1884. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 08:22:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020318032247.16195.00002532@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 37823

>Subject: Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test
>From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>Date: 03/17/02 13:42 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <a72obneto1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>

>The directors are elected by the memebership. Once so elected
>they vote as they see fit. That's the SAME way the USA
>legislative process works.

Bill, did you have a really bad day or was this a typo?

The directors are expected to carry out the wishes of thier constituents,
just like my state and local officals are expected to do.

When my local officials start acting on thier own accord, they get
recalled. And when ARRL elected officials don't conduct themselves according
to acceptable standards, THEY get recalled.

>They responded as elected directors and each voted according to
>what they believed was the right thing to do.

They have, as I always believe they have, responded according to what the
predominant opinion was of the electorate. It wasn't always what >>I<< wanted,
but the majority got the nod. And that's the way it's SUPPOSED to work.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1885. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 08:25:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020318032546.16195.00002533@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 37824

>Subject: Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/17/02 17:24 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020317172406.16055.00000078@mb-bh.aol.com>

>Who am I to argue with Big Brother?

Who are you, "period"...?!?!

1886. Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 08:47:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020318034731.16195.00002535@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 37825

>Subject: Re: Socio-Politico-Economic Factors in Ham Testing
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/17/02 17:24 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020317172407.16055.00000079@mb-bh.aol.com>

>I have no "resentment" your majesty. I don't have any warm regard
>for the "Real Ham" environment.

"I have no "resentment", your majesty".

Whew! Takes a LOT of cajones to author a statement like that!

Lennie, I NEVER see Ed address you in such a way. Why do you do that to him? (No need to answer...we already know, but it would really shock the heck out o a lot of folks to see where you get off doing it)

>I have a life experience of exposure to a large number of radio
>amateurs, radio hobbyists, and electronics experimenters in
>addition to having completed (not quite) a career in the industry.

Having "not quite" completed ANYTHING is your life story, now isn't it, Lennie?

>It's been my observation that approximately a third of all such
>"samples" represents the "Real Ham" variety wherein
>regulations should be frozen to the point of regulations as they
>were when those began their hobby.

I know I am wasting badwidth with this question, but I will ask His Putziness to produce some "documentation"...some verifyable numbers on this.

>I don't have any warm regard for those who find comfort in a pseudo-
>military service concept of a hobby.

This from a guy who can't make more than five posts without reminding us of his Korean-era one-tour miliary career, this is VERY funny!

>Certainly not for those who
>wish to wrap themselves in patriotic bunting and proclaim their
>hobby activity as some self-enobling "national service."

We don't have to do the wrapping, Your Traitorishness... the agencies that have, time and time again, put THIER signature on the line lauding Amateur radio for it's services to teh Nation do that perfectly well.

I KNOW it eats you up, but it's still facts. Department of Defense, Department of State, A.R.C., Salvation Army, F.E.M.A., etc etc etc.

And as for "wrapping up in patriotic bunting", all I can say is what do
YOU have against being wrapped up in American red, white and blue?

>Citizenship
>doesn't need self-serving jingoism, titles, impressive "credentials"
>flaunted as if they were some divine gift. A hobby is a hobby. No
>more, no less.

Still, Lennie, it irritates the hell out of you that Amateur Radio IS more
than a hobby. YOU can "nay say" it all you want. A hand full of the "unwashed
masses" can do more WITH radios in a day than you did in almost 50 years...

Sucks to be you, Lennie.

>I'm not but it
>would appear that some experience might seem "rocket
>science" to those multi-credentialed hobbyists who cannot
>understand the basics of radio or electronics.

Lennie...how much restraint did it take to type this...?!?! I KNOW you
were just DYING to say "YOU'RE DAMNED RIGHT I AM BETTER THAN YOU!"

No matter...it STILL sucks to be you.

>Now you come on back after completing the summer
>school re-doing Psychology 101. I won't chide you for
>failing the first go-around.

Good. Especially since you've been around MORE than once!

1887. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 08:50:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020318035015.16195.00002536@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 37826

>Subject: Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/17/02 17:24 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020317172410.16055.00000080@mb-bh.aol.com>

>You could just as well make the entreaty "Don't be controversial or
>nobody in here will like you."

YOU are NOT "controversial", Lennie. You are a documented antagonist and
pathological liar.

>Oh, boo-hoo.

You have much to cry over.

Steve

1888. Re: FA: McKay Dymek AM7 TUNER - AM / Long Wave Tuner

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 08:53:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020318035304.16195.00002537@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 37827

>Subject: Re: FA: McKay Dymek AM7 TUNER - AM / Long Wave Tuner
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 03/17/02 21:03 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C954AEE.76DC8C19@adelphia.net>
>
>Man, are you in the wrong neighborhood!

Why? I enjoy LF/MF experimentation.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1889. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 12:21:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020318072114.29962.00001873@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 37828

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> but you have
>> accused me of being a mind reader so many times that I now take your words
>> literally and respond only to them.
>
> It isn't so, Ed and it is clear to readers. You have consistently misstated
>my
>posts and attributed things to me I didn't say. Looks like you insert what
>you
>WISH I had said so you can criticize it.

Rather than either of us having to go back and do a google search to see what you said and what I said you said, let's do this. If I do what you say I do, say so in your reply post. We can then keep track of what percentage of the posts I make about what you say you believe mis-state what you said.

Sound fair?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1890. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 12:28:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020318072828.29962.00001874@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 37829

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> How would this technique you feel people are using to pass their exams so
>they
>> won't learn anything work if someone knew the meaning of every word in a
>> question and the correct answer?

> Is that a real, serious question?

Is it a serious allegation from you that most people are rote memorizing word assocations on the exam pool questions without understanding the meaning of the words? If so, the question is a valid one.

If you didn't mean that when you said it, you can post a corrected version. I THINK you meant to say that they are memorizing the question and correct answers without understanding the technical concepts behind them, but as you point out often, I am not a mind reader, so I respond to what you say.

>Cecil claims that sort of perfection. On every
>test he ever took.

He may be capable of such memorization skills, as I am sure a handful of people are today. Cecil's point is that the memorization you claim is rampant today existed when he took his tests in the 1950s, because he did it.

I, OTOH, do not feel I am capable of such memorization. If I were to be examined on a subject that was new to me, I would pass that exam with a combination of learning, memorizing, lucky guessing and hoping that a few of the tough questions did not appear on the exam I took.

I passed the CW test with only memorization.

>He claims to love the mode, yet is obtuse enough
>to believe that serious numbers of newcomers will want to study and learn it
>when
>it isn't part of the test.

Remains to be seen, Dick, but I believe that the number will be smaller because of some of the things you say about the mode, such as its not having enough value that serious numbers of newcomers will want to study and learn it when it isn't part of the test.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1891. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 12:29:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020318072949.29962.00001875@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 37830

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> What I find curious is that all you "license class doesn't matter" types
>have
>jumped right onto the Extra Lite even though you wouldn't be caught dead on
>CW.

Um, Dick... Bill occasionally operates CW. Carl has declined my invitation to
do so. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1892. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 12:32:23 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020318073223.29962.00001876@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 37831

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Is that anything like "next Monday?" The only people who say "Monday next"
>are people doing an imitation of upper-crust British homosexuals. Anyone in
>
>America who says that just wishes he was one.

As I said, Larry is stirring the pot.

It is unfortunate that apparently all he has left to say amounts to peeing in
the sandbox.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1893. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 13:00:56 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <cyll8.18472$Ex5.1662879@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37832

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020317230710.04235.00000194@mb-fo.aol.com...
> In article <20020317163537.04214.00000049@mb-mr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
(N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >
> >The total elimination of code testing may actually be a good thing for
code
> >USE because it may allow better methods of learning to come to the
fore.
>
> Jim:
>
> Do you really actually *believe* that nonsense, or are you just
parroting
> a bunch of mealy-mouthed, politically-correct nonsense so nobody in
> your local radio club will hate you?
>
> When the code testing requirements are zeroed-out, then code use will
> be on it's way out as well. Right now it has reached a plateau which
will
> remain stable for around ten years or so, as present old-timer CW users
> start to die out, total on-the-air CW usage will decline at a steady
rate,
> perhaps a bit flatter than the typical bell-shaped curve. There will be
> occasional new users of CW, but they will not get on-the-air in the
> kind of numbers that will keep the mode "alive" in a form recognizable
> to present-day hams. In fact, by the 2020 - 2025 time frame, I would
> expect to see on-the-air CW usage to be pretty much gone, assuming
> that ham radio itself lasts that long. In other words, we'll be able to
> enjoy CW for the rest of our lifetimes, but when we die, we'll be taking
> it with us.
>
> If you think you can "sell" CW to newcomer hams based solely on it's
> merits, then, my friend, you don't have a single moment to waste
> posting on this, or any other, newsgroup. You've got to put on that
> checkered jacket and get out there on the sales floor! Good luck!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

The twists and turns of the wheel of fate are hard to predict especially as it involves the future but you are more than likely correct. But it is not the function of authority to prop up the corpse. It was once said that it was fortunate the Interstate Commerce Commission came too late to preserve the Overland Stage and Pony Express because they would have found a way to at least try. We can live without turning things into museums and in general we have lived better without the ICC.

You did enough military time to have had a gutload of 'Motivation'. At some point you realize that you do not really motivate anyone to do anything, learn anything, or be anything. But you also realize that it is within your power to demotivate -- seems like they did a bit of a job on you personally -- or be a real pain to someone who is self-motivated. Jim's point with which I agree is that it is damned demotivating to have to unlearn what you did to get the right to practice the art in order to get good enough to do it. The trip is long enough without someone planting land mines.

Had the chance to visit with a bunch of my seventh graders after they went to the state football quarterfinals as juniors. When the gush and goo died down I asked them not if I did them any good but if I taught them anything that needed unlearning later -- in essence had I bullshitted them? The starting center was a really bright kid who was something of a blimp when I had him who couldn't get the ball thru his legs on a consistent basis-- he was known as Mongo even then. But Mongo has spent a lot of time in the weight room as have they all. I cannot claim any responsibility for his efforts but I can claim that I got the hell out of his way and gave him a pretty good reason to make the effort. After that, I will get out of his way any time he wants.

Morse will survive or not on the efforts of others. It is really not within my power nor should it be to force it on anyone no matter how good an idea I might think it is; I have a similar problem with forced baptisms. But at the very least, I should do no damage, sling no bullshit, and provide no obstruction to those who are motivated and not allow anyone else to do so unchallenged. And the only way I know to get that motivation is to be a good example and hope for rain.

Jim is simply saying that the methods in use to get to 5wpm are deadly in getting to 15 and require unlearning and are therefore wrong. I can but agree.

Dick NBK

1894. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 13:10:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020318081008.03008.00000099@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 37833

In article <MGdl8.18065$Ex5.1614940@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>> Here's a theory for you:
>>
>> Since the early 1970s, the FCC has had a tiger by the tail in the form
>of
>> pirate/freeband folks. Perhaps FCC thinks that making ham licenses
>easier to
>> get will induce these folks to be licensed, therefore making them easier
>to
>> control.
>>
>> That may sound "out in left field" at first, but look at FCC's actions
>since
>> 1976 or so.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>You been reading my old posts???

Must be where I got it. Great minds think alike.

>The great unanswered question in a lot
>of this is what is expected of the ARS by the FCC (love those TLA's).

Betcha they really wish we would just go away. But since that's not gonna
happen, next-best is to be a catchall service. That means the licenses gotta be
real easy to get.

>Certainly in the Cold War/ Sputnik era we were expected to provide a pool
>of CW ops; I was hustled by NSA and was not licensed at the time having
>let them lapse for the Nam. Not wanting to spend much time in a tin shack
>in Alaska copying Russian fishing boats into a Cyrillic typewriter at 12
>wpm, I graciously told them to take a hike.

HAW!

>Since then piracy has indeed become a problem more on Marine freqs really
>than CB; there has been a group of bootleggers in the Air freqs below 40
>meters since WW2. The broadcast pirates below 40 have better programming
>than the local Clear Channel Communications outlet (or K1MAN for that
>matter) so there are those who are for letting them do it. It does indeed
>appear the Commission is all for filling HF before the pirates do. They
>assign US SWB to Fixed Freqs outside the normal SW bands which have
>themselves been expanding and of course there is the small matter of 60

>meters. One wonders if Gene Scott's mission in life is to occupy the
>military and NASA freqs until they are needed; KAIJ has been on an oddessy
>as has Brother Stair on WWCR. And some of the 26 MHz studio-transmitter
>links program reggae to keep their freq from being freebanded. Not half
>bad actually.

Yup to all of it. Ya gotta wonder what the real agenda of some of those folks
is. And whether they'd accept a license if the FCC just handed them one, tied
to an amnesty document. For some the piracy is the game - many speakeasies
folded after Prohibition ended.
>
>CB is an interesting mess because of the cast of characters which really
>needs to be sorted out to make any sense out of it. You have the legal
>band/idiotic power level folks on Channel 6 that sounds like the low end
>of 20 in the AM days and assorted channel masters and headcases. You have
>SSB freebanders who are by and large pretty civilized and have flowed into
>the ARS forever without incident. Then you have the AMers who are by and
>large scum. It reminds you of Mississippi: anyone with intelligence or
>ambition left years ago leaving some pretty fragrant garbage including a
>certain minority leader and federal judge. The truckers who are our
>nemesis on ten are more refugees than combatants just looking for a home.
>And there are a pretty fair number of Techs who freeband in preference to
>taking a code test when the spots are up and as they have someone to shoot
>DX to, one would assume this is pretty worldwide.
>
And it's been going on for decades. The limits on our amplifiers date from
1978, and one of the main reasons for Techs and Novices on 10 decades back was
to occupy the band and give the pirates some competition/pressure.

When the EIA proposed "Class E" CB on 220 MHz, CB groups far and wide opposed
the move, even though it would have given them more channels and FM.

>So yes, the code test stands in the way of making honest HF amateurs out
>of the great unwashed to be led in righteous paths by an examination
>ritual of more form than substance and by us OTs thru the Dudley Doright
>Effect -- fine non-fingernail biting gentlemen that we are.

Which effect works on some but not all. FCC replies with more enforcement.
End of story.

>It is sure
>consistent with previous actions inside and outside the Amateur Service,
>not the least of which is opening 10 meters to anyone who can pass a code
>test.
>
>It is a pretty fair bet that code testing will disappear if possible for
>precisely the reasons you state so quickly the doors of the FCC will be
>sucked shut by the venturi effect of all the rushing around.

I see a simple "Executive Order" or some such. Any proposals or NPRMs will be
formalities, if they even happen.
>

>But I question again whether the issue at 5wpm is the Code or the simple
>requirement to actually DO something no matter how trivial as part of the
>process. I have come to believe it is the latter. It could be doing a
>box-step to the Wienerschnizel Waltz for 15 seconds and we'd have No Waltz
>International in a heartbeat with the same old horseshit and
>anti-personnel barrage.

'zactly. The real beef is the idea that folks from almost all walks of life would be required to LEARN something new that would require more than reading a book a couple times. Really ticks off the All-Knowing-Been-There-Done-That-Professionals, with or without portfolio, who quake and bellow at the idea of being put on a level playing field with the Great Unwashed and the preteen hotshots.

The Great Equalizer, in other words.

See my previous rant on mandatory Smith Chart testing and No Charts International, at a Usenet archive near you. Yes, I have mastered both Morse and the Smith Chart.
>
>If indeed this is the case then we can expect it to be a giant marketing
>game where instead of the standard 5 rigs before putting the last CB into
>the garage, we go thru a few transceivers with AM grafted on before
>letting the ticket expire and people cycling thru radio like the visitors
>to Lenin's tomb.

Even that's not a new problem. Back in the '30s the turnover was about 40% per year. Everyhting old is new again.

> And it actually will not stop most piracy.

Course not! Think the pirates are gonna tell Uncle their name, address, and SSN, and promise to play by all the rules or face Riley? Fuhgedaboudit!

>It will sell some gear in the short run and it will reward some people
>although not the NCI poobahs who having served their purpose will more
>than likely get stabbed in the back.

I dunno how you mean "stabbed in the back". Explain?

I see NCI as the classic rooster taking credit for the dawn, then quietly fading away, as has happened before. Didja know that the 1951 restructuring that started the whole current mess was largely pushed by two small groups, one pushing a 'phone agenda and the other a CW agenda? They are all but forgotten today. Probably nobody here but me even knows their names.

>As Stalin put it, you can't make an
>omelet without breaking eggs. I note one of them in an appropriate speech
>with all sorts of martial struggles etc is resigning to let someone else
>lead the the inevitable victory, yada yada yada; he probably noted the
>purchase order for whetstones.

Martial or marital problems? (actually, not much difference, is there?)
>

>So yes, I think the major function of the ARS in Washington is indeed to
>be a weapon against piracy. I also think it will fail miserably.

Might actually work the other way. Pirate types might use the ARS to get started, tire of the limitations and compulsive rule-following, and become pirates. Ya never know.

Keep passing the open windows and be sure to know where your towel is.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1895. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 13:49:00 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <gfml8.18501$Ex5.1669445@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37835

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020318081008.03008.00000099@mb-mw.aol.com...
> >It will sell some gear in the short run and it will reward some people
> >although not the NCI poobahs who having served their purpose will more
> >than likely get stabbed in the back.
>
> I dunno how you mean "stabbed in the back". Explain?

I have somewhat the same problem I have with the upcoming feast of Ishtar. Who supplied the props, who puts up the money, who cooks the meals, and who does KP? Mary Magdelene may well have been an early-day roadie. This Magical Mystery Tour doesn't just appear out of nowhere and it does not wander aimlessly. When Simon Magus wanted to buy a franchise he may have told the world more than he intended.

Now I will grant that NCI overestimates its own moxie and takes credit for things nearly as inevitable as sunrise in the East but it has shown signs of having coins and organization so my suspicious mind wonders whether this is not RFE or CARE all over again and I start looking for CIA/KGB (same people) involvement. If there is indeed background funding and/or direction it is for commercial purposes so equipment manufacturers etc are the suspects but I keep remembering that Annenberg was the only one who ever made any money from TV or horse racing so who knows.

Regardless of the funding, come the Revolution the apparatchiks rarely survive. They may be allowed to fade into the background depending on how close they were to the core but if they have any expectation of leading the multitudes into the sunset they tend to be found in ditches.

Gots to get my car fixed. Another time

> I see NCI as the classic rooster taking credit for the dawn, then
quietly
> fading away, as has happened before. Didja know that the 1951
restructuring
> that started the whole current mess was largely pushed by two small
groups, one
> pushing a 'phone agenda and the other a CW agenda? They are all but
forgotten
> today. Probably nobody here but me even knows their names.
>
> >As Stalin put it, you can't make an
> >omelet without breaking eggs. I note one of them in an appropriate
speech
> >with all sorts of martial struggles etc is resigning to let someone
else

> >lead the the inevitable victory, yada yada yada; he probably noted the
> >purchase order for whetstones.
>
> Keep passing the open windows and be sure to know where your towel is.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Never eat at a place called Mom's.

Don't play poker with guys named Doc.

Use every bathroom you pass.

Wash your underwear at every opportunity.

Don't squat while wearing spurs. It's the Code of the West, son.

1896. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 13:52:14 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9br7d272gl216@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37834

Larry Roll K3LT wrote, strangely

>Is that anything like "next Monday?" The only people who say "Monday next"
>are people doing an imitation of upper-crust British homosexuals. Anyone
in
>America who says that just wishes he was one. Perhaps (notice I didn't say
>"methinks?") you've seen one too many episodes of "Masterpiece Theatre."

Careful! I may have to sic my 9-year-old daughter and her Daisy
CO2 pistol on you! She's a big fan of Jeeves and Wooster on PBS.

In any event, I meant to say THIS Monday, that is, TONIGHT! The
original expression came about when I failed to type "next" before
"Monday" and so put it in afterwards. When it was still grammaticaly
correct, I left it. Sheesh, and I thought ** I ** could be testy and rude
sometimes -- for no apparent reason!

Give me a BREAK, will ya!

Val

1897. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 14:33:24 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9btkbpu9vf41f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37836

Hello, all!

Now we're getting somewhere! That is, there was NO way
I could believe that these NCI yahoos were the driving force
behind any FCC actions at ALL! My comments below are
set inside [brackets].

Richard McCollum wrote:

>The great unanswered question in a lot
>of this is what is expected of the ARS by
>the FCC . . .

[FINALLY, someone says something that seems to be actually
important! Just what the hell HAS been going on here with all
these changes in the ARS? In part what has to have been hap-
pening, unfortunately, is that Ham Radio's overall importance to
the powers that be has sharply declined, especially since 1980
or so. This has come through to me loud and clear! That being
the case, the service could in part be used for other, newer, pur-
poses . . . purposes having nothing intrinsically to do with amateur
radio, per se, such as use as a weapon against various FCC
targets. Ouch.]

>. . . piracy has indeed become a problem more on Marine
>freqs really than CB; there has been a group of bootleggers in
>the Air freqs below 40 meters since WW2.

[Ah, ha!]

> One wonders if Gene Scott's mission in life is to occupy the
>military and NASA freqs until they are needed; KAIJ has been
>on an oddessy as has Brother Stair on WWCR. And some of
>the 26 MHz studio-transmitter links program reggae to keep
>their freq from being freebanded. Not half bad actually.

[He may be an SOB, but he's OUR SOB, eh? :-)]

>CB is an interesting mess . . . [and] the code test stands in the
>way of making honest HF amateurs out of the great unwashed
>to be led in righteous paths by an examination ritual of more form
>than substance and by us OTs thru the Dudley Doright Effect -- fine
>non-fingernail biting gentlemen that we are. It is sure consistent
>with previous actions inside and outside the Amateur Service, not
>the least of which is opening 10 meters to anyone who can pass
>a code test.

[OK. Now a lot of things make more sense.]

>It is a pretty fair bet that code testing will disappear if possible for
>precisely the reasons you state so quickly the doors of the FCC will
>be sucked shut by the venturi effect of all the rushing around.

[Exactly, if what you are saying is the fact.]

>But I question again whether the issue at 5wpm is the Code or the
>simple requirement to actually DO something no matter how trivial
>as part of the process. I have come to believe it is the latter.

[It seems to me to be a small Balkan Republic of "The Yankee-Cowboy
War" of 1960s fame. The melody lingers on!]

>If indeed this is the case then we can expect it to be a giant marketing
>game where we . . . go thru a few transceivers with AM grafted on
>before letting the ticket expire and people cycling thru radio like the
>visitors to Lenin's tomb. And it actually will not stop most piracy.

[Oooh, this WOULD be bad.]

>It will sell some gear in the short run and it will reward some people
>although not the NCI poobahs who having served their purpose will more
>than likely get stabbed in the back. As Stalin put it, you can't make an
>omelet without breaking eggs. I note one of them in an appropriate
>speech with all sorts of martial struggles etc is resigning to let someone
>else lead the the inevitable victory, yada yada yada; he probably noted
>the purchase order for whetstones.

[Revolutions ALWAYS eat their children. Ask that French guy, er, what
was what his name . . . Robespierre?]

>So yes, I think the major function of the ARS in Washington is indeed to
>be a weapon against piracy. I also think it will fail miserably.

[Well, this certainly would explain a lot, including the actions of the
ARRL,
which has to be privy, at some level, to what is going on . . . which really
has nothing directly to do with the ARS. So, how do you finesse actions
which have importance to the FCC but NOT to your the vast majority of
your own members? Beyond even that, how do you finesse actions
which most of them would actually OPPOSE, but your REAL superiors, in
some ways, want very badly! Well, cranking up bogus surveys strikes me
as one way to do what you feel you have to do to keep the lights turned on.
This actually allows me to feel better about some things!

Oh, this modern world!

>Dick NBK

Val Germann
Columbia, Missouri

1898. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 15:17:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C960508.615BED36@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37839

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > You must compensate the measurements
> > for bandwidth, throughput, and power for it to be a scientific comparison.
>
> Yeah, as I suggested, why don't you just go right ahead with all that, meanwhile I 'll
> carry on, on the air with CW when I find that it's the mode that holds up and *functions*
> when PSK31 has tanked. See, just be a happy injurneer and I'll be a happier ham.
> Shannon will forgive us both.

Well, allow me to do something similar to what you reported. If I find a ham who is using 1000 watts SSB and is perfectly copyable and ask him to switch over to one watt CW, and if I cannot copy him on CW, then SSB beats CW. Does that convince you that comparisons should be adjusted for bandwidth, throughput, and power for it to be fair?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1899. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 15:24:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9606C3.6DF9F78D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37840

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > All I ever said was that CW worked in a set of identical
> > > circumstances where PSK31 wouldn't.
> >
> > That's a falsehood, Dick. The circumstances were NOT identical. PSK31 was being
> > squeezed through a 31 Hz filter and CW wasn't.
>
> That's YOUR story. I found that small group of stations on the air and had no way
whatever
> to prove that. Do you?

If it's not going through a 31Hz filter, then it's not PSK31. I'm surprised you don't know that 31Hz filter is part of the technical definition of PSK31. Oh, I forgot. You are not interested in how or why digital things work. As far as digital modes go, you are just a button pusher.

> Sure didn't work at all through my 500 cycle filter on the Icom. Or should I say it
didn't
> *function*. Performance is what the we want, fella, you can keep your theoretical stuff
in
> the lab.

If I say since 1000 watt SSB gets through when one watt CW doesn't, will you also say that SSB is superior to CW? Fair comparisons must include bandwidth, throughput, and average power. If you refuse to be fair regarding PSK31, then why am I not free to refuse to be fair regarding CW?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1900. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 15:26:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C960732.F5809938@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37841

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > What I find curious is that all you "license class doesn't matter" types
> >have
> >jumped right onto the Extra Lite even though you wouldn't be caught dead on
> >CW.
>
> Um, Dick... Bill occasionally operates CW. Carl has declined my invitation to
> do so. :-)

And I use CW 95% of the time.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1901. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 15:31:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C960859.83619D18@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37842

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Is that a real, serious question? Cecil claims that sort of perfection. On every
> test he ever took. That is, except CW test. I imagine that might explain why he
> hates it so. The test, that is. He claims to love the mode, yet is obtuse enough
> to believe that serious numbers of newcomers will want to study and learn it when
> it isn't part of the test.

Just like serious numbers of people like bows and arrows, stick shifts, and
horseback riding, the newcomers who are attracted to CW will learn it and
use it. The ones who are not attracted to CW will not. That's the same
way it has always been. A friend of mine got his Conditional in 1952 and
never used Morse code again. It would be interesting to give him a Morse
code test today.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1902. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 15:35:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C96092A.903E4E42@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37843

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Sure is ON OF my favorites, though, and nothing else is quite like it. Too
> > > bad that most people have to be shoved into it to ever have the experience.
> >
> > Too bad you are shoving newcomers away from CW by telling them they won't
> > learn Morse code if they are not required to do so.
>
> I sit here wondering if you have a rectum for a nose, the way you always get
> everything bassackwards. I tell none one nothing, they have been telling ME, loud
> and clear, via the likes of NCI officialdom et al.

I do not believe they have been telling you that. I believe you misunderstood
them and are spreading falsehoods about what they meant. During the process
of spreading those falsehoods, you are driving newcomers away from Morse code.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1903. Re: For Discussion: ARRL Fee's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 15:43:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C960B33.EFB755F5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37844

KC8PMX wrote:
> Your ideas and thoughts....

Lots of publications give discounted rates for new subscribers.
I'm just waiting for next year when I get the senior discount.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1904. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 16:19:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203180819.698d84f5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 37845

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C94BDAF.7899B814@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > How? You keep telling us you have a photographic memory. And I recall a story
> > about a certain "gift" you received in that part of the world.
>
> Actually, the gift was in Korea.

Which is why I wrote "in that part of the world".

I have a nice detail map of Japan and Korea. They are neighbors.
>
> > I think you want Japan's ham radio to be ignored because it disproves your
> > claims.
>
> Actually, Japan's ham radio was foreign to the subject of the thread.

Not at all! The subject was HF amateur radio licenses without code
tests. Japan has more experience with that than any other country.
They've had 'em for decades.
>
> > You'll just have to be more clear.
>
> About what? You aren't being clear. It is impossible to carry the complete
> context along with every sentence.

But it IS possible to give some hint of the context in a post, rather
than ASSUME everone knows what you're thinking.

Of course, not giving context in a post gives you maximum wiggle and
moan room.

> There is no way for me to remedy the real
> problem - your nitpicking.

Heck, I don't have TIME to nitpick, Cecil. I just go for your big
errors, and there are so many I can't keep up!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1905. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 17:57:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203180957.6cbda909@posting.google.com>
Source record: 37846

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20020317230710.04235.00000194@mb-fo.aol.com>...
> In article <20020317163537.04214.00000049@mb-mr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
> >
> >The total elimination of code testing may actually be a good thing for code
> >USE because it may allow better methods of learning to come to the fore.
>
> Jim:
>
> Do you really actually *believe* that nonsense, or are you just parroting
> a bunch of mealy-mouthed, politically-correct nonsense so nobody in
> your local radio club will hate you?

I don't worry about being electro-politically correct, Larry. And
nobody at the local radio clubs hates me (that I know of).

Actually, the CW tent/table has been the hit of the last several Field
Days I've attended. (Most of the credit goes to W3RV, though). Oddly
enough, the most interested are the younger hams. ("You can understand
that?" "Like listening to somebody talk" "COOL, dude!")
>
> When the code testing requirements are zeroed-out, then code use will
> be on it's way out as well. Right now it has reached a plateau which will
> remain stable for around ten years or so, as present old-timer CW users
> start to die out, total on-the-air CW usage will decline at a steady rate,
> perhaps a bit flatter than the typical bell-shaped curve. There will be
> occasional new users of CW, but they will not get on-the-air in the
> kind of numbers that will keep the mode "alive" in a form recognizable
> to present-day hams. In fact, by the 2020 - 2025 time frame, I would
> expect to see on-the-air CW usage to be pretty much gone, assuming
> that ham radio itself lasts that long. In other words, we'll be able to
> enjoy CW for the rest of our lifetimes, but when we die, we'll be taking
> it with us.

Maybe. I hope not, but maybe. And maybe something else will happen.

Way back in the early/mid-1960s there came a quiet revolution in ham
radio that went almost unnoticed. That was when SSB transceivers
became the standard HF rigs for hams, replacing separate transmitters
and receivers. (Yes, there were "matched pair" transmitter-receiver
combos, but most hams had transceivers for cost reasons). The first
ones appeared in the late 1950s but by the early '60s there was a wide
selection all over the price range.

And almost all of those transceivers were designed for SSB. Some did not even cover the CW/digital parts of the bands. Most did not have RIT, defeatable AGC or provision for a sharp filter. QSK? Forget it! Those rigs that did have CW had it as an afterthought.

And hams bought 'em like hotcakes because they were cheaper than separates and easier to use. No more zero beating, tuneup was a snap and the whole thing was in one box.

Matched to those transceivers were relatively inexpensive grounded grid linear amplifiers. All of a sudden high-power amateur 'phone became inexpensive, compact and easy, compared to the AM days. Ask most '60s hams what the dream rig was and they'd say "Collins KWM-2" even though it had no RIT, the AGC could not be defeated and there was no provision for any optional filters. (Those in the know said "Collins 'meatball' S-Line")

Yet CW operation survived and prospered. Sure, the code test brought a few new hams to the mode, but many simply wandered/ran away from CW once the General was in hand.

Then in the '70s and '80s a funny thing happened. Rigs began to include more and better CW features. Today most current low-end rigs are not very good on CW but there are a lot more good ones than before 1975 or so. There are even rigs now on the market where CW is standard and SSB is the extra-cost option.

Similar thing happened in the ham mags. They show CW every so often, but when's the last time QST had an article on how to learn the code, adjust a key, or pick out equipment with CW performance in mind? It's been a long time, lemme tellya. Sure, you can buy a book on the subject, but that's not the same as a magazine article in a mag you get every month.

What I'm saying is that the mode has already survived for decades on its merits. Despite decades of equipment poorly suited for the mode and inattention
from the amateur press, CW survives and prospers. Compare the number of CW QSOs reported on Field Day for the past two years - CW is up and phone is down! Digital? A way distant third - something like 1% of the total. (FD is a good comparison activity because there are not separate phone-CW weekends, where propagation could give one mode a big edge).

I know about all of the above because I was there. I remember asking about CW performance in the new rigs of those bygone days and getting strange looks and "waddya want that for?" responses from salesfolk and other hams.

> If you think you can "sell" CW to newcomer hams based solely on it's
> merits, then, my friend, you don't have a single moment to waste
> posting on this, or any other, newsgroup.

Y'know, you are more right than you realize, Larry.

> You've got to put on that
> checkered jacket and get out there on the sales floor! Good luck!

I never went for the Herbert R. Tarlek look, but if it works....

(No way I'd dress like that - Bailey Quarters wouldn't like it. End of story!)

73 de Jim, N2EY

1906. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 18:09:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C962D3E.6E28DEB9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37847

N2EY wrote:
> The subject was HF amateur radio licenses without code tests.

The context was the USA. I don't want to discuss Japan.

> Heck, I don't have TIME to nitpick, Cecil. I just go for your big
> errors, and there are so many I can't keep up!

Omitting an easily understood context is not a big error. You
were obviously nitpicking.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1907. Re: FA: McKay Dymek AM7 TUNER - AM / Long Wave Tuner

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 18:22:44 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C963073.E5145EBE@psu.edu>
Source record: 37848

Sounds like fun to me too. But I would sooner take our Mister Anderson out of my filter file than I would like to read FA posts. Most of my newsgroups filter that. I guess I'll have to apply it here too.

By now, you probably figured I don't like auction items.

- Mike -

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: FA: McKay Dymek AM7 TUNER - AM / Long Wave Tuner
> >From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
> >Date: 03/17/02 21:03 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3C954AEE.76DC8C19@adelphia.net>
> >
> >Man, are you in the wrong neighborhood!
>
> Why? I enjoy LF/MF experimentation.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

1908. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 18:26:06 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <2jql8.16479$tP2.1451192@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37849

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9btkbpu9vf41f@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all!
>
> Now we're getting somewhere! That is, there was NO way
> I could believe that these NCI yahoos were the driving force
> behind any FCC actions at ALL

Although reading the tea leaves too closely gives one stained eyeballs. Never use conspiracy to explain what can be explained by sheer stupidity or complete indifference. You are wandering in at Chapter 52 of a long and continuing saga which features among its cast of characters an FCC that most certainly reads the election returns: Billy Tauzin sees to that. Add an ARRL that has had almost zero influence in my lifetime for any number of good reasons and couldn't conspire to buy lunch with any real confidence in the outcome -- technical competence coupled with the political instincts of a water buffalo: all in all a classic and fairly good membership organization.

The Commission has bigger things on its mind. All in all, the FCC has been rather nice to the ARS over the years; note Region 2 freq allocations like 3.9-4.0, 7.1-7.3, 50-54, 222-225, 420-430, 440-450 etc. The latter are becoming indefensible but that fight will come another day. In the regulatory arena broadcasting vs cell phones at give or take 700 MHz are the major issue with all of the fallout therefrom, followed closely by a digital TV system that shows signs of being a major disaster and the perennial problem of VHF Televison that would take a lot of heat off of lo-power FM among a lot of things if it could be flushed as the rest of the world already has. The bond market has taken some heat out of the cellphone biz but the Great Digital Disaster hangs like the proverbial sword of Damocles.

So expecting the FCC to give rat tits about the ARS is expecting a bit too much. And certainly expecting money to be spent and resources to be committed is a bit unrealistic as well. So it would not be too surprising that we occupy in the grand scheme of things the status of weapon against piracy -- bastards gotta earn their keep somehow but keep it cheap. Fight the rear guard action to keep things from getting worse. So now we know how Vinegar Joe Stillwell felt honchoing the China-Burma-India theater in WW2. It would not be too surprising if this comes pretty close to Riley Hollingsworth's charge -- do it on a shoestring; it sure as hell looks that way. And Riley picked up his straw hat and cane is dancing up a storm with props from Goodwill.

And on a broader note, this is not bad. Any effective organization with a limited budget has to make a few decisions. The village idiot can set priorities; that is trivial. The trick is what Peter Drucker calls 'posteriorities', having realized that you ain't getting beyond number five on the priority list when the pusher for number 13 walks in throw him into the street or you aren't making it beyond four. While I don't really enjoy my personal ox being gored, I have to applaud the general approach.

Now you have things like the rules of procedure that get your pronouncements reversed in court so you go out and build a record and go thru the endless motions hoping not too many witnesses insist on doing their version of Jada but give you a few quotes. BTW nowhere in the Federal system, regulatory or legal, is anyone bound by the pleadings; Federal judges like to reduce both attorneys to an open-mouthed gape now and again for drill. For this purpose groups like NCI are like Aquinas' 6th proof of the existence of God: if they did not exist they would have to be invented.

The restructuring took a long time and to my knowlege it was never explained why but my guess is that it was largely a priority tussle and the Commission finally looked at the staff like Pope Julius to Michaelangelo and told them to bring an end to it. We got thrown into the street. It was too small to be interesting.

To whatever extent the Commission is even aware of ARS it would be interesting to know what our image is. "I bet you hate me, Reeck." "If I thought about it, I probably would". Actually I would bet it really isn't too bad. But if we have any silly idea this will offer any protection when the nut-cutting begins, we are dumber than we look.

And now you know why I want to preserve such things as the integrity and humanity of the testing process even tho I expect it to become more and more a ritual. This is why I advocate a service requirement to be a VE (which for some odd reason causes NCI to turn white and shake) simply to remove the pressure on a new Extra to wave all his friends by or even the suggestion that it can be done. They can turn my neighborhood into a slum but I am retaining my self-respect.

Oh well

Dick N&#65533;BK

1909. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 18:28:25 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C9631C9.F48DE240@psu.edu>
Source record: 37850

I notice you also had the nerve to put in not one - but TWO hyphens in
your post. Oh the indignities we have to suffer from the newbies!
(grinning, of course)

Valentine Germann wrote:

> correct, I left it. Sheesh, and I thought ** I ** could be testy and rude
> sometimes -- for no apparent reason!
>
> Give me a BREAK, will ya!

1910. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 20:32:33 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c965029_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 37851

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a73oq4rrc1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> news:u9af5varfke737@corp.supernews.com...
>
> > I rather
> > imagine that if the FCC were suddenly to reverse course about
> > code testing, we'd VERY soon be hearing very LITTLE about
> > how the agency is NOT to take into consideration the positions of
> > those being regulated!
>
> While a "turnaround" would not make me happy,
> you are misguided if you think we would abondon
> the reasoning used so far. Such a "turnaround"
> would be most difficult to justify given the public
> record and reasoning so far.

It is also worth pointing out that there were SEVERAL
Petitions for Reconsideration filed regarding the issue
and ALL of them were rejected by the FCC because
they raised no new issues and presented no compelling
reason to keep higher code test speeds or more classes
of license.

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast.net> [personal and NCI-related mail]
<mailto:wa6vse-shack@fast.net> [sked, QSO/QSL, and usenet related messages
ONLY, please]
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

1911. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 20:37:24 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c965150_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 37852

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020318072949.29962.00001875@mb-cq.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > What I find curious is that all you "license class doesn't matter" types
> >have
> >jumped right onto the Extra Lite even though you wouldn't be caught dead
on
> >CW.
>
> Um, Dick... Bill occasionally operates CW. Carl has declined my invitation
to
> do so. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Given the voice and data privileges afforded by the Extra,
coupled with the fact that I have been technically qualified
for several decades, did Dick really think I'd remain a Tech+
forever? Why should I have?

Additionally, I travel internationally on business a fair amount.
Having an Extra makes it easier to get a full privilege license
(or in some jurisdictions, perhaps a license, period) than having
a Tech+ ...

Carl - wa6vse

1912. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 20:39:56 UTC
From: Martin <mdwade@mobiletel.com>
Message-ID: <3C96509C.1FAA@mobiletel.com>
Source record: 37853

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> news:u9btkbpu9vf41f@corp.supernews.com...
> > Hello, all!
> >
> > Now we're getting somewhere! That is, there was NO way
> > I could believe that these NCI yahoos were the driving force
> > behind any FCC actions at ALL
>
> Although reading the tea leaves too closely gives one stained eyeballs.
> Never use conspiracy to explain what can be explained by sheer stupidity
> or complete indifference. You are wandering in at Chapter 52 of a long
> and continuing saga which features among its cast of characters an FCC
> that most certainly reads the election returns: Billy Tauzin sees to
> that. Add an ARRL that has had almost zero influence in my lifetime for
> any number of good reasons and couldn't conspire to buy lunch with any
> real confidence in the outcome -- technical competence coupled with the
> political instincts of a water buffalo: all in all a classic and fairly
> good membership organization.
>
> The Commission has bigger things on its mind. All in all, the FCC has
> been rather nice to the ARS over the years; note Region 2 freq allocations
> like 3.9-4.0, 7.1-7.3, 50-54, 222-225, 420-430, 440-450 etc. The latter
> are becoming indefensible but that fight will come another day. In the
> regulatory arena broadcasting vs cell phones at give or take 700 MHz are
> the major issue with all of the fallout therefrom, followed closely by a
> digital TV system that shows signs of being a major disaster and the
> perennial problem of VHF Televison that would take a lot of heat off of
> lo-power FM among a lot of things if it could be flushed as the rest of
> the world already has. The bond market has taken some heat out of the
> cellphone biz but the Great Digital Disaster hangs like the proverbial
> sword of Damocles.
>
> So expecting the FCC to give rat tits about the ARS is expecting a bit too
> much. And certainly expecting money to be spent and resources to be
> committed is a bit unrealistic as well. So it would not be too surprising
> that we occupy in the grand scheme of things the status of weapon against
> piracy -- bastards gotta earn their keep somehow but keep it cheap. Fight
> the rear guard action to keep things from getting worse. So now we know
> how Vinegar Joe Stillwell felt honchoing the China-Burma-India theater in
> WW2. It would not be too surprising if this comes pretty close to Riley
> Hollingsworth's charge -- do it on a shoestring; it sure as hell looks
> that way. And Riley picked up his straw hat and cane is dancing up a

> storm with props from Goodwill.
>
> And on a broader note, this is not bad. Any effective organization with a
> limited budget has to make a few decisions. The village idiot can set
> priorities; that is trivial. The trick is what Peter Drucker calls
> 'posteriorities', having realized that you ain't getting beyond number
> five on the priority list when the pusher for number 13 walks in throw him
> into the street or you aren't making it beyond four. While I don't really
> enjoy my personal ox being gored, I have to applaud the general approach.
>
> Now you have things like the rules of procedure that get your
> pronouncements reversed in court so you go out and build a record and go
> thru the endless motions hoping not too many witnesses insist on doing
> their version of Jada but give you a few quotes. BTW nowhere in the
> Federal system, regulatory or legal, is anyone bound by the pleadings;
> Federal judges like to reduce both attorneys to an open-mouthed gape now
> and again for drill. For this purpose groups like NCI are like Aquinas'
> 6th proof of the existence of God: if they did not exist they would have
> to be invented.
>
> The restructuring took a long time and to my knowlege it was never
> explained why but my guess is that it was largely a priority tussle and
> the Commission finally looked at the staff like Pope Julius to
> Michaelangelo and told them to bring an end to it. We got thrown into the
> street. It was too small to be interesting.
>
> To whatever extent the Commission is even aware of ARS it would be
> interesting to know what our image is. "I bet you hate me, Reeck." "If I
> thought about it, I probably would". Actually I would bet it really isn't
> too bad. But if we have any silly idea this will offer any protection
> when the nut-cutting begins, we are dumber than we look.
>
> And now you know why I want to preserve such things as the integrity and
> humanity of the testing process even tho I expect it to become more and
> more a ritual. This is why I advocate a service requirement to be a VE
> (which for some odd reason causes NCI to turn white and shake) simply to
> remove the pressure on a new Extra to wave all his friends by or even the
> suggestion that it can be done. They can turn my neighborhood into a slum
> but I am retaining my self-respect.
>
> Oh well
>
> Dick Nï¿½BK
I live in Billy Tauzin's Baliwick and you ain't too far off.
Good summation.
Martin N5PZJ

1913. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 20:41:50 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c96525c_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 37854

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C8DBB8A.92A3B5F0@worldnet.att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Sure is ON OF my favorites, though, and nothing else is quite like
it. Too
> > > bad that most people have to be shoved into it to ever have the
experience.
> >
> > Too bad you are shoving newcomers away from CW by telling them they
won't
> > learn Morse code if they are not required to do so.
>
> I sit here wondering if you have a rectum for a nose, the way you always
get
> everything bassackwards. I tell none one nothing, they have been telling
ME, loud
> and clear, via the likes of NCI officialdom et al.

Dick,

That is an outright lie ... YOU are one of the ones who keep
insisting that few or nobody will learn Morse if they are not
forced to do so to pass a test.

NCI's position is that the test is not justified. We believe that
Morse is just one of many modes, does not deserve
pass/fail/don't get a license status, and that the choice to learn
Morse or not should be a matter of personal interest/choice.

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast.net> [personal and NCI-related mail]
<mailto:wa6vse-shack@fast.net> [sked, QSO/QSL, and usenet related messages
ONLY, please]
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

1914. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 21:23:14 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9clkpmmegl3f8@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37855

Richard McCollum wrote:

>Never use conspiracy to explain what can be explained by
>sheer stupidity or complete indifference.

An excellent point!

>Add an ARRL that has had almost zero influence in my
>lifetime for any number of good reasons and couldn't conspire
>to buy lunch with any real confidence in the outcome -- technical
>competence coupled with the political instincts of a water buffalo:
>all in all a classic and fairly good membership organization.

This is a very interesting line of thought: Just what influence, and
with whom, does the ARRL have? Inside the tent, the ARRL's
staff surely has great control over the maganize's content, and that
content provides the prinicpal means by which U.S. hams know
what's what in U.S. amateur radio. This is not insignificant, is it?
But beyond that, what did Ham Radio do to get so unimportant?

>The Commission has bigger things on its mind.

Once again, how come Ham Radio has ceased to rate?

>All in all, the FCC has been rather nice to the ARS over the
>years; note Region 2 freq allocations like 3.9-4.0, 7.1-7.3,
>50-54, 222-225, 420-430, 440-450 etc.

This seems to indicate that Ham Radio DOES rate, a little! Isn't
it a fact that there are a lot of ex-military in Ham Radio, and a
lot of Hams vote? I'd like to think there's SOMETHING left!

>The latter are becoming indefensible but that fight will come
>another day.

Uh-oh! Are the highest frequencies the most likely to go?

>The bond market has taken some heat out of the cellphone
>biz but the Great Digital Disaster hangs like the proverbial
>sword of Damocles.

Again, for which frequences?

>So expecting the FCC to give rat tits about the ARS is ex-
>pecting a bit too much. And certainly expecting money to
>be spent and resources to be committed is a bit unrealistic
>as well.

This is really sad.

>So it would not be too surprising that we occupy in the grand
>scheme of things the status of weapon against piracy -- [snip]
>. . . it would not be too surprising if this comes pretty close to
>Riley Hollingsworth's charge -- do it on a shoestring; it sure as
>hell looks that way. And Riley picked up his straw hat and cane
>is dancing up a storm with props from Goodwill.

Oooooh, not good, in a lot of ways, eh?

>And on a broader note, this is not bad. [snip] While I don't really
>enjoy my personal ox being gored, I have to applaud the general
>approach.

Well, I guess it could be worse! Maybe that's "not bad!"

> . . . nowhere in the Federal system, regulatory or legal, is anyone
>bound by the pleadings; Federal judges like to reduce both attorneys
>to an open-mouthed gape now and again for drill. For this purpose
>groups like NCI are like Aquinas' 6th proof of the existence of God: if
>they did not exist they would have to be invented.

In intel circles they're called "useful idiots," I believe.

>The restructuring took a long time and to my knowlege it was never
>explained why but my guess is that it was largely a priority tussle and
>the Commission finally looked at the staff like Pope Julius to
>Michaelangelo and told them to bring an end to it. We got thrown into
>the street. It was too small to be interesting.

Surely it wasn't THAT reprehensible, was it? That is, this seems to
BE reprehensible, in my view.

>To whatever extent the Commission is even aware of ARS it would be
>interesting to know what our image is. "I bet you hate me, Reeck." "If I
>thought about it, I probably would". Actually I would bet it really isn't
>too bad. But if we have any silly idea this will offer any protection
>when the nut-cutting begins, we are dumber than we look.

You mean about those frequences going away? Ouch!

>And now you know why I want to preserve such things as the integrity and
>humanity of the testing process even tho I expect it to become more and
>more a ritual. This is why I advocate a service requirement to be a VE
>(which for some odd reason causes NCI to turn white and shake) simply to
>remove the pressure on a new Extra to wave all his friends by or even the
>suggestion that it can be done. They can turn my neighborhood into a slum
>but I am retaining my self-respect.

This is sort of the way I feel, already. In my case it's like I came back
to
the neighborhood and found a lot of broken windows, due in part to the
fact that the locals had been throwing rocks at each other!

>Oh well
>

>Dick N&#65533;BK

Sigh.

Val Germann
Columbia, Missouri
(I've been doing well on the QRZ exams! I hope that's a sign!)

**

1915. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 22:18:13 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gt6o3i0.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 37856

On Mon, 18 Mar 2002 14:39:56 -0600, Martin wrote:

>I live in Billy Tauzin's Baliwick and you ain't too far off.

What will it take for Billy to het the Commish' split intp two entities (just like Canada has), one dealing with "national policy" issues such as who gets broadcast and cellphone licenses ubder what conditions and the other dealing with keeping the spectrum clean?

Those of us who serve(d) in the secomd group always feel/felt that the antics of the first hroup (the only part that The Congress ever sees) p-o-ed The Congress against giving us enough resources and authority to enable us to do our job properly.

>Good summation.

Yes,

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1916. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 22:25:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020318172530.23057.00000117@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 37858

In article <3C954F95.2BC74E2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Fess up, Len. Nobody pulled any "I am the expert" routine here except
>for you and perhaps Carl.

Heh heh heh.

You've kept that mantra for so long you are beginning to actually
believe it to be true... :-)

>You made a claim and were called on it.

Noooo, noooo. This goes way back before NPRM 98-143 ever
existed. All the big daddy PCTAs were jumping up and down
about the "superiority" in all of radio of the OOK CW morsemen.

Sorry old timer, but you and the rest of the big daddies got
called and you and the rest got your collective ears pinned
back. You've been pissed about that for a long time but can't
admit it. Admission destroys the self-perceived "superiority"
status.

>The
>fact that you've been involved with HF communications before me will,
>according to actuarial tables, even out.

Heh heh heh. Another play on the "mortality" of chronological
old timers. Don't worry. It's a phase that many middle aged
men go through suddenly realizing that they will die someday.
[see the statement of the resident 24/7 PMS sufferer that he
"will live forever." :-)]

You can no longer accept something done by the US
government in the much-larger-than-State military's radio use
of HF as beginning phasing out OOK CW over a half century
ago. Accepting something like that destroys your credibility
as a whooper and hollerer for your kind of amateur radio.
Accepting something like that goes against your elevation
of morsemanship as a personal status symbol.

>Just think, Len--if you obtain
>an amateur license, I'll have a 38 year head start on you.

Heh heh heh. This presupposes that amateur radio is a
total Lifestyle, that it is somehow more noble, glorious,
and generally superior (probably in all aspects) to any
professional experience in radio whatsoever. That's a

very personal viewpoint only...it isn't nor was it ever a
"qualification" of anything but a very personal opinion.

An amateur radio license is simply a federal permission,
a grant to operate a radio transmitter in specific EM
spectrum bands using certain allocated modes and
obeying certain technical and operational regulations.
It isn't an academic achievement certificate, never was.

Now if there is this terrible need to insult and demean
those who have differing opinions, let's just say that I
became a human 16 years before Heil did...Heil is
still working on that aspect. :-)

>> You could just as well make the entreaty "Don't be controversial or
>> nobody in here will like you." Oh, boo-hoo.
>
>This is one time that YOU can make the claim, "been there; done that;
>got the T-shirt".

I'm just repeating a stock phrase seen used by others in computer-
modem communications since 1984. :-)

I'm here just to champion the removal of the morse code test for
an amateur radio license. No more, no less...BUT...the Lifestylers
are terribly opposed to removing anything that They did to get into
that Lifestyle...they demand a license before they will discuss
anything. Here's a repeated quote from a Lifestyler:

>> >>>Who would go to a non-ham for advice about amateur radio.

...and then there's the ever-popular:

>Maybe you should have gone to accredited schools.

I did. Got the papers. Did the work. :-)

>Tell me, Len, just how did you go about cooking yourself?

I don't need the Heil method..."bring up to a boil, simmer for
a long time until way over-done." :-)

>Amateur radio does not consist solely of radio theory.

From talking with many radio amateurs, it doesn't even exist!
:-)

>Actually, failing to obtain an amateur license is not the same as
>failing the exam. If someone fails to meet his goals, he does not fail
>an exam.

Heh heh heh...still on that kick, ey? Right away there is:

>I've never DEMANDED anything of you at any time, Len. That'd make your
>statement merde de bull.

Not at all. Heil DEMANDS the achievement of a license or he will
make up a lot of bullshit about "failing some personal goal." :-)

>Writing on something is not an indicator of expertise in a subject.
>By the way, was most of your other stuff fiction?

Yes and no. :-) There's a sort of joke in electronics engineering
which concerns technical proposals. Some who have done them
call them "science fiction" in fun, a jolly-time remark to others
who've done the same. Heil doesn't appear to have done anything
like that. Since he hasn't, he will surely make some demeaning,
insulting remark about it. :-)

>They certainly can. I especially liked that part where you cooked
>yourself.

I'm so glad that Heil finds SOME joy in life! :-)

1917. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 22:25:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020318172531.23057.00000118@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 37859

In article <20020317200954.23139.00000082@mb-ct.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>>Might you as well have come to the conclusion that Morse was never the
>>real issue to begin with?
>
>I think that for a long time Morse was the issue. At least into the 1960-70s,
>
>Morse was in wide use in both the US military and commercial services.
>Particularly the seagoing folks.

You may think so, but that isn't the case for US military and commercial radio services. The mode was in existance for military and commercial radio services but it was NOT in "wide use."

About the last hold-out for OOK CW outside of amateurism was maritime radio. Even so, the USN depended on data modes for the primary communications traffic in the 60s-70s.

>That may sound "out in left field" at first, but look at FCC's actions since
>1976 or so.

The morsemen from the league are losing their influence ability?
:-)

1918. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 22:25:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020318172532.23057.00000119@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 37857

In article <a739hnntb1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> So far, the only "proof" has come from the ARRL itself.
>
>Len,
>Simple but serious question...
>Do you NOT believe the published meeting minutes of
>the ARRL Board?

Bill, I don't know WHAT to believe. The ARRL says it does
things and the ARRL reports on what is said. Except for
documentation that gets into public release at government
sites, there's no way to find out what is really done in those
meetings or other closed function.

>Should every volunteer organization be subject to
>some outside "third party" audit to satisfy people
>who are NOT members? If yes, WHY?

If they are as BIG as the ARRL and are making a profit
on producing-selling goods as a non-profit (organized)
organization, AND purport to "represent US amateur
radio" when they only support a demographically-skewed
membership, a resounding YES!

If they can't make things open, then they ought to cut out
the deception of "representation" and "democratic whatsis"
and "they are the only organization looking out for amateur
radio."

>> Here's the self-defining mechanism of this "insider" business:
>>
>> 1. One cannot be a director without having a voting membership.
>> 2. Voting membership is defined by the grant of an amateur
>> license.
>> 3. The ARRL controls the voting process.
>> 4. The ARRL controls announcement of "winners."
>>
>> The basic flaw is that there is no way to ascertain that voting
>> went according to democratic principles. As a private
>> organization, the ARRL is NOT bound by the same laws that
>> apply to US government elected officials or legislative matters.
>
>NOR is any other private organization.

There are private (legal term) organizations and then there are
private (closed-door) organizations. Then there's one which is
both plus makes and sells goods.

>Why is that so hard for you (Len) to understand.?

Why is it so hard for you (Bill) to understand why skeptics are
skeptical?

If a Belief is really True, it should stand up to skeptical inquiry.

Problem is that all the True Believers are truly offended by any
and all skepticsm.

>So? Is that effort in any aspect illegal? Does the Detroit
>auto industry not pursue similar efforts to influence
>legislation favorable to its own end?

?

>> By all the recorded history and empirical evidence of human
>> behavior, those in control of some personal activity are
>> likely to both retain that control and seek a continuation of
>> their personal desires.
>
>Human nature...nothing new there.

That sort of rationalization is the same as the critics of some
control law, saying "you can't stop it if you just make laws
about it!" :-)

Okay, so you think it perfectly all right that a small group of
movers and shakers who've gained control in a membership
organization should rule over everyone else without question?

>YOU keep talking of skeptics but offer none other
>than your own self.

Ah, yes, you suddenly need documented proof of some
existance of a "group?" :-)

Skeptics abound here, on the public comment databases of
the FCC, in every random gathering of radio amateurs and
radio hobbyists and (probably) in the wastebaskets of an
organization a few miles SW of Hartford, CT. We exist.

1919. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 22:35:13 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C966BA1.775406AA@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 37860

>
>
> States Ex Ad Gen Pl Tch Nov
>
> CA 11,400 11,300 17,000 12,500 41,500 6,300
>
> NY
> OH 14,850 12,650 21,050 13,150 30,550 6,800
> PA
> MO
>
> FL
> TX 11,000 14,100 22,700 12,450 33,650 5,300
> NM
> AZ
>
> The last group of states above I'm calling my "retirement states"
> while the second group is my "working states." California is in
> a class by itself, obviously.
>

I don't think that there is a significant difference between these sets of states. Also I don't think Texas is a retirement state.

1920. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 23:13:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C96748C.A28B19F4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37861

Robert Casey wrote:
> Also I don't think Texas is a retirement state.

Also, he left out the amateur radio operators on Centauri Prime.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1921. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 23:42:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a75ufoold1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37862

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020318172532.23057.00000119@mb-fk.aol.com...
> In article <a739hnntb1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
>
> >> So far, the only "proof" has come from the ARRL itself.
> > >
> > >Len,
> > >Simple but serious question...
> > >Do you NOT believe the published meeting minutes of
> > >the ARRL Board?
> >
> > Bill, I don't know WHAT to believe. The ARRL says it does
> > things and the ARRL reports on what is said. Except for
> > documentation that gets into public release at government
> > sites, there's no way to find out what is really done in those
> > meetings or other closed function.

Buy QST then and read the meeting minutes.
What do you expect...tape recordings of every
ARRL telephone call, of every ARRL BOD meeting?

> > >Should every volunteer organization be subject to
> > >some outside "third party" audit to satisfy people
> > >who are NOT members? If yes, WHY?
> >
> > If they are as BIG as the ARRL and are making a profit
> > on producing-selling goods as a non-profit (organized)
> > organization, AND purport to "represent US amateur
> > radio" when they only support a demographically-skewed
> > membership, a resounding YES!

PLEASE tell us where your expectation has any
basis in law, ethics, or just plain business practices.

> > If they can't make things open, then they ought to cut out
> > the deception of "representation" and "democratic whatsis"
> > and "they are the only organization looking out for amateur
> > radio."

Any organization can make any claims it wants.
The FCC well understands that other interest groups
exist.

> >> Here's the self-defining mechanism of this "insider" business:
> >>
> >> 1. One cannot be a director without having a voting membership.
> >> 2. Voting membership is defined by the grant of an amateur
> >> license.
> >> 3. The ARRL controls the voting process.
> >> 4. The ARRL controls announcement of "winners."
> >>
> >> The basic flaw is that there is no way to ascertain that voting
> >> went according to democratic principles. As a private
> >> organization, the ARRL is NOT bound by the same laws that
> >> apply to US government elected officials or legislative matters.
> >
> >NOR is any other private organization.
>
> There are private (legal term) organizations and then there are
> private (closed-door) organizations. Then there's one which is
> both plus makes and sells goods.

Is ANY of what you observe illegal? unethical?

> >Why is that so hard for you (Len) to understand.?
>
> Why is it so hard for you (Bill) to understand why skeptics are
> skeptical?

I have no problem understanding that YOU are skeptical.
What is lacking is any references or examples that supports
your claim as to skepticS (emphasis on the plural).

> If a Belief is really True, it should stand up to skeptical inquiry.

Other than your demands to have access to a level
of "reporting" that no other organization
is subject to, it seems the ARRL IS standing up to
a level of inquiry that satisfies most everyone but you.
Bottom line...it isn't worth ARRL's time and effort
to try to satisfy you.

> Problem is that all the True Believers are truly offended by any
> and all skepticsm.

Not offeneded at all, just amazed that you think any
volunteer/private entity should have to satisfy all
critics.

> >So? Is that effort in any aspect illegal? Does the Detroit
> >auto industry not pursue similar efforts to influence
> >legislation favorable to its own end?
>
> ?

Lobbying by organizations that make similar
claims goes on all the time.

> >> By all the recorded history and empirical evidence of human
> >> behavior, those in control of some personal activity are
> >> likely to both retain that control and seek a continuation of
> >> their personal desires.
> >
> >Human nature...nothing new there.
>
> That sort of rationalization is the same as the critics of some
> control law, saying "you can't stop it if you just make laws
> about it!" :-)
>
> Okay, so you think it perfectly all right that a small group of
> movers and shakers who've gained control in a membership
> organization should rule over everyone else without question?

It is the "small groups" that control everything in all
aspects of life. They are NOT without question, but
if no one is dissatisfied, where's the beef.

> >YOU keep talking of skeptics but offer none other
> >than your own self.
>
> Ah, yes, you suddenly need documented proof of some
> existance of a "group?" :-)

So far that group of skeptics is a group of one.
You can stand on your own credibility as to if
anyone believes there are any but a handful of
people that side with your thinking.

> Skeptics abound here, on the public comment databases of
> the FCC, in every random gathering of radio amateurs and
> radio hobbyists and (probably) in the wastebaskets of an
> organization a few miles SW of Hartford, CT. We exist.

You may exist, but your impact is apparently minimal and,
more to the point, the skeptics haven't convinced any others
there is any sort of problem.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1922. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 23:49:44 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a75v5enuq1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37864

"Richard McCollum" <rmcollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:gfml8.18501$Ex5.1669445@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020318081008.03008.00000099@mb-mw.aol.com...
> > >It will sell some gear in the short run and it will reward some people
> > >although not the NCI poobahs who having served their purpose will more
> > >than likely get stabbed in the back.
> >
> > I dunno how you mean "stabbed in the back". Explain?
>
> I have somewhat the same problem I have with the upcoming feast of Ishtar.
> Who supplied the props, who puts up the money, who cooks the meals, and
> who does KP? Mary Magdelene may well have been an early-day roadie. This
> Magical Mystery Tour doesn't just appear out of nowhere and it does not
> wander aimlessly. When Simon Magus wanted to buy a franchise he may have
> told the world more than he intended.
>
> Now I will grant that NCI overestimates its own moxie and takes credit for
> things nearly as inevitable as sunrise in the East but it has shown signs
> of having coins and organization so my suspicious mind wonders whether
> this is not RFE or CARE all over again and I start looking for CIA/KGB
> (same people) involvement.

Yes sir...we have been outed. My membership # in NCI
is 1007. Note the "double Oh". We are "licensed to kill".

> If there is indeed background funding and/or
> direction it is for commercial purposes so equipment manufacturers etc are
> the suspects but I keep remembering that Annenberg was the only one who
> ever made any money from TV or horse racing so who knows.

ROTFLMAO.

> Regardless of the funding, come the Revolution the apparatchiks rarely
> survive. They may be allowed to fade into the background depending on how
> close they were to the core but if they have any expectation of leading
> the multitudes into the sunset they tend to be found in ditches.

I've said this before. When the code test goes, so ends my need
to be involved. I am now and will continue to be an ARRL
member and an ARRL field organization volunteer (LGL).

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1923. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 23:52:09 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <J4vl8.16914$tP2.1489420@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37863

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9clkpmmegl3f8@corp.supernews.com...
> This is a very interesting line of thought: Just what influence, and
> with whom, does the ARRL have? Inside the tent, the ARRL's
> staff surely has great control over the maganize's content, and that
> content provides the prinicpal means by which U.S. hams know
> what's what in U.S. amateur radio. This is not insignificant, is it?
> But beyond that, what did Ham Radio do to get so unimportant?

The progression of technology has inevitably passed by the ARS as any industry tends to do over time as it becomes increasingly specialized. And the lack of really good junque is an element as well. The biggest thing is that the emphasis has gone from dealing with people to dealing with machines, moving data etc. As a people service that in the case of CW valued the use of wetware more for grinsies and cheapitude it does not fit in too well with doing things in wholesale quantities from one machine to another. Remember the consumer side of electronics has been abandoned to the Orient, partially because of its own economics and partially because Sam pays better. You really gotta like punching an anonymous keyboard under an assumed name these days and that really is not in the Amateur tradition.

The League has overstated its influence in DC for many years and has paid the price in that when the code wars broke out both sides were firmly convinced the League was in league with Satan. It is widely thought the League is a lobbying org which in fact it cannot be and retain a non-profit postal permit among other things. But the fact is that the FCC has generally done what it is going to do with little input from those affected; and, in fact, the League has managed to keep the stupidities to a gentle ladylike belch on several occasions. When Sputnik went up, the ARS became a source of electronic genius for national defense and we were blessed with incentive licensing; now we are going to put on our Dudley suits and lead the natives in righteous paths thru our sterling personalities and interpretive dance. Not the first time, won't be the last.

There seems to be a good working relationship among the tech types lower in the orgs and you see a bit of mutual backscratch go on. The League blesses the guys who certify that you can't get local TV and need it on your DBS dish; a minor little problem but it gets Charlie off a hook.

Where the League may be criticized is its failure to be more of a pain in the drain about digital standards which are really backward. When you can do things under part 15 (Incidental transmitters) that you can't do under Part 97 the mirror is cracked.

>
> >The bond market has taken some heat out of the cellphone
> >biz but the Great Digital Disaster hangs like the proverbial
> >sword of Damocles.
>
> Again, for which frequences?

This is the new hi-definition system that will run in parallel with the existing and very obsolete NTSC so it is in the regular TV channels. Each broadcaster got another channel to do it in. As a result of several things, no new assignments above 50 are made but remember that in major areas 14-21 are also unavailable because UHF public service and commercial freqs are extended to 512 MHz, the so-called S and T bands if you own a scanner. So in a place like Chicago with the full VHF complement (2,4,5,7,9,11,13) plus some existing UHF it simply is not possible to maintain the traditional 6 channel spacing so 3 or four will have to do and quite possibly the 2 channel spacing of VHF.

The problem is that there is enough digital trash coming out to cover three channels already so I rather suspect that some ARS allocations will be taken to move T band. As well as this issue, there is the economic issue (TV is not the money spinner it once was) and some receive issues like T-Storms and MPD (ghosts) that have a habit of turning screens blue and sending digital decoders screaming for the exit. And if it works, coverage patterns will overlap like mad because digital sigs do have more effective range and obsolete existing stations. Odds are you could get STL or KC not to mention Des Moines and Little Rock and Omaha on a good day if you don't like Channel 8's version of Barbie and Ken bring you the news. This thing has more hair than a barber shop floor. Channel 8 in Milwaukee supposedly makes watching analog 8 in Grand Rapids MI across the lake virtually impossible outside of GR proper so they are not really compatible modes. Now when you realize that IL outside of Chi, IN, and a good part of OH are already UHF only and have been for centuries or so, the possibility of a major 'bloody balls up' is all too real. Then comes NYC, LA, SF, etc.

> > . . . nowhere in the Federal system, regulatory or legal, is anyone
> >bound by the pleadings; Federal judges like to reduce both attorneys
> >to an open-mouthed gape now and again for drill. For this purpose
> >groups like NCI are like Aquinas' 6th proof of the existence of God: if
> >they did not exist they would have to be invented.
>
> In intel circles they're called "useful idiots," I believe.

Most dictators have had similar names for them.

>
>
>
> >The restructuring took a long time and to my knowlege it was never
> >explained why but my guess is that it was largely a priority tussle and

> >the Commission finally looked at the staff like Pope Julius to
> >Michaelangelo and told them to bring an end to it. We got thrown into
> >the street. It was too small to be interesting.
>
> Surely it wasn't THAT reprehensible, was it? That is, this seems to
> BE reprehensible, in my view.

Depends on what you have in mind which is where this discussion began. If you are going to use ARS as a tackling dummy there is not a great amount of sense in being coy about it. The criteria seemed to be to withdraw as much staff involvement and other resources as possible, train ARS to paddle its own canoe in preparation for donning Dudley suits, and get on to bigger things. Actually it was, in light of the above, probably the right decision but it was kind of like taking a 50 story elevator ride in 17 seconds flat.

>
>
>
> Sigh.
>
> Val Germann
> Columbia, Missouri
> (I've been doing well on the QRZ exams! I hope that's a sign!)

It is and while you are at it, study Element 3 which is not nearly so technical as you might believe.

Some have had good luck with the ARRL code disk and some have downloaded Morse Academy from http://ah0a.org which I am told does not fly under XP. Compared to the crap we had to work with, you guys studying code have it soft. We went 12 miles uphill in both directions dodging hail stones to study code :-)

1924. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-18 23:59:47 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a75v5hnuq2@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37865

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020318032247.16195.00002532@mb-fm.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test
> >From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
> >Date: 03/17/02 13:42 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <a72obneto1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
>
> >The directors are elected by the memebership. Once so elected
> >they vote as they see fit. That's the SAME way the USA
> >legislative process works.
>
> Bill, did you have a really bad day or was this a typo?
>
> The directors are expected to carry out the wishes of thier
constituents,
> just like my state and local officals are expected to do.

So does your representative always vote as you wish?
Does s/he always "poll" everyone to know the latest position of the masses?

> When my local officials start acting on thier own accord, they get
> recalled.

Not all places have recall. Sometimes ya just gotta wait
until the next election.

> And when ARRL elected officials don't conduct themselves according
> to acceptable standards, THEY get recalled.

Pretty rare event. I note also that there has been no movement
to do so after the recent policy decision to not oppose dropping
the treaty requirement for morse.

> >They responded as elected directors and each voted according to
> >what they believed was the right thing to do.
>
> They have, as I always believe they have, responded according to what
the
> predominant opinion was of the electorate. It wasn't always what >>I<<
wanted,
> but the majority got the nod. And that's the way it's SUPPOSED to work.

Nope...the representatives CAN use whatever input they
want to vote on a position. There's NO requirement that they
follow some undefined majority. In the end, the next
election will bear out how far afield an individual may have gone

yet still be re-elected.

Reality, deal with it.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

>
>

1925. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 00:07:43 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <jjvl8.16965$tP2.1491678@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37866

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gt6o3i0.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Mon, 18 Mar 2002 14:39:56 -0600, Martin wrote:
>
>
> >I live in Billy Tauzin's Baliwick and you ain't too far off.
>
> What will it take for Billy to het the Commish' split intp two
> entities (just like Canada has), one dealing with "national policy"
> issues such as who gets broadcast and cellphone licenses ubder what
> conditions and the other dealing with keeping the spectrum clean?
>
> Those of us who serve(d) in the secomd group always feel/felt that
> the antics of the first hroup (the only part that The Congress ever
> sees) p-o-ed The Congress against giving us enough resources and
> authority to enable us to do our job properly.
>
> >Good summation.
>
> Yes,
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

Good point, Phil. As I recall, you were around in the days of the idiot Senator from RI or CT who wasn't going to give the FCC beans until they came up with a way to censor that rotten TV, and don't tell him about constitutionality not to mention the Communications Act.

For what it is worth, I have seen the same thing in private industry with similar effects.

Dick NBK

1926. Re: NCI finances/outside influences

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 00:37:17 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c9689f5_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 37867

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:gfml8.18501$Ex5.1669445@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > Now I will grant that NCI overestimates its own moxie and takes
credit for
> > things nearly as inevitable as sunrise in the East but it has
shown signs
> > of having coins and organization

Yes, we're organized in terms of presenting effective, rational arguments to radio regulatory agencies ... that's what it takes to be effective. (and whether you like to admit it or not, I think it's a fact that we HAVE been effective)

I'll take your admission that we're well organized as a compliment.

> > so my suspicious mind wonders whether
> > this is not RFE or CARE all over again and I start looking for
> > CIA/KGB (same people) involvement.

Richard ... you're going off the deep end here ... area you having a problem with black choppers circling your house or what??? :-)

> > If there is indeed background funding and/or
> > direction it is for commercial purposes so equipment manufacturers
> > etc are the suspects

FWIW, I give you and everyone else who may "wonder" my personal promise, on the lives of my 5 grandchildren, that there is NO "background funding and/or direction" involved in NCI. The treasury of NCI consists ENTIRELY of voluntary donations from individual members. $10donations are BY FAR the most common, with a modest number of $20s, a much smaller number of $50s, and only a handfull or so of $100 ... $100 is the largest individual donation we've ever received.

There is NO commerical sponsorship or direction ... we have done everything we've done with member support, volunteer directors, and no outside help or influence.

We have NEVER received a donation from an equipment manufacturer or supplier ... nothing but personal checks and money orders from individual members.

I hope that that sets that matter straight once and for all.

- - --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast.net> [personal and NCI-related mail]
<mailto:wa6vse-shack@fast.net> [sked, QSO/QSL, and usenet related
messages ONLY, please]
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- - --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- - --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPJaINpe+N6+q84HiEQI+xgCdGIfU2Pk1/BLa4J4YOx/SXv1wBB0An2S6
UGL+WPtBz9zqQHrsmCzyyj6v
=qHmF
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

1927. Re: NCI finances/outside influences

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 01:28:37 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <9vwl8.17141$tP2.1499501@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37868

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3c9689f5_1@news7.fast.net...
>
> > "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:gfml8.18501$Ex5.1669445@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > >
> > > Now I will grant that NCI overestimates its own moxie and takes
> credit for
> > > things nearly as inevitable as sunrise in the East but it has
> shown signs
> > > of having coins and organization
>
> Yes, we're organized in terms of presenting effective, rational
> arguments to radio regulatory agencies ... that's what it takes to
> be effective. (and whether you like to admit it or not, I think it's
> a fact that we HAVE been effective)
>
> I'll take your admission that we're well organized as a compliment.
>
> > > so my suspicious mind wonders whether
> > > this is not RFE or CARE all over again and I start looking for
> > > CIA/KGB (same people) involvement.
>
> Richard ... you're going off the deep end here ... area you having a
> problem with black choppers circling your house or what??? :-)
>
> > > If there is indeed background funding and/or
> > > direction it is for commercial purposes so equipment manufacturers
> > > etc are the suspects
>
> FWIW, I give you and everyone else who may "wonder" my
> personal promise, on the lives of my 5 grandchildren, that
> there is NO "background funding and/or direction" involved
> in NCI. The treasury of NCI consists ENTIRELY of voluntary
> donations from individual members. $10donations are BY
> FAR the most common, with a modest number of $20s, a
> much smaller number of $50s, and only a handfull or so of
> $100 ... $100 is the largest individual donation we've ever
> received.
>
> There is NO commerical sponsorship or direction ... we have
> done everything we've done with member support, volunteer
> directors, and no outside help or influence.
>

> We have NEVER received a donation from an equipment
> manufacturer or supplier ... nothing but personal checks and
> money orders from individual members.
>
> I hope that that sets that matter straight once and for all.
>
> - - --
> Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse

It does as far as I am concerned and no I don't have black helicopters but I did fraud detection for a living thru the biggest compooter in the state of Wisconsin for a while so perhaps I am overly skeptical; maybe that is why I got the job. Did it damned well, too. I will take your word for the finances.

Yes, I will give you credit for organization and generating paperwork to support decisions that are/were either inevitable or already made and have sent your names in nomination for the Ira Magaziner Trophy competition as a result. If 450 page books start showing up on a weekly basis you will know you won.

Still think it would be hilarious if it all went down the shitter in Geneva. Not that I particularly disagree with you but it would still be a lot of fun.

Have a splendid life!

Dick N BK

1928. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 01:48:38 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020318204838.21361.00002141@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 37869

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>Your question and answer about 5 wpm shows you may have been
>less than experienced with HF morse operation. The 5 wpm
>was the entry level just to allow one to get a CW Keyed rig
>on the air in the novice subbands to begin to get ones speed
>up to a "minimum" level suitable for operation in the larger
>portions of spectrum outside the novice subbands. 5 wpm was
>for entry level novices. Historically, 5 wpm was never
>intended to be an on-going minimum. Historically, it took
>10 to 13 wpm to be introduced to general use in the
>international arena of code not only amateur, but ship to
>ship, ship to shore, and other commercial use. 13 wpm was
>judged by many to be the minimum operating speed where one
>could say one had developed the ear/wetware modem
>coordination required for proper utilization of CW Morse.
>
>Of course now these facts will all be declared fabrications,
>and mythology by NCIists, ARRL Zombies, etc., in order to
>justify their beliefs and actions. Isn't it funny how
>historical revisionism works?

No, I would say that your history of the intent of 5 wpm vs 13 wpm is
reasonably accurate.

Bill, do you think he was correct in his assessment of the recent history of
code speeds?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1929. Re: For Discussion: ARRL Fee's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 01:51:59 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <3Rwl8.7750$g47.1510628545@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 37870

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C960B33.EFB755F5@IEEE.org...
> KC8PMX wrote:
> > Your ideas and thoughts....
>
> Lots of publications give discounted rates for new subscribers.
> I'm just waiting for next year when I get the senior discount.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Cecil, what age is that?

I think Ryan is on to something. Hey Ed...

Brian

1930. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 01:55:04 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <YTwl8.7751$ua7.1511036079@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 37871

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020318073223.29962.00001876@mb-cq.aol.com...
> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >Is that anything like "next Monday?" The only people who say "Monday
next"
> >are people doing an imitation of upper-crust British homosexuals.
Anyone in
> >
> >America who says that just wishes he was one.
>
> As I said, Larry is stirring the pot.
>
> It is unfortunate that apparently all he has left to say amounts to peeing
in
> the sandbox.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

I'd say he left some lumpy stuff, too. Brian

1931. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 01:56:43 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <vVwl8.7752$Vc7.1511185526@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 37872

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C96748C.A28B19F4@IEEE.org...
> Robert Casey wrote:
> > Also I don't think Texas is a retirement state.
>
> Also, he left out the amateur radio operators on Centauri Prime.

Is that where you're a 100 foot giant?

1932. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 02:02:10 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <C_wl8.7759$kn7.1511831766@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 37873

"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote in message
news:JKTj8.10108$Ex5.943149@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message:
> > "K7JEB" <k7jeb @ arrl.net> writes:
> >
> > >It's a dark night in the city. But in a small office
> > >up on the 12th floor of the Acme Building, one man
> > >still ponders the vagaries of human nature.....
> >
> > ...stroking his chin reflectively, he leaned against the
> > xerox machine again and again and again, lost in
> > thought...
>
> AT&T's newserver was screwed up. I kept trying and trying
> to post this supposedly humorous blivet and it kept telling
> me it couldn't find itself in the dark, all the while
> secretly posting every one of my attempts to everyone
> but me.
>
> My apologies to r.r.a.p. and W5DXP.
>
>
> --
> Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
> Glendale, Arizona

Can you work up a story with both Cecil Noir with Little Billy Beeper?

1933. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 02:02:25 UTC
From: Martin <mdwade@mobiletel.com>
Message-ID: <3C969C30.14E7@mobiletel.com>
Source record: 37875

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Mon, 18 Mar 2002 14:39:56 -0600, Martin wrote:
>
> >I live in Billy Tauzin's Baliwick and you ain't too far off.
>
> What will it take for Billy to het the Commish' split intp two
> entities (just like Canada has), one dealing with "national policy"
> issues such as who gets broadcast and cellphone licenses ubder what
> conditions and the other dealing with keeping the spectrum clean?

Probably a close election with some national interest, however, the
general
public does not have clue about this! Billy did, at one time, want to
do away with the FCC (Abolish the Commission (for you high dollar
wordsmiths))
and roll everything over to the Commerce Dept.
>
> Those of us who serve(d) in the secomd group always feel/felt that
> the antics of the first hroup (the only part that The Congress ever
> sees) p-o-ed The Congress against giving us enough resources and
> authority to enable us to do our job properly.
>
See explanation above.

> >Good summation.
>
> Yes,
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
73 de Martin N5PZJ

1934. Re: Looks like Mr. Carroll and others . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 02:05:50 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <22xl8.7761$Px7.1512510709@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 37874

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0203140504.584b361a@posting.google.com...
> Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv) <kf2ti@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:<a6p4vn$bc0$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > I am Rocky Anderson...errr Ricco
>
> Rocky Rococo, I presume
>
> (everyone knew her as Nancy)

I thought her name was "Lil," or was it "Eleanor Rigby?"

1935. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 02:14:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020318211451.00675.00000097@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 37876

In article <a75ufoold1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>You may exist, but your impact is apparently minimal and,
>more to the point, the skeptics haven't convinced any others
>there is any sort of problem.

Okay, should I give up NCI-4234 that I've held since Sunday?

:-)

1936. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 02:14:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020318211451.00675.00000096@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 37877

In article <J4vl8.16914$tP2.1489420@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
>news:u9clkpmmegl3f8@corp.supernews.com...
>> This is a very interesting line of thought: Just what influence, and
>> with whom, does the ARRL have? Inside the tent, the ARRL's
>> staff surely has great control over the maganize's content, and that
>> content provides the prinicpal means by which U.S. hams know
>> what's what in U.S. amateur radio. This is not insignificant, is it?
>> But beyond that, what did Ham Radio do to get so unimportant?
>
>The progression of technology has inevitably passed by the ARS as any
>industry tends to do over time as it becomes increasingly specialized.
>And the lack of really good junque is an element as well. The biggest
>thing is that the emphasis has gone from dealing with people to dealing
>with machines, moving data etc. As a people service that in the case of
>CW valued the use of wetware more for grinsies and cheapitude it does not
>fit in too well with doing things in wholesale quantities from one machine
>to another.

Isn't it just awful? Why, an average of half the households in the
USA have some kind of Internet access now (including 15% of the
households with income under $5000). One in four of the population
of the USA is a cellphone subscriber.

>Remember the consumer side of electronics has been abandoned
>to the Orient, partially because of its own economics and partially
>because Sam pays better. You really gotta like punching an anonymous
>keyboard under an assumed name these days and that really is not in the
>Amateur tradition.

Wearing eyeshades and sleeve garters isn't all that popular either.

>The League has overstated its influence in DC for many years and has paid
>the price in that when the code wars broke out both sides were firmly
>convinced the League was in league with Satan. It is widely thought the
>League is a lobbying org which in fact it cannot be and retain a
>non-profit postal permit among other things.

Hmmm...I would think that the FCC Reading Room has a rather
large collection of documents to prove the ARRL really IS a
lobbying special interest group. :-)

>But the fact is that the FCC
>has generally done what it is going to do with little input from those

>affected; and, in fact, the League has managed to keep the stupidities to
>a gentle ladylike belch on several occasions. When Sputnik went up, the
>ARS became a source of electronic genius for national defense and we were
>blessed with incentive licensing; now we are going to put on our Dudley
>suits and lead the natives in righteous paths thru our sterling
>personalities and interpretive dance.

I think you forgot "visions of sugar plums danced in their heads." :-)

>Where the League may be criticized is its failure to be more of a pain in
>the drain about digital standards which are really backward. When you can
>do things under part 15 (Incidental transmitters) that you can't do under
>Part 97 the mirror is cracked.

Awwww.... :-)

>This is the new hi-definition system that will run in parallel with the
>existing and very obsolete NTSC so it is in the regular TV channels. Each
>broadcaster got another channel to do it in. As a result of several
>things, no new assignments above 50 are made but remember that in major
>areas 14-21 are also unavailable because UHF public service and commercial
>freqs are extended to 512 MHz, the so-called S and T bands if you own a
>scanner. So in a place like Chicago with the full VHF complement
>(2,4,5,7,9,11,13) plus some existing UHF it simply is not possible to
>maintain the traditional 6 channel spacing so 3 or four will have to do
>and quite possibly the 2 channel spacing of VHF.

Oh, my, a "technical assessment" of DTV!

"Traditional channel spacing!" Yes, for tube-analog designs of
the late 1940s, over a half-century old. :-)

>The problem is that there is enough digital trash coming out to cover
>three channels already so I rather suspect that some ARS allocations will
>be taken to move T band.

"T band?" The DTV channel assignments have been publicly
given for two years or so. You can find out yourself (by using
a true or anonymous keyboard) at the FCC site.

The new channels already allocated have resulted in a SURPLUS
of spectrum once allocated to TV broadcast only. Several new
bands have been created for other radio services. That's also on
the FCC site but some of them are in archives that require a
search...but are still accessible and downloadable. Don't do that
if you feel a rant will be destroyed..

>As well as this issue, there is the economic
>issue (TV is not the money spinner it once was) and some receive issues
>like T-Storms and MPD (ghosts) that have a habit of turning screens blue
>and sending digital decoders screaming for the exit. And if it works,
>coverage patterns will overlap like mad because digital sigs do have more
>effective range and obsolete existing stations.

Oh? The engineering and testing by the "Grand Alliance" group was
extensive and lengthy. It's been reported at length by the IEEE, both
on SPECTRUM and on the website.

Of the three TV receivers we have here, the oldest being 14 years old,
none of them have a problem on receiving analog channels packed
side-by-side on cable...that including ALL the VHF channels from
2 through 13. Good separation on all, no problems. We've had
digital service for a half year with over a 120 channels plus another
40+ music-only channels with the only problem in discovering a
37-year-old coax extension going bad (replaced, no further
problems).

>Odds are you could get
>STL or KC not to mention Des Moines and Little Rock and Omaha on a good
>day if you don't like Channel 8's version of Barbie and Ken bring you the
>news. This thing has more hair than a barber shop floor. Channel 8 in
>Milwaukee supposedly makes watching analog 8 in Grand Rapids MI across the
>lake virtually impossible outside of GR proper so they are not really
>compatible modes. Now when you realize that IL outside of Chi, IN, and a
>good part of OH are already UHF only and have been for centuries or so,
>the possibility of a major 'bloody balls up' is all too real. Then comes
>NYC, LA, SF, etc.

Well sir, you ought to hiyaku right over to da FCC and EIA and the
DTV Alliance NOW and set them straight! [don't tell 'em you saw
Bigfoot, too, though...]

"Illinois outside of Chicago, Indiana, <etc> ...already UHF only and
have been for centuries or so"? Gosh, bigfoot, we were in Rockford
just a half year ago and channel 13 was still there as it was in '56,
also two UHF channels (up from one in '56 to two now). I might
agree on "Ken and Barbie" to some extent since only Ken's
granpa was doing things in front of a TK30 a half century ago.

You are free to fully try to explain the "merits" of old NTSC TV
on a fringe area (~90 miles) and try to tell me how "good" the
old system was in 1949 through 1952. Go ahead, make a day.

If you need some cynical soothing syrup, get out that old
"anonymous keyboard" and subscribe to nakednews.com.
They have Kens and Barbies without costume.

Better yet, spend some time at the FCC and review what
has ACTUALLY happened recently (say last 5 years) in and
about the old analog TV spectrum...and cruise on over to the
NTIA and check out their 2001 analysis of spectrum needs
for everyone, not just the government...or start some sort of
money-making scheme to buy a TV set and antenna made
after 1960. In dollar figures the new, better, many-channel TV
sets on today's market are less expensive than those of 1960.

>Some have had good luck with the ARRL code disk and some have downloaded
>Morse Academy from http://ah0a.org which I am told does not fly under XP.

>Compared to the crap we had to work with, you guys studying code have it
>soft. We went 12 miles uphill in both directions dodging hail stones to
>study code :-)

What, no ice or snow? Geez, whatta complainer!

Why is there a need for a code test at all in 2002?

1937. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 02:19:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C96A01E.D53D7C3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 37878

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3C954F95.2BC74E2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Fess up, Len. Nobody pulled any "I am the expert" routine here except
> >for you and perhaps Carl.
>
> Heh heh heh.
>
> You've kept that mantra for so long you are beginning to actually
> believe it to be true... :-)
>
> >You made a claim and were called on it.
>
> Noooo, noooo. This goes way back before NPRM 98-143 ever
> existed. All the big daddy PCTAs were jumping up and down
> about the "superiority" in all of radio of the OOK CW morsemen.

Oh, I see...

> Sorry old timer, but you and the rest of the big daddies got
> called and you and the rest got your collective ears pinned
> back. You've been pissed about that for a long time but can't
> admit it. Admission destroys the self-perceived "superiority"
> status.

Is that what happened, Len? I'll have to admit, as a fiction writer,
you're pretty good.

> >The
> >fact that you've been involved with HF communications before me will,
> >according to actuarial tables, even out.
>
> Heh heh heh. Another play on the "mortality" of chronological
> old timers. Don't worry. It's a phase that many middle aged
> men go through suddenly realizing that they will die someday.
> [see the statement of the resident 24/7 PMS sufferer that he
> "will live forever." :-)]

That's what it was, Len--a play on mortality based in fact.
By the way, I thought YOU were the resident 24/7 PMS sufferer.

> You can no longer accept something done by the US
> government in the much-larger-than-State military's radio use
> of HF as beginning phasing out OOK CW over a half century

> ago.

This would be a peculiar statement even if it was coherent. Now I'm
starting to have doubts about those writing skills of yours.

> Accepting something like that destroys your credibility
> as a whooper and hollerer for your kind of amateur radio.
> Accepting something like that goes against your elevation
> of morsemanship as a personal status symbol.

Are you now claiming that I haven't accepted that the U.S. government
does not use morse much anymore? It hasn't changed my status in being
skilled in the use of morse one iota.

> >Just think, Len--if you obtain
> >an amateur license, I'll have a 38 year head start on you.
>
> Heh heh heh. This presupposes that amateur radio is a
> total Lifestyle, that it is somehow more noble, glorious,
> and generally superior (probably in all aspects) to any
> professional experience in radio whatsoever. That's a
> very personal viewpoint only...it isn't nor was it ever a
> "qualification" of anything but a very personal opinion.

It doesn't presuppose any such thing. It means that if you obtain your
ticket tomorrow, I'll have a 38 year headstart on you. You've missed
decades of enjoyment of amateur radio.

> An amateur radio license is simply a federal permission,
> a grant to operate a radio transmitter in specific EM
> spectrum bands using certain allocated modes and
> obeying certain technical and operational regulations.
> It isn't an academic achievement certificate, never was.

I've held federal permission to operate an amateur radio station for 38
years (using certail allotcated modes and obeying certain technical and
operational regulations). Where did I state anything about an academic
achievement? I've had 38 years of enjoyment of amateur radio while
you've frittered.

> Now if there is this terrible need to insult and demean
> those who have differing opinions, let's just say that I
> became a human 16 years before Heil did...Heil is
> still working on that aspect. :-)

Maybe in 16 years I'll have a sudden revelation and become as you are--a
happy old man. Your joy over life's simple pleasures and your unique
ability to touch another's life are known throughout the land.

>
> >> You could just as well make the entreaty "Don't be controversial or
> >> nobody in here will like you." Oh, boo-hoo.
> >

> >This is one time that YOU can make the claim, "been there; done that;
> >got the T-shirt".
>
> I'm just repeating a stock phrase seen used by others in computer-
> modem communications since 1984. :-)

Why the parakeet imitation if you didn't mean what you wrote?

> I'm here just to champion the removal of the morse code test for
> an amateur radio license. No more, no less...BUT...the Lifestylers
> are terribly opposed to removing anything that They did to get into
> that Lifestyle...they demand a license before they will discuss
> anything. Here's a repeated quote from a Lifestyler:

> >> >>>Who would go to a non-ham for advice about amateur radio.

...and a fine champion you are, Len. You've managed to honk off
numerous fellows who've held licenses for decades as you go about
treading on the traditions of amateur radio and throw darts at the ARRL.

While we're at it, Leonard, what did you say to those fellows which you
claim (I haven't seen 'em so I doubt that your claim has any base in
truth) when they asked you to help them with the morse code?

>
> ...and then there's the ever-popular:
>
> >Maybe you should have gone to accredited schools.
>
> I did. Got the papers. Did the work. :-)

That isn't what you indicated in your statement (conveniently snipped to
avoid your further embarrassment).
>
> >Tell me, Len, just how did you go about cooking yourself?
>
> I don't need the Heil method..."bring up to a boil, simmer for
> a long time until way over-done." :-)

But you told us, using those superlative writing skills, that you cooked
yourself.

> >Amateur radio does not consist solely of radio theory.
>
> From talking with many radio amateurs, it doesn't even exist!
> :-)

I've not many any radio amateurs who believe that radio theory does not
exist. Can you produce one? I note that you don't deny my statement.
What do you offer the aspiring young ham in the way of the things I
asked you about?

> >Actually, failing to obtain an amateur license is not the same as
> >failing the exam. If someone fails to meet his goals, he does not fail

> >an exam.
>
> Heh heh heh...still on that kick, ey? Right away there is:
>
> >I've never DEMANDED anything of you at any time, Len. That'd make your
> >statement merde de bull.
>
> Not at all. Heil DEMANDS the achievement of a license or he will
> make up a lot of bullshit about "failing some personal goal." :-)

I have not DEMANDED that you obtain a license, Leonard H. That isn't true. I've pointed out that the fact that you are not a licensed ham gives your opinions less credibility than they would otherwise have.

> >Writing on something is not an indicator of expertise in a subject.
> >By the way, was most of your other stuff fiction?
>
> Yes and no. :-) There's a sort of joke in electronics engineering
> which concerns technical proposals. Some who have done them
> call them "science fiction" in fun, a jolly-time remark to others
> who've done the same. Heil doesn't appear to have done anything
> like that. Since he hasn't, he will surely make some demeaning,
> insulting remark about it. :-)

First you say, "Heil doesn't appear to..." and later you go on, "Since he doesn't..." It isn't clear whether you mean that you believe that I've had anything published or whether you mean that I've not had anything published in amateur radio periodicals or books.

I've written. I've written for Ham Radio Horzons, CQ and wrote a chapter of OH2BH's book "Where Do We Go Next?". I did some illustrations for another amateur radio book. I'm just finishing up a book on my travels with a slant toward the amateur radio operations. It'll be sold only on CD and will feature video clips, sound files and photos. Would you like to buy a copy?

> >They certainly can. I especially liked that part where you cooked
> >yourself.
>
> I'm so glad that Heil finds SOME joy in life! :-)

I do indeed find some joy, Len. You certainly help in keeping me entertained.

Dave K8MN

1938. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 02:22:14 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <qhxl8.7786$Z7.1514670349@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 37879

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020317141557.12652.00000182@mb-mq.aol.com...
> In article <a70m5f$p0q$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> > If you are code test advocate you might think that's great.
> >> > If you think for a minute, however, you'll see how the
> >> > "vote" is extremely narrow.
> >> >
> >>
> >> The "vote" for President of the US was also extremely
> >> narrow, but GWB is President.
> >
> >True, but the analogy is faulty since the DARC vote
> >is binding on no one but DARC as an entity...and that
> >is only because they choose to do so.
> >
> >Cheers,
> >Bill K2UNK
>
> Bill:
>
> If DARC wants to keep code testing, I'm sure the Deutsche Bundespost
> will vote that way at whatever WRC gets to decide the issue. You see,
> unlike the U.S. FCC, the Bundespost has no problem with the bureaucratic
> burden of code testing prospective radio amateurs.

What? No favorite German on the bus? How bout a good "knuckle dragging
lowlander" joke? You must be running out of material.

And Germans (like
> myself) aren't a bunch of lazy whiners. They get the job done.

Til the 'Mericans showed up. Whose Air Force were you in? Oh, that's
right, you are a blue-helmutted "citizen of the world."

1939. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 02:25:06 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C96A16E.79153444@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37880

Martin wrote:
>

>
> I live in Billy Tauzin's Baliwick and you ain't too far off.
> Good summation.
> Martin N5PZJ

He and J. Dingle looked good lecturing and threatening A.
Andersen and Enron on C-Span. No doubt U.S. has the best
Energy and Commerce oversite $$$$$ can buy.;-)

73,
Clay N4AOX

1940. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 02:31:25 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <1qxl8.7797$Zj.1515438271@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 37881

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020317114018.07168.00001772@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>
> > Unfortunately the FCC's hands are tied and have been due to treaties
that
> >they are not allowed to unilaterally ignore due to the flak they'd take
from
> >Congress, and ARRL respoonds to ARRL membership...NOT NCI. I am sure
there
> >are
> >many NCI folks who are both and express themselves accordingly, but there
is
> >no
> >requirement that ARRL take ANY heed from NCI policy or practice.
>
> ARRL and NCI had radically different positions. I am sure that NCI's
comments
> and reply comments were a significant part of ARRL's decision to do an Ex
Parte
> presentation to the FCC.

No kidding, more like pre-emption efforts with regard to restructuring.
Clay, however is referring to S25.5 at the 03 WRC.

Brian

1941. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 02:37:49 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <1wxl8.7799$vt.1516045420@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 37882

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C94E952.5D0D58A3@IEEE.org...
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > ... I do not believe that there has been any actual "full-up" effort
> > taken in many years to determine the actual position of a true majority
> > of the group, on code testing, and several other important issues.
>
> The ARRL did a survey a number of years ago. Approximately 2/3 of the
> respondees used CW "rarely" or "never", if I remember the survey words
> correctly. The other 1/3 said they "often" use CW. Many of the hams
> who answered "often" also "voted" to end the Morse code requirement.
> I wonder if the results of that survey are published anywhere on the
> web so you could take a look.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

We should have come up with a 7th license class at that point and moved all
the ARRL members to it.

1. Novice
2. Tech
3. Tech Plus
4. General
5. Advanced
6. Amateur Extra
7. CW Only

Brian

1942. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 02:38:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C96A493.F41F773E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 37883

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <a739hnntb1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> So far, the only "proof" has come from the ARRL itself.
> > >
> > >Len,
> > >Simple but serious question...
> > >Do you NOT believe the published meeting minutes of
> > >the ARRL Board?
> >
> > Bill, I don't know WHAT to believe. The ARRL says it does
> > things and the ARRL reports on what is said. Except for
> > documentation that gets into public release at government
> > sites, there's no way to find out what is really done in those
> > meetings or other closed function.

I probably shouldn't tell you this, Len, but the League sends us
detailed accounts of what transpires. These are sent only to full
members.

> > >Should every volunteer organization be subject to
> > >some outside "third party" audit to satisfy people
> > >who are NOT members? If yes, WHY?
> >
> > If they are as BIG as the ARRL and are making a profit
> > on producing-selling goods as a non-profit (organized)
> > organization, AND purport to "represent US amateur
> > radio" when they only support a demographically-skewed
> > membership, a resounding YES!

So organizations like the American Legion, the NRA, AARP are guilty of
something too. They purport to represent some segment of the American
population and serve a demographically skewed membership. You might
have uncovered some things which may make life dangerous for you.
Better keep mum.

> > If they can't make things open, then they ought to cut out
> > the deception of "representation" and "democratic whatsis"
> > and "they are the only organization looking out for amateur
> > radio."
> >
> > >> Here's the self-defining mechanism of this "insider" business:
> > >>

> >> 1. One cannot be a director without having a voting membership.
> >> 2. Voting membership is defined by the grant of an amateur
> >> license.
> >> 3. The ARRL controls the voting process.
> >> 4. The ARRL controls announcement of "winners."
> >>
> >> The basic flaw is that there is no way to ascertain that voting
> >> went according to democratic principles. As a private
> >> organization, the ARRL is NOT bound by the same laws that
> >> apply to US government elected officials or legislative matters.
> >
> >NOR is any other private organization.
>
> There are private (legal term) organizations and then there are
> private (closed-door) organizations. Then there's one which is
> both plus makes and sells goods.

Still wondering what's going on up in the lodge hall?

> >Why is that so hard for you (Len) to understand.?
>
> Why is it so hard for you (Bill) to understand why skeptics are
> skeptical?

You are beginning to sound like Harold Pransky. Harold lives up in Washington or Oregon and used to send 9 x 12" envelopes to the embassy in Gaborone, Botswana about once every six months or so. We didn't have to open the envelopes to see Harold's messages. They were all written in crayon, magic marker and colored pencil on the outside. There was nothing on the inside.

Harold had obviously uncovered some sort of conspiracy since his envelopes were usually addressed to "The American Embassy, Puppet masters of the Government of Botswana". Nobody could figure what tripped Harold's trigger on Botswana much as no one can understand how your amateur radio fetish came to be. Mr. Pransky's message seemed to be, "E=mc2=(drawing of a mushroom cloud). I understood his message better than I understand yours.

> If a Belief is really True, it should stand up to skeptical inquiry.

...so far, so good.

> Problem is that all the True Believers are truly offended by any
> and all skepticsm.

Spinoza?

> >So? Is that effort in any aspect illegal? Does the Detroit
> >auto industry not pursue similar efforts to influence
> >legislation favorable to its own end?
>
> ?

>
> >> By all the recorded history and empirical evidence of human
> >> behavior, those in control of some personal activity are
> >> likely to both retain that control and seek a continuation of
> >> their personal desires.
> >
> >Human nature...nothing new there.
>
> That sort of rationalization is the same as the critics of some
> control law, saying "you can't stop it if you just make laws
> about it!" :-)

> Okay, so you think it perfectly all right that a small group of
> movers and shakers who've gained control in a membership
> organization should rule over everyone else without question?

What small group of movers and shakers? The board is elected by us.
There is a director from each ARRL division. The candidates are
nominated by those within each division. By the way, we don't elect
these folks to rule over us. We're also permitted to question.

> >YOU keep talking of skeptics but offer none other
> >than your own self.
>
> Ah, yes, you suddenly need documented proof of some
> existance of a "group?" :-)
>
> Skeptics abound here, on the public comment databases of
> the FCC, in every random gathering of radio amateurs and
> radio hobbyists and (probably) in the wastebaskets of an
> organization a few miles SW of Hartford, CT. We exist.

Organize.

Dave K8MN

1943. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 02:39:04 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <cxxl8.7801$YB.1516599447@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 37884

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C94F252.6F316B79@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Valentine Germann wrote:
> > > ... I do not believe that there has been any actual "full-up" effort
> > > taken in many years to determine the actual position of a true
majority
> > > of the group, on code testing, and several other important issues.
> >
> > The ARRL did a survey a number of years ago. Approximately 2/3 of the
> > respondees used CW "rarely" or "never", if I remember the survey words
> > correctly. The other 1/3 said they "often" use CW. Many of the hams
> > who answered "often" also "voted" to end the Morse code requirement.
> > I wonder if the results of that survey are published anywhere on the
> > web so you could take a look.
>
> This sure is a fuzzy answer for a "black and white" logic
> purist.;-) If "Many" means most, say 2/3, then 2/3 of 1/3 =
> 2/9 of those responding. So does 2/9 carry the day?
> Are you responding to the question about a "full-up" effort
> by your recollections of this survey?
>
> Since Morse testing was only required for HF operations, why
> not survey the HF operators?
>
> 73,
> Clay N4AOX

1944. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 02:39:45 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Rxxl8.7802$KG.1516912864@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 37885

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C94F252.6F316B79@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Valentine Germann wrote:
> > > ... I do not believe that there has been any actual "full-up" effort
> > > taken in many years to determine the actual position of a true
majority
> > > of the group, on code testing, and several other important issues.
> >
> > The ARRL did a survey a number of years ago. Approximately 2/3 of the
> > respondees used CW "rarely" or "never", if I remember the survey words
> > correctly. The other 1/3 said they "often" use CW. Many of the hams
> > who answered "often" also "voted" to end the Morse code requirement.
> > I wonder if the results of that survey are published anywhere on the
> > web so you could take a look.
>
> This sure is a fuzzy answer for a "black and white" logic
> purist.;-) If "Many" means most, say 2/3, then 2/3 of 1/3 =
> 2/9 of those responding. So does 2/9 carry the day?
> Are you responding to the question about a "full-up" effort
> by your recollections of this survey?
>
> Since Morse testing was only required for HF operations, why
> not survey the HF operators?

Why not just let the ARRL speak for all amateurs?

1945. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 02:56:49 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c97faad_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38008

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020319002214.16994.00000309@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <qhxl8.7786$Z7.1514670349@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> Bill:
> >>
> >> If DARC wants to keep code testing, I'm sure the Deutsche Bundespost
> >> will vote that way at whatever WRC gets to decide the issue. You see,
> >> unlike the U.S. FCC, the Bundespost has no problem with the
bureaucratic
> >> burden of code testing prospective radio amateurs.
> >
> >What? No favorite German on the bus? How bout a good "knuckle dragging
> >lowlander" joke? You must be running out of material.
> >
> >And Germans (like
> >> myself) aren't a bunch of lazy whiners. They get the job done.
> >
> >Til the 'Mericans showed up. Whose Air Force were you in? Oh, that's
> >right, you are a blue-helmutted "citizen of the world."
>
> Brian:
>
> They got Mexicans in Germany? They must have got their wet backs
> from swimming across the Atlantic, then. Of course, someone has
> to harvest all those cabbages and potatoes, and pick those grapes
> in the vinyards. Axeually, I think Mexicans serve a very useful
> purpose. Someone has to do the menial, back-breaking manual
> tasks of the world. I say they are perfectly welcome here in the U.S.,
> as long as they are legally emigrated, card-carrying, and learn to
> read and speak enough American English to get along. In fact, if
> they ever figured out that by using their human intelligence, initiative,
> and ingenuity -- and got a good education, learned to speak English,
> and dropped their goal of living off of the American Welfare State,
> they could be a very powerful force in this country in a generation
> or two. However, if they had what it took to get that kind of power,
> they would have their own paradise down in Mexico, and wouldn't
> need to come up here, would they?
>
> If Bush signs this Amnesty legislation for the illegal XE's, he will have
> lost my vote in '04 -- war or no war.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

>

Larry's one of these folks that says "I'm not prejudice at all" with a big grin on his face, probably prays to God for "them" also.

Kim W5TIT

1946. Re: For Discussion: ARRL Fee's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 03:01:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C96A9F4.4ACBCBCC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37887

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C960B33.EFB755F5@IEEE.org...
> > KC8PMX wrote:
> > > Your ideas and thoughts....
> >
> > Lots of publications give discounted rates for new subscribers.
> > I'm just waiting for next year when I get the senior discount.
>
> Cecil, what age is that?

65 - I only renewed for one year this time.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1947. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 03:07:21 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c97fd27_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38010

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020319003228.09247.00001994@mb-cs.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test
> >From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
> >Date: 03/18/02 18:59 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <a75v5hnuq2@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
>
> >So does your representative always vote as you wish?
> >Does s/he always "poll" everyone to know the latest position of the
masses?
>
> Voting as >>I<< wish..??? Of course not, not always, but they
CERTAINLY
> do not simply do as they see fit, either!
>
> One very popular US President tried that "silent majority" tack for
taking
> his own advice, and you see what it got him!
>

I wish I had a video, and wish I'd saved a couple of letter responses I've received from "my representative" when I've visited their office and/or written letters. More than once I have literally been told, "my constituents do not fully understand this issue and I will vote as *I* best see the issue." No joke, been told that a few times.

> >
> > When my local officials start acting on thier own accord, they get
> >> recalled.
> >
> >Not all places have recall. Sometimes ya just gotta wait
> >until the next election.
>
> Don't have recall? What public office cannot be recinded by popular
or
> Congressional vote?
>

How many people are *that* motivated, Steve? I mean, really. Even with the crap in the Clinton Whitehouse there just wasn't enough public outcry to do a thing about it. Hell, Congress even acted against the will of the people on that one! The inaction against that was amazing to me.

> >>
> >> And when ARRL elected officials don't conduct themselves according

> >> to acceptable standards, THEY get recalled.
> >
> >Pretty rare event.
>
> Excuse me? Without going back through the last couple month'sQST's,
an SM
> was removed for just such reasons.
>

Bill said "rare" not implying it never happens. That's the first time I've ever heard of it happening...and was that at the will of the Section Membership, or the ARRL leadership? There's a difference.

> >
> >I note also that there has been no movement
> >to do so after the recent policy decision to not oppose dropping
> >the treaty requirement for morse.
>
> EXACTLY what I have been saying to Clay. While it certainly remains
a
> topic of conversation, the "Morse Code" issue is not the firebrand it used
to
> be.
>
> Just as I said of my own opinions...I don't particularly like it, but
it
> was given it's day in the court of public opinion, and now it's time to
move
> on. There are REAL policy issues to get on with, yet they still are
ignored by
> those who figure someone else will do something about it.
>

Therein lies the issue and the problem with membership stuff...there's never that many paying members who are involved in the decision making process.

> >Nope...the representatives CAN use whatever input they
> >want to vote on a position. There's NO requirement that they
> >follow some undefined majority.
>
> In my Congressional District there is no "undefined majority". It IS
my
> fellow voters in this district.
>
> And there IS a requirement that they represent us per our wishes.
>

There's no such requirement...unless you are speaking of intrinsically. There is no obligation a governmental representative has to do as his/her constituents wish. Most act within their boundaries and get away with a whole, whole lot--leaving many people to feel as though they have no power to change a thing. Why? Because good little rep is up there acting so

within the boundaries that not enough people get stirred enough to do a thing about it.

> >
> >In the end, the next
> >election will bear out how far afield an individual may have gone
> >yet still be re-elected.
>
> If the representitive has stayed the course with popular opinion of
the
> constituents all-the-while having not been caught doing dope or molesting
> teenage pages, they stand a pretty good chance of keeping thier job.
>

They will more generally be allowed to stay in office because they a)have more money than their opponent, b) have a couple of gimmee votes during their term that people really liked, c) have more exposure, etc., etc.

> >Reality, deal with it.
>
> I am not the one having the problem here, Bill.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>

I don't think there's a problem. An obvious differing of opinion, but no problem.

Kim W5TIT

1948. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 03:11:57 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c97fe38$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38015

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020319204808.27626.00000357@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article <u9darbppq9om73@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
> <vgermann@socket.net> writes:
>
> >Well, I ** did ** pass the Technician test this evening,
> >with 100 percent.
>
> Val:
>
> Congratulations on the remarkable achievement of passing a test
> that can be passed by any reasonably intelligent 2nd-grader with
> a copy of "Now You're Talking!" Now, to get your General, you've
> got to somehow beat that nasty 'ole 5 WPM Morse hazing ritual.
> Good luck -- you're gonna need it
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Val, meet the very dark side of amateur radio. Then promptly ignore it, as most of us do.

Kim W5TIT

1949. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 03:14:51 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C96AD17.111D9DDD@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37889

Bill Sohl wrote:

>
> Buy QST then and read the meeting minutes.
>
Oops better hurry Bill. The BoD (no doubt on a
recommendation by the Newington Crowd) just voted to strike
the minutes from the QST. The motion claimed that
eliminating 12 b&W pages a year from print would justify the
cut. They also cut Section News.
>
> > >Should every volunteer organization be subject to
> > >some outside "third party" audit to satisfy people
> > >who are NOT members? If yes, WHY?

501-C3 probably.

>
> Lobbying by organizations that make similar
> claims goes on all the time.

Lobbying is prohibited by the ARRL charter or by-laws, I
believe.
>

> It is the "small groups" that control everything in all
> aspects of life. They are NOT without question, but
> if no one is dissatisfied, where's the beef.
>

How small? Like Bill Aramony and the United Way of America?

1950. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 03:16:18 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9daaoj7j82db0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37886

Richard McCollum wrote:

A whole lot of very interesting stuff that's going to take me
a while to digest. In the meantime, I passed the Tech test
this evening with 100 percent, thank heaven. That is, I went
in with a fellow-traveler from our astronomy club, who got
100 percent also. I had missed one I never would have heard
the end of it, just because . . .

Anyway, I studied hard for it and feel I know most the
material that I was not familiar with before. That is, I
know how to solder and have had electronics training,
though it was a while back, in the military.

Very much fun this evening and I'm going to enjoy being a
member of this group here in Columbia. I've already paid
my dues and they even voted me in late last week! So, I
guess I'm "inside the tent" for sure now!

Val

1951. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 03:18:14 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <W5yl8.19906$Ex5.1760929@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37890

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9daaoj7j82db0@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> A whole lot of very interesting stuff that's going to take me
> a while to digest. In the meantime, I passed the Tech test
> this evening with 100 percent, thank heaven. That is, I went
> in with a fellow-traveler from our astronomy club, who got
> 100 percent also. I had missed one I never would have heard
> the end of it, just because . . .
>
> Anyway, I studied hard for it and feel I know most the
> material that I was not familiar with before. That is, I
> know how to solder and have had electronics training,
> though it was a while back, in the military.
>
> Very much fun this evening and I'm going to enjoy being a
> member of this group here in Columbia. I've already paid
> my dues and they even voted me in late last week! So, I
> guess I'm "inside the tent" for sure now!
>
> Val

Good job. Voted in, aye? I assume that you also got the flashlite test. Point it in one ear and see what sort of interesting pattern is projected on the wall.

A good club is a joy. If you can get into one that doesn't take anything super seriously and keeps the close-order drill to a minimum it adds a lot.

But with your background, try not to be Field Day Chairman for a year or so. One of the minor problems of having an outdoor hobby. You would be amazed how popular telescopes are at FD.

A lot of what this is about is making a plan and executing it. That you have done and a tip of the hat to you.

Dick, Nudnick Zilch Bionic Klutz

1952. Re: For Discussion: ARRL Fee's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 03:18:23 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c97ffba$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38016

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020319172942.06015.00002603@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >I think Ryan is on to something. Hey Ed...
>
> ARRL at one point in the not distant past had a 3-month trial membership
at a
> substantial discount. I don't think there were many takers. I don't know
if it
> is still available, although I suspect not because I couldn't find
anything on
> the ARRL Web site. Of course, as anyone who has searched the ARRL Web
site,
> that doesn't necessarily prove anything. :-)
>
> ARRL does offer Senior rates at $34 a year, if memory serves, and has
> substantial discounts for young hams if they are the oldest ham in their
> household.
>
> And either way, Ed doesn't get to make these policies. I suggest that
those
> that feel ARRL membership should be available to new members at a one-time
> discount should let their Division Director know their views.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Knock-Knock...may be preaching to the choir here but I'll say it again: the ARRL is losing/has lost membership because, at least in this Section, there is little to no discussion on the air of ARRL happenings... No incentive to join, because there's nothing "in it" locally. No, I don't feel that way, but I bet on a dollar that many do feel that way, in the NTX Section--and we hear Jim Haynie on the air all the time.

Wish HQ could inspire Sections to be more active. Oh, and nightly NTS nets don't do it...the idea of net participation for most hams is met with dread...LOL

Kim W5TIT

1953. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations/problem Hams vs Good Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 03:21:18 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c98006a_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38017

"Russell Todd" <RussellTodd@istoreplus.net> wrote in message
news:217b8ae4.0203190928.2458aaa@posting.google.com...
> Now we've taken a survey of Ham operators in Cornelia, Georgia and
> found that some of them are Shortwave Pirates. KE4ENX is the famous
> Radio Bob and when he ain't jamming the local VHF repeaters here and
> in Cleveland, GA, because he opposes code and won't get a license
> upgrade from Tech, he's yapping on 27.455 Childrens Band causing
> trouble, calling people names, making false accusations. Eveytime he
> tunes up on 6955khz he blocks out TV's all over Mt. Airy and Cornelia
> and us legal Hams get blamed. Considering there aren't but a few of
> us in Cornelia, does anyone have any recomendation as to what we can
> do about KE4ENX and his illegal Radio Bob transmissions? Legal
> suggestions only, he ain't worth going to jail over!

You just may end up in court for the above, yourself. You have other avenues available, such as a report to the FCC, with recordings of the things you speak of. All you get here in this newsgroup is...well, nothing. And, if this person happens to see your post--you are the one who may end up in court on the wrong side of a lawsuit.

Caution advised.

Kim W5TIT

1954. Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 03:25:06 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9darbppq9om73@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37888

Hello, all!

Well, I ** did ** pass the Technician test this evening,
with 100 percent. I was in competition with another
fellow (we're both long-time members of the local
astronomy club) and he got 100 percent as well. If
I had missed one, well, I never would have heard the
end of it, just because . . .

We both took the test seriously and studied hard.

My neighbor down the street, the guy who started me
down this road, took my dues for the local club last
week and they voted me in a few days ago, on his
word that I would pass. So, the heat was REALLY on!

I'm very happy to at last be a ham and have already
started on the General book and the CW. Also, the
amateur satellite programs have a lot of interest for
me, particularly because I give fifteen to twenty
programs per year on astronomy, about half of them
to schools. Now, I can have a radio component in
those programs!

Val Germann
Columbia, Missouri
(waiting for a call sign on the QRZ site!)

**

1955. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 03:36:30 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9dbgkmbf45a4a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37891

>Also, the amateur satellite programs have a lot
>of interest for me, particularly because I give fifteen
>to twenty programs per year on astronomy, about half
>of them to schools. Now, I can have a radio component
>in those programs!

These programs are to both elementary and high
schools. But, hey, even my college students are
going to hear about amateur radio now!

Val

1956. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 04:17:22 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C96BBBE.76DA823E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37896

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
>
> > And when ARRL elected officials don't conduct themselves according
> > to acceptable standards, THEY get recalled.

Check p. 60, March QST: Now the ARRL executive committee
can banish elected Section Managers and keep them banished,
"for the good of amateur radio" of course. No recall
required. Guess who makes up the executive committee?

> Nope...the representatives CAN use whatever input they
> want to vote on a position. There's NO requirement that they
> follow some undefined majority. In the end, the next
> election will bear out how far afield an individual may have gone
> yet still be re-elected.

That is if the membership can find out how the Div.Dir.
voted.

>
> Reality, deal with it.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
> >
> >

73,
Clay N4AOX

1957. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 04:46:42 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9dfkbm0ej9mc5@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37897

Richard McCollum wrote:

>Good job. Voted in, aye? I assume that you also got
>the flashlite test. Point it in one ear and see what sort
>of interesting pattern is projected on the wall.

Actually, they haven't done that yet because I was not
at that last meeting in person. I'll be careful NEXT month!

>A good club is a joy. If you can get into one that doesn't take
>anything super seriously and keeps the close-order drill to a
>minimum it adds a lot.

They seem pretty even-tempered and quite friendly.

>But with your background, try not to be Field Day Chairman
>for a year or so. One of the minor problems of having an
>outdoor hobby. You would be amazed how popular tele-
>scopes are at FD.

I'm going to have to miss this year's field day because
a trip to Mexico has been on the calendar for quite a while.
But something tells me the club has plans for me in 2003!

>A lot of what this is about is making a plan and executing
>it. That you have done and a tip of the hat to you.

So far, so good. Next month, the General written test
and the CW. We'll see!

>Dick, Nudnick Zilch Bionic Klutz

Val -- Kinda klutzy with a soldering iron these days
due to lack of recent practice!

**

1958. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 05:04:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020319000425.09247.00001988@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 37898

>Subject: Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/18/02 21:14 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020318211451.00675.00000097@mb-ma.aol.com>

>Okay, should I give up NCI-4234 that I've held since Sunday?

CERAINLY NOT! That's as close as you will ever get to an American issued
callsign!

1959. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 05:16:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020319001624.09247.00001991@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 37899

>Subject: Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/18/02 17:25 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020318172530.23057.00000117@mb-fk.aol.com>

>>Fess up, Len. Nobody pulled any "I am the expert" routine here except
>>for you and perhaps Carl.
>
>Heh heh heh.
>
>You've kept that mantra for so long you are beginning to actually
>believe it to be true.

Almost true, Lennie. You have never SAID "I am the expert"...You have
just slandered, cussed and denigrated anyone/everyone else EXCEPT yourself that
dared to utter a remotely-technical sounding utterance.

>Sorry old timer, but you and the rest of the big daddies got
>called and you and the rest got your collective ears pinned
>back.

This is cute! Just three weeks ago you were vehemently denying that any
precedent had been established in the recent restructuring, and NOW you are
claiming we "got (our) ears pinned back".

Which story are you standing on today, Your Confusedness?

>[see the statement of the resident 24/7 PMS sufferer that he
>"will live forever."]

I never remember seeing you post such a statement, Lennie.

>>Just think, Len--if you obtain
>>an amateur license, I'll have a 38 year head start on you.
>
>Heh heh heh. This presupposes that amateur radio is a
>total Lifestyle, that it is somehow more noble, glorious,
>and generally superior (probably in all aspects) to any
>professional experience in radio whatsoever. That's a
>very personal viewpoint only...it isn't nor was it ever a
>"qualification" of anything but a very personal opinion.

Nope. You try to "read in" something here. Balck and white is not your
forte, is it?

>I'm here just to champion the removal of the morse code test for
>an amateur radio license. No more, no less.

The reams of crap you have archived in Google are testimony to the lie you just uttered here, Untruthful One.

>>Maybe you should have gone to accredited schools.
>
>I did. Got the papers. Did the work.

Yep...Fourteen years to complete a 3 year program. Real impressive.

Yep...rrreeeeeeaaaaalllllll impressive.

SR

1960. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 05:22:12 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020319002212.16994.00000306@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 37900

In article <a73ptv$1ak$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>
>Val,
>
>Isn't it great to have friends :-) The above from
>one of the esteemed Pro-code Test Advocates.
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK

Bill:

Hey, don't I at least get credit for being PolitiKally-KorrecKt? You'll
notice I didn't use the "f-" word that rhymes with "maggot!"

73 de Larry, K3LT

1961. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 05:22:12 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020319002212.16994.00000307@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 37901

In article <20020318073223.29962.00001876@mb-cq.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>Is that anything like "next Monday?" The only people who say "Monday next"
>>are people doing an imitation of upper-crust British homosexuals. Anyone
>in
>>
>>America who says that just wishes he was one.
>
>As I said, Larry is stirring the pot.
>
>It is unfortunate that apparently all he has left to say amounts to peeing in
>the sandbox.

And, of course, since Ed has had his Sense-Of-Humorectomy, he wouldn't see it any other way!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1962. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 05:22:13 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020319002213.16994.00000308@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 37902

In article <u9br7d272gl216@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>>America who says that just wishes he was one. Perhaps (notice I didn't say
>>"methinks?") you've seen one too many episodes of "Masterpiece Theatre."
>
>Careful! I may have to sic my 9-year-old daughter and her Daisy
>CO2 pistol on you!

That wouldn't be a very good idea, Val. BTW I hope she doesn't take
that Daisy to school with her. Why is a 9-year old in possession of
such a thing, anyway? I was 14 before I ever handled a .22 rifle, and
never owned a handgun until I was almost 25.

>She's a big fan of Jeeves and Wooster on PBS.

I'm a big fan of anything with Fry and Laurie in it -- the Jeeves and
Wooster series was great -- wish they'd re-run it locally, but all WHYY
in Philadelphia does is run 3-week long pledge breaks every two months.
All we get to see are PH.d's giving motivational lectures and the Three
Tenors, that kind of crap -- between the whining and the phone numbers
on the screen. Personally, I'd rather watch the commercials. At
least they inform me of products and services I'd be interested in as
a consumer. I have no use for a WHYY-logo'ed 100% cotton shopping
bag as my free gift for a $60 membership pledge!

>In any event, I meant to say THIS Monday, that is, TONIGHT! The
>original expression came about when I failed to type "next" before
>"Monday" and so put it in afterwards. When it was still grammaticaly
>correct, I left it. Sheesh, and I thought ** I ** could be testy and rude
>sometimes -- for no apparent reason!
>
>Give me a BREAK, will ya!
>
>Val

Hey, man, this is Usnet. Get over it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1963. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 05:22:14 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020319002214.16994.00000309@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 37903

In article <qhxl8.7786$Z7.1514670349@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> Bill:
>>
>> If DARC wants to keep code testing, I'm sure the Deutsche Bundespost
>> will vote that way at whatever WRC gets to decide the issue. You see,
>> unlike the U.S. FCC, the Bundespost has no problem with the bureaucratic
>> burden of code testing prospective radio amateurs.
>
>What? No favorite German on the bus? How bout a good "knuckle dragging
>lowlander" joke? You must be running out of material.
>
>And Germans (like
>> myself) aren't a bunch of lazy whiners. They get the job done.
>
>Til the 'Mericans showed up. Whose Air Force were you in? Oh, that's
>right, you are a blue-helmutted "citizen of the world."

Brian:

They got Mexicans in Germany? They must have got their wet backs
from swimming across the Atlantic, then. Of course, someone has
to harvest all those cabbages and potatoes, and pick those grapes
in the vinyards. Axeually, I think Mexicans serve a very useful
purpose. Someone has to do the menial, back-breaking manual
tasks of the world. I say they are perfectly welcome here in the U.S.,
as long as they are legally emigrated, card-carrying, and learn to
read and speak enough American English to get along. In fact, if
they ever figured out that by using their human intelligence, initiative,
and ingenuity -- and got a good education, learned to speak English,
and dropped their goal of living off of the American Welfare State,
they could be a very powerful force in this country in a generation
or two. However, if they had what it took to get that kind of power,
they would have their own paradise down in Mexico, and wouldn't
need to come up here, would they?

If Bush signs this Amnesty legislation for the illegal XE's, he will have
lost my vote in '04 -- war or no war.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1964. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 05:32:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020319003228.09247.00001994@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 37904

>Subject: Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test
>From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>Date: 03/18/02 18:59 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <a75v5hnuq2@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>

>So does your representative always vote as you wish?
>Does s/he always "poll" everyone to know the latest position of the masses?

Voting as >>I<< wish..??? Of course not, not always, but they CERTAINLY
do not simply do as they see fit, either!

One very popular US President tried that "silent majority" tack for taking
his own advice, and you see what it got him!

> When my local officials start acting on thier own accord, they get
>> recalled.
>
>Not all places have recall. Sometimes ya just gotta wait
>until the next election.

Don't have recall? What public office cannot be recinded by popular or
Congressional vote?

>> And when ARRL elected officials don't conduct themselves according
>> to acceptable standards, THEY get recalled.
>
>Pretty rare event.

Excuse me? Without going back through the last couple month'sQST's, an SM
was removed for just such reasons.

>I note also that there has been no movement
>to do so after the recent policy decision to not oppose dropping
>the treaty requirement for morse.

EXACTLY what I have been saying to Clay. While it certainly remains a
topic of conversation, the "Morse Code" issue is not the firebrand it used to
be.

Just as I said of my own opinions...I don't particularly like it, but it
was given it's day in the court of public opinion, and now it's time to move
on. There are REAL policy issues to get on with, yet they still are ignored by
those who figure someone else will do something about it.

>Nope...the representatives CAN use whatever input they
>want to vote on a position. There's NO requirement that they
>follow some undefined majority.

In my Congressional District there is no "undefined majority". It IS my fellow voters in this district.

And there IS a requirement that they represent us per our wishes.

>In the end, the next
>election will bear out how far afield an individual may have gone
>yet still be re-elected.

If the representitive has stayed the course with popular opinion of the constituents all-the-while having not been caught doing dope or molesting teenage pages, they stand a pretty good chance of keeping thier job.

>Reality, deal with it.

I am not the one having the problem here, Bill.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1965. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 05:41:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020319004152.09255.00002125@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 37905

>Subject: Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 03/19/02 00:04 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020319000425.09247.00001988@mb-cs.aol.com>
>
>>Subject: Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 03/18/02 21:14 Eastern Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20020318211451.00675.00000097@mb-ma.aol.com>
>
>>Okay, should I give up NCI-4234 that I've held since Sunday?
>
> CERAINLY NOT! That's as close as you will ever get to an American
>issued
>callsign!

As a matter of fact, why not drop the hyphen, and then you can use it on
one of your AMA RC models as it's "registration" number on the wings?

1966. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 10:26:20 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020319052620.24400.00001434@mb-de.news.cs.com>
Source record: 37906

>Well, I ** did ** pass the Technician test this evening,
>with 100 percent.

Congratulations! Best of luck to you on the General and Element 1.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

1967. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 11:16:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020319061648.05983.00002300@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 37907

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Hey, man, this is Usnet. Get over it.

Yeah, Val; guys like Larry have decided that Usenet should be a place where they can say anything they want and get away with it. The fact that most people would prefer that it be a place where reasoned discussions take place notwithstanding.

If you want to see an interesting reaction, mention the rec.radio newsgroups in amateur social circles and see the result of Larry's "get over it" attitude. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1968. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 11:20:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020319062017.05983.00002301@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 37908

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>Check p. 60, March QST: Now the ARRL executive committee
>can banish elected Section Managers and keep them banished,
>"for the good of amateur radio" of course.

If you don't like the decision, don't vote for your Director next time he comes up for election.

>Guess who makes up the executive committee?

No need to guess, Clay; the EC is made up of elected members of the ARRL Board.

>That is if the membership can find out how the Div.Dir.
>voted.

The few times I have been curious, I asked Tom Frenaye and he told me. If Tom ever stops answering those questions, I will consider that when it is time to vote again.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1969. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 11:24:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020319062427.05983.00002302@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 37909

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>Well, I ** did ** pass the Technician test this evening,
>with 100 percent.

Congratulations, Val.> Also, the
>amateur satellite programs have a lot of interest for
>me, particularly because I give fifteen to twenty
>programs per year on astronomy, about half of them
>to schools. Now, I can have a radio component in
>those programs!

Contact ARRL's Educational Activities folks. They have some good support and materials available for Amateur Radio in the classroom.

See:

http://www.arrl.org/ead/
http://www.arrl.org/FandES/tbp/

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1970. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 11:25:54 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020319062554.05983.00002303@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 37910

From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam (Bert Craig)

>Congratulations! Best of luck to you on the General and Element 1.

Assuming he wants to upgrade right away. Some hams want to have fun with the
license they just passed before worrying about the next one. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1971. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 11:34:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020319063408.05983.00002304@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 37911

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>> Buy QST then and read the meeting minutes.

>Oops better hurry Bill.

> The BoD (no doubt on a
>recommendation by the Newington Crowd) just voted to strike
>the minutes from the QST.

Clay, let me tell ya' what would happen if THIS Newington employee started to tell the ARRL Board what to do...

Better advice would be to download the minutes for free from the ARRL Web page.

http://www.arrl.org/announce/board.html

In addition to the minutes that used to be printed in QST, all of the reports of the various Board committees are also available at the same URL.

> The motion claimed that eliminating 12 b&W pages a year from print would
> justify the cut.

And I agree. I would rather see those pages used for something else and download the minutes from the web site.

>They also cut Section News.

Perhaps you should download the minutes and read them, Clay. They did not cut Section News at this time. They voted to postpone that decision. If you feel that Section News should remain in QST, let your Director know.

In the mean time, they are expanding the Section presence on the ARRL Web. This will allow SMs to put up web-based Section News that can contain photos, hyperlinks, sound clips and the like.

>> > >Should every volunteer organization be subject to
>> > >some outside "third party" audit to satisfy people
>> > >who are NOT members? If yes, WHY?

>501-C3 probably.

ARRL undergoes an audit every year. It is required by law.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1972. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 11:34:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020319063457.05983.00002305@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 37912

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>Okay, should I give up NCI-4234 that I've held since Sunday?

One down, one to go. Are we going to see you as an ARRL member soon? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1973. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 11:46:01 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <ZxFl8.5$aF.289@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37913

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020319062554.05983.00002303@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam (Bert Craig)
>
> >Congratulations! Best of luck to you on the General and Element 1.
>
> Assuming he wants to upgrade right away. Some hams want to have fun with
the
> license they just passed before worrying about the next one. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Agreed but in the instant case Val said it himself.

1974. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 12:29:27 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9eao3cmpu32a5@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37914

W5TIT - Kim wrote:

>A Hearty WELCOME, Valentine! You'll enjoy, I'm sure!

Thanks! I think it's going to a lot of fun!

Val

1975. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 12:31:53 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9eash4b8udjfb@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37915

Bert Craig wrote:

>Congratulations! Best of luck to you on the General
>and Element 1.

Yes, I'm going to need it because I'd like to take them
both a month from now. If I pass I can work on my CW
speed with my neighbor down the street. Even my
old Swan (I love tube stuff) will reach him!

Val

1976. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 12:38:48 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9eb9hn9gqoif0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37916

W1RFI wrote:

>Assuming he wants to upgrade right away. Some hams want to
>have fun with the license they just passed before worrying about
>the next one. :-)

I hope to have some fun AND study for the General!
For instance, I'm now shopping for a radio to use on
the club repeater, which is definitely fun, and I'm assembling
parts to make an antenna to raise those satellites!
I have access to a computer-controlled telescope
that could track satellites while mounting that antenna.
It's gonna be great -- I hope!

Val

1977. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 12:39:37 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9ebb098udp20a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37917

Richard McCollum wrote:

>Agreed but in the instant case Val said it himself.

I sure hope to be a general sometime in April.
We'll see, though!

Val

1978. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 12:42:40 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9ebgm5r8khu81@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37918

W1RFI wrote:

>Contact ARRL's Educational Activities folks. They have some
>good support and materials available for Amateur Radio in the
>classroom.

Thanks! I'll be joining ARRL this week using the application
in my March copy of QST, bought at a newstand.. In my view, well,
you should always support your group's national organization.
I've been a member of the Astronomical League for 25 years
and wouldn't dream of being a Ham and NOT joining the ARRL.

Val

1979. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 13:01:40 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9eck9n4bg8s0e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37919

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>That wouldn't be a very good idea, Val. BTW I hope she
>doesn't take that Daisy to school with her. Why is a 9-year
>old in possession of such a thing, anyway? I was 14 before
>I ever handled a .22 rifle, and never owned a handgun until
>I was almost 25.

Last summer, at a family get-together, some of her cousins
were target shooting with a very nice BB pistol that my
father has. They were using proper range procedure and
my daughter joined the group. Since she liked the activity
I got her a air pistol for Christmas. Though it is "her pistol"
it normally sits on a high shelf. That is, she ain't carryin'!

>I'm a big fan of anything with Fry and Laurie in it -- the Jeeves
>and Wooster series was great -- wish they'd re-run it locally,
>but all WHYY in Philadelphia does is run 3-week long pledge
>breaks every two months.

Ah, the bane of Public Television and Radio. My wife and
daughter and I were at Michael Feldman's "Whad'ya Know"
broadcast, which was held Saturday on the Missouri campus,
the second time he has been here in seven years. We got
pretty good seats and they weren't cheap!

>All we get to see are PH.d's giving motivational lectures and
>the Three Tenors, that kind of crap -- between the whining and
>the phone numbers on the screen. Personally, I'd rather watch
>the commercials.

We have tons of stuff on tape, some we've purchased but
mostly what we've taped off the air. Makes things better!

>At least they inform me of products and services I'd be inter-
>ested in as a consumer. I have no use for a WHYY-logo'ed
>100% cotton shopping bag as my free gift for a $60 member-
>ship pledge!

They DO give a lot better stuff here!

>Hey, man, this is Usnet. Get over it.

Oh, I know it's UseNet allright! Don't worry about THAT!

Val

1980. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 13:06:36 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <wJGl8.61$aF.5185@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37920

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9ebgm5r8khu81@corp.supernews.com...
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
>
> >Contact ARRL's Educational Activities folks. They have some
> >good support and materials available for Amateur Radio in the
> >classroom.
>
>
> Thanks! I'll be joining ARRL this week using the application
> in my March copy of QST, bought at a newstand.. In my view, well,
> you should always support your group's national organization.
> I've been a member of the Astronomical League for 25 years
> and wouldn't dream of being a Ham and NOT joining the ARRL.
>
> Val

Thank you, Val. I had an app they finally sent me in the mail sitting on the counter in my DND file (Die Natural Death) and finally got motivated to do the deed on line. So after a long absence I can now claim to be a member of the American Registry of Rotten Lids.

A number of stiffs having passed from the scene, it is time to support such things as the Education people and Ed's merry band of thieves and brigands.

Dick N BK, from Nebraska -- World's ugliest license plates.

1981. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 13:43:33 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <9gHl8.119$aF.7225@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37921

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9eck9n4bg8s0e@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Ah, the bane of Public Television and Radio. My wife and
> daughter and I were at Michael Feldman's "Whad'ya Know"
> broadcast, which was held Saturday on the Missouri campus,
> the second time he has been here in seven years. We got
> pretty good seats and they weren't cheap!
>
>
> Val

Living in WI for 18 years I got to see Mike progress from resident wiseass to pretty funny guy. WI runs a double network, one side talk the other NPR/Classical so you kind of get spoiled. His show comes out of PRI which is Minnesota Public Radio's alias.

You mentioned the lack of cheapitude. At 8:50 AM the local station carries a PRI show done from one of MPRs two stations in Los Angeles and Morning Edition often carries a promo for a contributor 'supporting NPRs West Coast Expansion'. What in hell is going on???

And on TV we spend Saturday doing Men in Toolbelts with Norm Abrams' incredible workshop that is increasing looking like one giant infomercial. The good Mr. Morath at WGBH probably has more special partnerships than Enron. Norm has done more for biscuit-joinery than Armstrong did for FM.

And for one of life's minor mysteries, does anyone actually broadcast El Presidente's radio speech every Saturday? You couldn't displace Texaco and the Metropolitan Opera with a nuclear device. Ain't nothing like scrubbing your bathroom to Carmen.

Dick NBK

1982. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 15:24:45 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9el0mianhbn2c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37922

Richard McCollum wrote:

>Living in WI for 18 years I got to see Mike progress from
>resident wiseass to pretty funny guy.

He still has an edge sometimes but he gets away with it,
because he's a nice guy at heart . . . I think!

>WI runs a double network, one side talk the other
>NPR/Classical so you kind of get spoiled. His show
>comes out of PRI which is Minnesota Public Radio' . .

We get mostly classical here on the local affiliate.

>You mentioned the lack of cheapitude. At 8:50 AM
>the local station carries a PRI show done from one of
>MPRs two stations in Los Angeles and Morning Edition
>often carries a promo for a contributor 'supporting NPRs
>West Coast Expansion'. What in hell is going on???

NPR used to be "National Public Radio" and funded
mostly by "The National Corporation for Public
Broadcasting," which was funded by Congress, more
or less. Staring about 20 years ago, NPR & Co. began
to be seen as WAAAY to liberal and so began to be
de-funded. Today they're out there on their own and
have to get money any way they can. It's expand or die.

>And on TV we spend Saturday doing Men in Toolbelts
>with Norm Abrams' incredible workshop that is increasing
>looking like one giant infomercial.

It has to if it wants to stay on the air!

>The good Mr. Morath at WGBH probably has more
>special partnerships than Enron.

No doubt!

>Norm has done more for biscuit-joinery than
>Armstrong did for FM.

You got that right . . . and I've my biscuit-joiner, you betcha!

>And for one of life's minor mysteries, does anyone
>actually broadcast El Presidente's radio speech every
>Saturday?

I know somebody does because I've scanned through it
in the car. But exactly who that is, er, I couldn't say!

>You couldn't displace Texaco and the Metropolitan Opera
>with a nuclear device.

No. In fact for me "NPR" means: "National Petroleum
Radio." After all, Mobile made all those Masterpiece
Theater and Mystery programs possible!

>Ain't nothing like scrubbing your bathroom to Carmen.

Or, joining those biscuits!

Val
(In "Zero-Land", too!)

1983. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 15:31:24 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9eld1skgqr3dd@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37923

Richard McCollum wrote:

> So after a long absence I can now claim to be a member
>of the American Registry of Rotten Lids.

Hm, I think I see an acronym contest coming on! Let me
think . . A, R, R, L . . "Amateurs Retrograding [while] Roundly
Laughing"? This is harder than I thought.

>A number of stiffs having passed from the scene, it is time
>to support such things as the Education people and Ed's
>merry band of thieves and brigands.

Sure! They're a LOT like NPR!

>Dick N BK, from Nebraska -- World's ugliest license plates.

We USED to have that title, with an ugly ersatz-red thing that
made the prison system look good. But now we have the "World's
Hardest to Understand License Plates." That is, the tiny little
blue squiggle on the things is supposed to represent the Missouri
and Mississippi rivers. But it just looks . . . Ouch!

Val

1984. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 17:13:19 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <PkKl8.360$Jc5.32210@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 37924

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9eld1skgqr3dd@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> > So after a long absence I can now claim to be a member
> >of the American Registry of Rotten Lids.
>
> Hm, I think I see an acronym contest coming on! Let me
> think . . A, R, R, L . . "Amateurs Retrograding [while] Roundly
> Laughing"? This is harder than I thought.
>
>
> >A number of stiffs having passed from the scene, it is time
> >to support such things as the Education people and Ed's
> >merry band of thieves and brigands.
>
> Sure! They're a LOT like NPR!
>
>
> >Dick N&#65533;BK, from Nebraska -- World's ugliest license plates.
>
> We USED to have that title, with an ugly ersatz-red thing that
> made the prison system look good. But now we have the "World's
> Hardest to Understand License Plates." That is, the tiny little
> blue squiggle on the things is supposed to represent the Missouri
> and Mississippi rivers. But it just looks . . . Ouch!
>
> Val

The new plates are three shades of yellow and orange with unreadable black letters featuring a website no less. Up in the corner is the sun but it looks like an orange. Even the winning artist that designed them is less than impressed by the rendition. Only plate I ever saw that can clash with school-bus yellow.

Now to top it all off, three of the 93 counties use a 3x3 numbering system while the rest use the old county number. So NXP 289 and 20-A1234 are both legit. Let's see Barney Fife figure that one out.

Back in days of old, Missouri plates indicated the expiration month with the first letter so some bright soul when the call plates became available in the 40s made them all expire in October, the usual month indicated by W so as not to confuse Barney. Well in the 50s comes K calls and in the 70s

came N and A and they all expired in October. So one quiet summer day in about 1978 or so we get the call on the repeater from a K&#65533; who was being hauled in in Marlboro, in StL County on old 66 and a notorious speed trap. So a raft of us showed up registration in hand to convice the locals that all of the ham calls expired in October. The killer was AA&#65533;A.

Back before Mo went with message plates, the only unique plates were amateur and the 1-9999 plates where you had to be a poobah or know one. You have not lived until you pull up to a stop sign in Ladue with a 4-long on a ratty 73 Dart and received a filthy look from a car that cost more than your new house.

Whatever else, we don't have to look for the cactus anymore to tell if you come from Misery or Arizona -- damned snowbirds.

Dick BK

1985. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations/problem Hams vs Good Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 17:28:28 UTC
From: RussellTodd@istoreplus.net
Message-ID: <217b8ae4.0203190928.2458aaa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 37925

Now we've taken a survey of Ham operators in Cornelia, Georgia and found that some of them are Shortwave Pirates. KE4ENX is the famous Radio Bob and when he ain't jamming the local VHF repeaters here and in Cleveland, GA, because he opposes code and won't get a license upgrade from Tech, he's yapping on 27.455 Childrens Band causing trouble, calling people names, making false accusations. Eveytime he tunes up on 6955khz he blocks out TV's all over Mt. Airy and Cornelia and us legal Hams get blamed. Considering there aren't but a few of us in Cornelia, does anyone have any recomendation as to what we can do about KE4ENX and his illegal Radio Bob transmissions? Legal suggestions only, he ain't worth going to jail over!

1986. California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 18:57:37 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9f1fn1afu0t21@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37926

Hello, all!

Looking at the population data I put up earlier,
based on the QRZ site, there is a significant
difference between California and its 100,000
Hams and the 100,000 Hams in each of my two
other multi-state groupings.

For instance, the number of Technicians in CA
is about 41, 500.

At the same time, NY, OH, PA & MO can
muster only about 30,500 Techs.

And TX, FL, NM and AZ have about 33,500.

That's a BIG difference, I think.

Also, summing the "Top Three" licesnse classes,
EX, AD, GEN, we get:

For CA a total of 39,700.
For NY, OH, PA & MO we have 48,500.
For TX, FL, NM and AZ we have 47,800.

Once again, a significant difference between
CA and the other two groups.

The implication is . . . more growth in CA since
the Technician group would tend to be younger?
I did expect to see more Extras, etc., in the
TX, FL, NM and AZ group, because of the fact
that people do retire to those three states in
fairly large numbers and so the average age of
Hams there should be, er, more senior!

Val Germann
Columbia, Missouri
(Waiting for Technician callsign!)

*

1987. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 19:07:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C978C86.9BF63AB9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37927

Valentine Germann wrote:
> The implication is . . . more growth in CA since
> the Technician group would tend to be younger?

Here's another possibility (based on my experience at Intel).
Many highly technical people consider learning Morse code to
be a waste of their technical talents and therefore settle
for the nocode Tech license. Since Silicon Valley and LA
contain more than the average share of highly technical
people, having more than the average number of nocode Techs
doesn't seem unreasonable based on my experience.

Of the 50-60 hams Elmered by my team of VEC's at Intel, the
nocode Techs tended to be the design engineers and managers
with graduate technical degrees. The coded group of hams
tended to be the networking and lab technicians and marketing
engineers. In other words, the higher the technical degree,
the less likely was the person to be interested in learning
Morse code. The moral IMO? Recruit new hams when they are
young and more likely to be interested in CW while Morse
code is easier to learn. I would like to see a new "novice"
license, akin to a learning permit, with reasonable privileges,
that expires on a youngster's 18th birthday.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1988. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 20:21:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020319152154.26064.00000102@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 37929

In article <Rxxl8.7802$KG.1516912864@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> Since Morse testing was only required for HF operations, why
>> not survey the HF operators?
>
>Why not just let the ARRL speak for all amateurs?

You mean they aren't doing so?!? Gasp...! :-)

1989. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 20:21:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020319152155.26064.00000103@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 37928

In article <20020319063457.05983.00002305@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>One down, one to go. Are we going to see you as an ARRL member soon? :-)

Why do you ask?

1990. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 20:21:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020319152157.26064.00000104@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 37931

In article <3C96A01E.D53D7C3@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Noooo, noooo. This goes way back before NPRM 98-143 ever
>> existed. All the big daddy PCTAs were jumping up and down
>> about the "superiority" in all of radio of the OOK CW morsemen.
>
>Oh, I see...

Your corrected vision is still 20/400. :-)

>Is that what happened, Len? I'll have to admit, as a fiction writer,
>you're pretty good.

It's always nice to get compliments from such an authoritative
writer of myth and fantasy... :-)

>That's what it was, Len--a play on mortality based in fact.
>By the way, I thought YOU were the resident 24/7 PMS sufferer.

"PMS" is Powerful Marine Syndrome. "Marine" as in USMC. :-)

>This would be a peculiar statement even if it was coherent.

Fact established by the US military way back in 1948.

Mythologists and fantasy writers don't want to accept planning
that is carried out and proven to all others.

>Now I'm
>starting to have doubts about those writing skills of yours.

Poor baby. Send a nasty letter to my editors, ok? :-)

>Are you now claiming that I haven't accepted that the U.S. government
>does not use morse much anymore?

Absolutely.

>It hasn't changed my status in being skilled in the use of morse one iota.

BFD. You can nominate yourself to the nearest IOTA list. :-)

>It doesn't presuppose any such thing. It means that if you obtain your
>ticket tomorrow, I'll have a 38 year headstart on you.

A "38 year headstart" is only in your head. :-)

>You've missed decades of enjoyment of amateur radio.

Nope. I've had decades of enjoyment as both a hobbyist and
professional working in the radio-electronics industry.

>I've held federal permission to operate an amateur radio station for 38
>years (using certail allotcated modes and obeying certain technical and
>operational regulations).

Ignoring finger-slips (due to rage drool?) in "certail allotcated..." let's
analyze the quote above. I've had several kinds of federal permissions
to operate over a much wider range of frequencies and modes for 49
years...and did it. Got paid for doing it all.

Some of that operation was IN amateur bands; remember that
amateur frequencies aren't all exclusive to amateurs. Most of it
was "outside" amateur allocations.

>Where did I state anything about an academic achievement?

Nothing...but these postings are all in public, not private, and
the resident 24/7 PMS sufferer will reply (and did). :-)

>I've had 38 years of enjoyment of amateur radio while
>you've frittered.

That's nice. For you.

I'm not a food specialist and not fond of fritters. Never made
any. :-)

I've spent over 50 years thoroughly enjoying the much larger
avocational and occupational radio world, meeting technical
changes and problems head-on and solving them.

What have I missed? Oh, yes, I've missed marching in ranks
in the endless re-creation of "pioneering radio" traditions that
seemed more like a Rennaisance Pleasure Faire production
than anything else.

You can say I've "missed working DX," "collecting the rare
ones," and even "being a rare DX station." No problem to me
since I got into the HF comm biz early by DOING DX 24/7.
There's some loss of emotional feel-good in "magic" when
one can pick up a handset and talk immediately to a
counterpart also on duty many thousands of miles away.
That was a half century ago.

Collecting QSL cards is a nice thing. So is stamp
collecting. I've "worked" a station ON the moon without
using CW. No big thing. Why all the furor over "weak-
signal moonbounce?"

Your PMS-suffering brother touts the wonderfulness of having
"one's own radio station!" That's nice for some, but having
lived IN an antenna farm far larger than the fabled Palos Verdes
Penninsula amateur antenna place that was, it isn't a personal

inducement. It's far from a universal desire.

>Maybe in 16 years I'll have a sudden revelation and become as you are--a
>happy old man.

Your prognosis is very pessimistic. Once a bossy, nasty loudmouth,
always a bossy, nasty loudmouth. :-)

>Why the parakeet imitation if you didn't mean what you wrote?

"Parakeet imitation?!?" Did someone tell you to eat the bird? :-)

>...and a fine champion you are, Len. You've managed to honk off
>numerous fellows who've held licenses for decades as you go about
>treading on the traditions of amateur radio and throw darts at the ARRL.

Heh heh heh...I've managed to "honk off" a crowing semi-pro (who
was THE ONLY ham in Guinea-Bisseau) on a professional basis
and he could never forget that! Poor feller, he got all uppity. :-)

Heh heh heh...go sit on a Rittysnitch and see if you "honk." :-)

>I do indeed find some joy, Len. You certainly help in keeping me
>entertained.

Goody. Now complete your day's recreation and go find an AARP
member to pistol-whip with your J-38. You can have lotsa fun
at the Legion hall telling the Legionaires about it...

BTW, you ARE eligible for AARP membership. :-)

1991. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 20:21:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020319152158.26064.00000105@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 37930

In article <3C96A493.F41F773E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <a739hnntb1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >> So far, the only "proof" has come from the ARRL itself.
>> >
>> >Len,
>> >Simple but serious question...
>> >Do you NOT believe the published meeting minutes of
>> >the ARRL Board?
>>
>> Bill, I don't know WHAT to believe. The ARRL says it does
>> things and the ARRL reports on what is said. Except for
>> documentation that gets into public release at government
>> sites, there's no way to find out what is really done in those
>> meetings or other closed function.
>
>I probably shouldn't tell you this, Len, but the League sends us
>detailed accounts of what transpires. These are sent only to full
>members.

The ARRL does, the ARRL says...

>So organizations like the American Legion, the NRA, AARP are guilty of
>something too. They purport to represent some segment of the American
>population and serve a demographically skewed membership.

Quite true, but all of them have much more openness in their
dealings with the public. Except for one, they accept criticsm
and roll with it. The NRA seems to have a simple policy: Gun
down those of opposite views. :-)

>You might
>have uncovered some things which may make life dangerous for you.

None yet...except for all the hot, dingy air blown by some of
your gasbags during santana wind times...high fire danger then.
:-)

>Better keep mum.

Too late. The word has been out for a long time.

>Still wondering what's going on up in the lodge hall?

No. That filters out through the locked doors and blackened
windows.

The ARRL does, the ARRL says, ARRL members keep the
faith. No problem.

>You are beginning to sound like Harold Pransky. Harold lives up in
>Washington or Oregon and used to send 9 x 12" envelopes to the embassy
>in Gaborone, Botswana about once every six months or so. We didn't have

<cut of blat, blat, blat...>

That's a cute story.

You are beginning to sound like Wilhem Gustloff.

>What small group of movers and shakers? The board is elected by us.

The ARRL does, the ARRL says, the ARRL counts the votes.

>There is a director from each ARRL division. The candidates are
>nominated by those within each division.

The ARRL handles the nomination papers.

>By the way, we don't elect

That is the suspected way of things... :-)

1992. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 20:28:53 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <a78725$239n$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 37932

Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net> wrote:
>Also, summing the "Top Three" licesnse classes,
>EX, AD, GEN, we get:
>
>For CA a total of 39,700.
>For NY, OH, PA & MO we have 48,500.
>For TX, FL, NM and AZ we have 47,800.
>
>Once again, a significant difference between
>CA and the other two groups.

Not really. Here are the 2001 estimates for the populations of
those states:

CA: 34,501,130
NY, OH, PA & MO: 48,301,776
TX, FL, NM & AZ: 44,858,010

California has more hams per capita in all classes. It just
has somewhat more of the higher classes and a lot more Techs.

Trying to correlate this with anything in particular seems
hopeless. For example, California also has a signficantly
larger economy per capita then your other two groups, so maybe
it proves that people with higher discretionary income are more
likely to blow some of it on radios? It also has a larger base of
technology industries, has generally better mountains near the
cities for repeaters, has a delightfully mild climate near the coast,
has more than its share of both tree-hugging liberals and technophile
libertarians, ranks 49th among states for per-capita electricity
consumption, doesn't number freeway exits, and simultaneously has
some of the nation's best universities and worst performing public
schools. Pick any factor you like.

Dennis Ferguson

1993. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 21:31:06 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9fafhce8fjhae@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37933

CAM wrote:

>Many highly technical people consider learning Morse
>code to be a waste of their technical talents and therefore
>settle for the nocode Tech license.

Well, maybe, although I find it interesting that "highly technical people" would be UN-interested in a mode that allows highly efficient international communication on just a few watts, and with equipment that can fit inside a lunch box. Sounds like just the meat for NASA-slash-DOD contractor types! Maybe your group (see below) somehow failed to explain things properly to your highly-technical recruits!

>Of the 50-60 hams Elmered by my team of VEC's at
>Intel, the nocode Techs tended to be the design
>engineers and managers with graduate technical
>degrees. The coded group of hams tended to be the
>networking and lab technicians and marketing
>engineers. In other words, the higher the technical
>degree, the less likely was the person to be interested
>in learning Morse code.

Fascinating. Perhaps we might be privileged to know what these two groups hoped to get out of Ham radio, in your view. That is, it seems somewhat odd that the folks with the lower incomes and less technical training would be MORE interested in the most efficient mode on HF. Of course, that would't have anything to do with the people who were introducing these folks to Ham Radio, would it? I didn't think so.

>The moral IMO? Recruit new hams when they are young
>and more likely to be interested in CW while Morse
>code is easier to learn. I would like to see a new "novice"
>license, akin to a learning permit, with reasonable
>privileges, that expires on a youngster's 18th birthday.

Well, fine, but it's going nowhere unless the Elmers give a rat's patoot about CW -- and SAY SO! Your attitude toward CW in Ham Radio is bizarre, to me. You say you're a big user of the mode but, well, er, that's hard to believe. It's as if you went to an automobile dealership and the guy who is supposed to be selling you a Tahoe, because that's what's on the floor next to him, and it's

what the dealership selling, AND what he says he drives,
is instead saying, "No, you don't what THAT! You'd
have to take a TEST, which seems unfair to ME, to be
able to drive it legally! How about a nice bicycle instead!"

Val

1994. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 21:40:26 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9fb1dcugsvt1f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37934

Dennis Ferguson wrote, concerning a difference of
about 10,000 people in the Technician class between
CA and other state groupings of 100,000 Hams, and
a similiar difference in the numbers of people holding
the higher license classes. I said that this difference
was significant:

>Not really. Here are the 2001 estimates for the
>populations of those states:
>
>CA: 34,501,130
>NY, OH, PA & MO: 48,301,776
>TX, FL, NM & AZ: 44,858,010
>
>California has more hams per capita in all classes. It
>just has somewhat more of the higher classes and a
>lot more Techs.

No, it has LESS of the higher classes, in absolute
numbers, and VASTLY less per capita! Ah, yeah,
CA has a lot more Techs, absolutely and relatively,
and, er, that's what I was referring to!

Ask any statistician . . . it IS significant. That is, the
factors behind those numbers are important to Ham
Radio and it's future, most likely.

>Trying to correlate this with anything in particular seems
>hopeless.

To you, maybe, but the folks at ARRL likely care!

>For example, California also has a signficantly larger
>economy per capita then your other two groups, so
>maybe it proves that people with higher discretionary
>income are more likely to blow some of it on radios?

That would seem arguable BUT, it would not necessarily
explain the internal differences by itself.

>It also has a larger base of technology industries, has
>generally better mountains near the cities for repeaters,
>has a delightfully mild climate near the coast . . . [snip]
> Pick any factor you like.

Sorry, can't do that! I'm interested in what's actually
going on with those numbers!

Val

1995. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 21:55:23 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9fbt4gg58v70a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 37935

Richard McCollum wrote:

>The new [Nebraska] plates are three shades of yellow
>and orange with unreadable black letters featuring a
>website no less . . .

Ooooh, I guess I've never looked at those plates good!

>Now to top it all off, three of the 93 counties use a 3x3
>numbering system while the rest use the old county number.
>So NXP 289 and 20-A1234 are both legit. Let's see Barney
>Fife figure that one out.

I don't think Missouri uses any such code anymore.

>Back in days of old, Missouri plates indicated the expiration
>month [by letter] . . .

I remember that!

>Well in the 50s comes K calls and in the 70s came N and A and
>they all expired in October.

You can see what's coming!

>So one quiet summer day in about 1978 or so we get the call on
>the repeater from a K<illegible> who was being hauled in in Marlboro, in
>StL County on old 66 and a notorious speed trap.

You're lucky it wasn't Mack's Creek! That would have been BAD!

>Back before Mo went with message plates, the only unique plates
>were amateur and the 1-9999 plates where you had to be a poobah
>or know one.

Ah, yes!

>You have not lived until you pull up to a stop sign in Ladue with a
>4-long on a ratty 73 Dart and received a filthy look from a car that
>cost more than your new house.

You should have been ARRESTED and shown the city limits!
That would only be fair, in Ladue!

>Whatever else, we don't have to look for the cactus anymore to
>tell if you come from Misery or Arizona -- damned snowbirds.

Yeah, but our plate still ain't so hot!

Val

1996. Re: For Discussion: ARRL Fee's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 22:29:42 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020319172942.06015.00002603@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 37936

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>I think Ryan is on to something. Hey Ed...

ARRL at one point in the not distant past had a 3-month trial membership at a substantial discount. I don't think there were many takers. I don't know if it is still available, although I suspect not because I couldn't find anything on the ARRL Web site. Of course, as anyone who has searched the ARRL Web site, that doesn't necessarily prove anything. :-)

ARRL does offer Senior rates at $34 a year, if memory serves, and has substantial discounts for young hams if they are the oldest ham in their household.

And either way, Ed doesn't get to make these policies. I suggest that those that feel ARRL membership should be available to new members at a one-time discount should let their Division Director know their views.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1997. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 22:30:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C97BC1B.55AA8A1F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37937

Len Over 21 wrote:
> The NRA seems to have a simple policy: Gun down those of opposite views. :-)

How many deaths per year are prevented by guns?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1998. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 22:31:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020319173137.06015.00002604@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 37938

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>>>>You've blown smoke here for years without much in the way of support.
>>
>>>Nope. I gave up smoking some time ago. :-)
>>
>>Now, we DO know better. This is a blatant an attempt at misdirection as I
>>have ever seen! :-)
>
>How? Is smoking okay now?
>
>You could just as well make the entreaty "Don't be controversial or
>nobody in here will like you." Oh, boo-hoo.

I can see that the rest of this post is more of stuff like this, so I think we have reached the limits of usefulness. We will talk again when you want to do more than "boo hoo" at me.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1999. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 22:41:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C97BEA1.696102E1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 37939

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >Many highly technical people consider learning Morse
> >code to be a waste of their technical talents and therefore
> >settle for the nocode Tech license.
>
> Well, maybe, although I find it interesting that "highly
> technical people" would be UN-interested in a mode
> that allows highly efficient international communication
> on just a few watts, and with equipment that can fit
> inside a lunch box.

Highly technical people, on the average, are not interested
in efficient international communications. A lot of them
are millionaires UN-interested in efficiency or cost. Every
engineer I know who cashed out of Intel in the late 90's
after working there for 15 years, left Intel a millionaire.

> Fascinating. Perhaps we might be privileged to know
> what these two groups hoped to get out of Ham radio,
> in your view.

Most of the Techs were happy to get valley wide coverage
from mountain top repeaters around the Valley of the Sun.
To the best of my knowledge, none of the M.S. or Ph.D. degreed
engineers who became hams were interested in HF. About eight
of my camping buddies became Techs because 5w CB was unreliable.

> you're a big user of the mode but, well, er, that's hard to
> believe.

Pass the code test along with your Tech and let's set up a
schedule. I'm trying to gain a modicum of competence on
an electronic keyer. You seem to be confusing the code
test requirement with CW the mode, strangely enough,
just like Dick does.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2000. Death to Ham Radio at the hands of it's own operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 22:43:35 UTC
From: "Phillip A Manning (KC8TAU)" <kc8tau@fuse.net>
Message-ID: <0fff9uke3qjcqqnc8oi1v8ubr8t5166af6@4ax.com>
Source record: 37940
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.amateur,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I have been recently toying with the idea of putting a dual band (2m/440) amateur rig in my car. To assess if the investment would be worth it (seeing as how I already have a mod'ed commercial 440 rig in my car for amateur and GMRS) I borrowed a friend's scanner and listened to many of the "active" frequencies in this area, the greater Cincinnati area. I found a few very active places, which got my hopes up until I started listening to the content of these channels.

It appears to me that the Greater Cincinnati area is "under siege" by a very few groups of amateurs. I noticed that the diversity in radio is nil the same people on all the used frequencies, and even thou they clam to be an "open" group if you listen to them new people with new ideas are ran off. On some of the repeaters just a normal conversation is cut off for tying up the repeater. On a clear sunny day not during peak traffic times why should a conversation on a Ham repeater that it observing the courtesies of normal ham communications (i.e. waiting for the repeater to drop so any other station calling could get in if they wanted to) be cut for the reason of wanting empty air. That to me sounds like non-effective use of frequency space.

Now that we are on frequency space let me just say that it seems a little excessive for one group to control six different repeater pairs across two different bands. Five of those in the 2m band alone. This to me sounds like a lack of diversity, and if you track some of there frequencies you will find that one of them is in a garage on a mag. mount antenna just to tie up the space so that no one else can use that space for a new repeater and haven forbid some new opinions and views.

If you live in or near Cincinnati you may know who I am talking about. CRA (Cincinnati Repeater Association) seems to be the only way to get on the air in this city, and if you try to put up a repeater of your own you will find that all the vhf pairs are taken. Now, if this group is truly interested in keeping ham radio alive they would welcome new people and points of view, but to the contrary if you disagree with any member of the group you will find yourself subject to jamming and "the cold shoulder" until you just give up. These people do not extent their damaging attitude into just a standard radio group, but the "leaders" of the group also seem to run all activity available to hams in this area like: Sky Warn Group, QCEN (Queen City Emergency Net), and ARPSC (Amateur Radio Public Service Corps). So as you can see if you want to do anything in this city in ham radio you have to subject your self to a group that I have heard, aptly referred to as the CRM (Cincinnati Repeater Mafia).

So you may ask, what can be done about such atrocities? Well I have added contact information to a key person at the bottom of this post if you know of anyone else who may help please let them know and if you would let me know and I will forward a copy of this letter to them so they may hear my argument as well. Please contact someone and let them know that the hams in Cincinnati are being oppressed by local radio groups of, and we would like to take the air waves back for the hams and not leave them to the death they are suffering here in this great city.

Ohio Coordinator:

Kin Bird, W8SMK
244 North Parkway Dr.
Delaware, OH 43015-8788
Ken@midohio.net

Phil Manning
KC8TAU
kc8tau@fuse.net

2001. Re: CW vs. Digital (was Re: The tests that Real Hams took)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 23:16:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C97C6AC.10D47C08@earthlink.net>
Source record: 37941

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3C96A01E.D53D7C3@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:

>
> >Is that what happened, Len? I'll have to admit, as a fiction writer,
> >you're pretty good.
>
> It's always nice to get compliments from such an authoritative
> writer of myth and fantasy... :-)

It was just that your statement didn't seem to have much basis in fact.
Where I live, that's called fiction--or worse.

> >That's what it was, Len--a play on mortality based in fact.
> >By the way, I thought YOU were the resident 24/7 PMS sufferer.
>
> "PMS" is Powerful Marine Syndrome. "Marine" as in USMC. :-)

That isn't the common use of the term at all. If you went about saying
that to a group of middle-aged women, you be hacked to death with
fingernail files.

> >This would be a peculiar statement even if it was coherent.
>
> Fact established by the US military way back in 1948.

It was difficult to see a fact beneath all of the clumsey writing.

> Mythologists and fantasy writers don't want to accept planning
> that is carried out and proven to all others.

I'd assume that you have some knowledge of what you say based upon your
long experience.

> >Now I'm
> >starting to have doubts about those writing skills of yours.
>
> Poor baby. Send a nasty letter to my editors, ok? :-)

I haven't seen anything you've written for pay, Len. Are those editors
all retired by now?

> >Are you now claiming that I haven't accepted that the U.S. government
> >does not use morse much anymore?
>
> Absolutely.

You'd be, as you often are, wrong.

> >It hasn't changed my status in being skilled in the use of morse one iota.
>
> BFD. You can nominate yourself to the nearest IOTA list. :-)

You don't have any amateur radio "big deals" in your life, Len. You
have yet to demonstrate that you can even attain the most basic license.

> >It doesn't presuppose any such thing. It means that if you obtain your
> >ticket tomorrow, I'll have a 38 year headstart on you.
>
> A "38 year headstart" is only in your head. :-)

My claim is obvious and easily verifiable.

> >You've missed decades of enjoyment of amateur radio.
>
> Nope. I've had decades of enjoyment as both a hobbyist and
> professional working in the radio-electronics industry.

Get it straight, will you? This isn't a professional radio newsgroup.
This is an amateur radio newsgroup. I didn't say anything about your
professional use of radio. I said that you've missed decades of
enjoyment of amateur radio.

> >I've held federal permission to operate an amateur radio station for 38
> >years (using certail allotcated modes and obeying certain technical and
> >operational regulations).
>
> Ignoring finger-slips (due to rage drool?) in "certail allotcated..." let's
> analyze the quote above. I've had several kinds of federal permissions
> to operate over a much wider range of frequencies and modes for 49
> years...and did it. Got paid for doing it all.

We aren't discussing that, Len. I mentioned amateur radio. After all,
this is an amateur radio newsgroup. We cant' take money for doing what
we do on the ham bands.

> Some of that operation was IN amateur bands; remember that
> amateur frequencies aren't all exclusive to amateurs. Most of it
> was "outside" amateur allocations.

...but not as a ham, Len; not as a ham.

> >Where did I state anything about an academic achievement?
>
> Nothing...but these postings are all in public, not private, and
> the resident 24/7 PMS sufferer will reply (and did). :-)

So you admit that I didn't say anything about academnic achievement and
yet you through it in as though it had been brought up. Hmmmmm.

> >I've had 38 years of enjoyment of amateur radio while
> >you've frittered.

>
> That's nice. For you.
>
> I'm not a food specialist and not fond of fritters. Never made
> any. :-)

Just a couple of posts ago you were discussing cooking yourself.

> I've spent over 50 years thoroughly enjoying the much larger
> avocational and occupational radio world, meeting technical
> changes and problems head-on and solving them.

That isn't under discussion, Len. This isn't "I was a big man in professional radio". It is an amateur radio newsgroup. All you've done here is to dismiss the accomplishments of radio amateurs.

> What have I missed? Oh, yes, I've missed marching in ranks
> in the endless re-creation of "pioneering radio" traditions that
> seemed more like a Rennaisance Pleasure Faire production
> than anything else.

There is no requirement for a radio amateur do anything remotely resembling the above fantasy.

> You can say I've "missed working DX," "collecting the rare
> ones," and even "being a rare DX station." No problem to me
> since I got into the HF comm biz early by DOING DX 24/7.
> There's some loss of emotional feel-good in "magic" when
> one can pick up a handset and talk immediately to a
> counterpart also on duty many thousands of miles away.
> That was a half century ago.

I could add: "What have you done lately". Instead, I'll simply point out that what you did in the military isn't really of consequence to amateur radio in the here and now.

> Collecting QSL cards is a nice thing. So is stamp
> collecting. I've "worked" a station ON the moon without
> using CW. No big thing. Why all the furor over "weak-
> signal moonbounce?"

Why not read a few articles and find out? No ham is required to send QSL cards or to solicit them from others.

> Your PMS-suffering brother touts the wonderfulness of having
> "one's own radio station!" That's nice for some, but having
> lived IN an antenna farm far larger than the fabled Palos Verdes
> Penninsula amateur antenna place that was, it isn't a personal
> inducement. It's far from a universal desire.

I don't think anybody made a statement about living in an antenna farm. I don't have a brother.

> >Maybe in 16 years I'll have a sudden revelation and become as you are--a
> >happy old man.
>
> Your prognosis is very pessimistic. Once a bossy, nasty loudmouth,
> always a bossy, nasty loudmouth. :-)

I'll have to assume that also comes from personal experience. I don't
suppose that you've found any reason to change at this point.

> >Why the parakeet imitation if you didn't mean what you wrote?
>
> "Parakeet imitation?!?" Did someone tell you to eat the bird? :-)

Maybe you'd have understood if you hadn't snipped the relative portion
of your own post--you know, the one where you said something because
others had said it rather than because you meant it.

> >...and a fine champion you are, Len. You've managed to honk off
> >numerous fellows who've held licenses for decades as you go about
> >treading on the traditions of amateur radio and throw darts at the ARRL.
>
> Heh heh heh...I've managed to "honk off" a crowing semi-pro (who
> was THE ONLY ham in Guinea-Bisseau) on a professional basis
> and he could never forget that! Poor feller, he got all uppity. :-)

Get it straight, Len. I was not a semi-pro. I was a professional in
communications in Guinea-Bissu, Sierra Leone, Botswana, Tanzania and
during two postings to Finland. I was a radio amateur on the ham bands.
As stated in at least two previous posts, I was the only ham in
Guinea-Bissau for *most* of my time there.

Don't sell yourself short, Len. You've managed to honk off lots of
folks who read your stuff here.

> Heh heh heh...go sit on a Rittysnitch and see if you "honk." :-)

I'll bet you said that to all the kids on the playground.

> >I do indeed find some joy, Len. You certainly help in keeping me
> >entertained.
>
> Goody. Now complete your day's recreation and go find an AARP
> member to pistol-whip with your J-38. You can have lotsa fun
> at the Legion hall telling the Legionaires about it...

Why would I want to do that?

> BTW, you ARE eligible for AARP membership. :-)

BTW, I've been a member for three years. Boy, are they ever secretive
about their inner workings. I don't even get to vote for a director or
anything else.

Dave K8MN

2002. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 23:25:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C97C8EA.2243DBD5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 37942

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3C96A493.F41F773E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <a739hnntb1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >> So far, the only "proof" has come from the ARRL itself.
> >> >
> >> >Len,
> >> >Simple but serious question...
> >> >Do you NOT believe the published meeting minutes of
> >> >the ARRL Board?
> >>
> >> Bill, I don't know WHAT to believe. The ARRL says it does
> >> things and the ARRL reports on what is said. Except for
> >> documentation that gets into public release at government
> >> sites, there's no way to find out what is really done in those
> >> meetings or other closed function.
> >
> >I probably shouldn't tell you this, Len, but the League sends us
> >detailed accounts of what transpires. These are sent only to full
> >members.
>
> The ARRL does, the ARRL says...

Yeah, mysterious and so hush-hush, huh?
>
> >So organizations like the American Legion, the NRA, AARP are guilty of
> >something too. They purport to represent some segment of the American
> >population and serve a demographically skewed membership.
>
> Quite true, but all of them have much more openness in their
> dealings with the public. Except for one, they accept criticsm
> and roll with it. The NRA seems to have a simple policy: Gun
> down those of opposite views. :-)

I don't know that NRA members get to vote for a board of directors.
We certainly don't have the opportunity to vote for an AARP slate of
director candidates. The ARRL has a board of directors elected by the
members of their Division. We can vote 'em in. We can vote 'em out.

> >You might
> >have uncovered some things which may make life dangerous for you.
>
> None yet...except for all the hot, dingy air blown by some of
> your gasbags during santana wind times...high fire danger then.
> :-)

I drew that conclusion only because of your continuing stories of
intrigue at the league.

> >Better keep mum.
>
> Too late. The word has been out for a long time.

Tell us then. What is "the word" that has been out. Out among whom?
>
> >Still wondering what's going on up in the lodge hall?
>
> No. That filters out through the locked doors and blackened
> windows.

Ahhhh. A leak. I see.

> The ARRL does, the ARRL says, ARRL members keep the
> faith. No problem.

Doesn't seem to be for those of us who are members. Why should it be of
concern to you? You aren't a ham and you aren't a League member.

> >You are beginning to sound like Harold Pransky. Harold lives up in
> >Washington or Oregon and used to send 9 x 12" envelopes to the embassy
> >in Gaborone, Botswana about once every six months or so. We didn't have
>
> <cut of blat, blat, blat...>
>
> That's a cute story.
>
> You are beginning to sound like Wilhem Gustloff.

Why? Did he have fun at your expense too? Did he know Harold Pransky?
>
> >What small group of movers and shakers? The board is elected by us.
>
> The ARRL does, the ARRL says, the ARRL counts the votes.

So you've never heard of how the League actually counts the votes, huh?

>
> >There is a director from each ARRL division. The candidates are
> >nominated by those within each division.
>
> The ARRL handles the nomination papers.

So they handle them? I don't know of any prospective candidate who
claims that he was not put on the slate due to the League's "losing" his

nomination. Do you have leaked information that this has happened at
any time?
>
> >By the way, we don't elect
>
> That is the suspected way of things... :-)

To quote you:
<... blat, blat, blat...>

Dave K8MN

2003. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 23:31:31 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a78i2p$f14$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37943

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020318211451.00675.00000097@mb-ma.aol.com...
> In article <a75ufoold1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
>
> >You may exist, but your impact is apparently minimal and,
> >more to the point, the skeptics haven't convinced any others
> >there is any sort of problem.
>
> Okay, should I give up NCI-4234 that I've held since Sunday?
> :-)

Must I agree with everything you say simply because
you are an NCI member now?

Cheers :-)
Bill K2UNK

2004. NCI/ARRL memership (was Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 23:37:23 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c97cbbd_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 37944

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020319063457.05983.00002305@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
> >Okay, should I give up NCI-4234 that I've held since Sunday?
>
> One down, one to go. Are we going to see you as an ARRL member soon? :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Ed,

While I somehow doubt that Len's answer is going to be
a resounding "Yes!" I feel compelled to point out that NCI
has NO problems with its members being ARRL members.
I am ... and many of the other NCI directors are as well.

In fact, I would encourage NCI members to join ARRL as
well, if they're not already members. First, ARRL does do
a lot of good things for amateur radio. Second, the more
NCI members we have contacting their ARRL directors
with their views and voting in ARRL elections, the more
we'll be able to influence ARRL policy on issues where we
may have historically had diverging views.

73,
--
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast.net> [personal and NCI-related mail]
<mailto:wa6vse-shack@fast.net> [sked, QSO/QSL, and usenet related messages
ONLY, please]
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.

<http://www.nocode.org>

2005. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 23:38:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a78ibi$8vh$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 37945

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C96AD17.111D9DDD@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > Buy QST then and read the meeting minutes.
> >
> Oops better hurry Bill. The BoD (no doubt on a
> recommendation by the Newington Crowd) just voted to strike
> the minutes from the QST. The motion claimed that
> eliminating 12 b&W pages a year from print would justify the
> cut. They also cut Section News.
> >
> > > >Should every volunteer organization be subject to
> > > >some outside "third party" audit to satisfy people
> > > >who are NOT members? If yes, WHY?
>
> 501-C3 probably.

ARRL isn't a 501-C3. Neither is NCI.

> > Lobbying by organizations that make similar
> > claims goes on all the time.
>
> Lobbying is prohibited by the ARRL charter or by-laws, I
> believe.

Depends on what we mean by "lobbying". Clearly
sending comments on FCC matters via the normal input
process is not within the legal definition of lobbying.

> > It is the "small groups" that control everything in all
> > aspects of life. They are NOT without question, but
> > if no one is dissatisfied, where's the beef.
>
> How small? Like Bill Aramony and the United Way of America?

I haven't a clue about what you're talking about.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2006. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-19 23:41:49 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c97ccc8_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 37946

Congrats on passing your tech test.

Carl - wa6vse

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9darbppq9om73@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all!
>
> Well, I ** did ** pass the Technician test this evening,
> with 100 percent. I was in competition with another
> fellow (we're both long-time members of the local
> astronomy club) and he got 100 percent as well. If
> I had missed one, well, I never would have heard the
> end of it, just because . . .
>
> We both took the test seriously and studied hard.
>
> My neighbor down the street, the guy who started me
> down this road, took my dues for the local club last
> week and they voted me in a few days ago, on his
> word that I would pass. So, the heat was REALLY on!
>
> I'm very happy to at last be a ham and have already
> started on the General book and the CW. Also, the
> amateur satellite programs have a lot of interest for
> me, particularly because I give fifteen to twenty
> programs per year on astronomy, about half of them
> to schools. Now, I can have a radio component in
> those programs!
>
> Val Germann
> Columbia, Missouri
> (waiting for a call sign on the QRZ site!)
>
> **
>
>
>
>

2007. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 00:21:56 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gt8od10.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 37947

On Tue, 19 Mar 2002 16:41:37 -0600, CAM wrote:

>Highly technical people, on the average, are not interested
>in efficient international communications.

How do they expect their precious Internet and cell-phone systems to
exisy without same?

Can't compare Morse with either......

>A lot of them are millionaires UN-interested in efficiency or cost.

They are nouveau-riche and that won't last long if they spend
blindly. A very distant branch of my family has OLD money and
you better believe that they are interested in cost and efficiency.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2008. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 01:48:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020319204808.27626.00000358@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 37948

In article <3c96af43_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> As I said, Larry is stirring the pot.
>>
>> It is unfortunate that apparently all he has left to say amounts to peeing
>in
>> the sandbox.
>>
>> 73,
>> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>'S all he's got. 'S all he ever had...
>
>Kim W5TIT

OMIGOSH!!! Another brilliantly scathing, fiercely rapacious, biting retort
from The One With The Callsign That Is Bringing The ARS One Step
Closer To Extinction. Oh woe is me!!! What AM I going to do now???
How can I possibly go on living after "'S all he's got?" Those words will
ring in my head for, maybe the next .005 seconds!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2009. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 01:48:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020319204808.27626.00000357@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 37949

In article <u9darbppq9om73@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>Well, I ** did ** pass the Technician test this evening,
>with 100 percent.

Val:

Congratulations on the remarkable achievement of passing a test
that can be passed by any reasonably intelligent 2nd-grader with
a copy of "Now You're Talking!" Now, to get your General, you've
got to somehow beat that nasty 'ole 5 WPM Morse hazing ritual.
Good luck -- you're gonna need it

73 de Larry, K3LT

2010. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 01:54:34 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c97ebeb_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 37950

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020319204808.27626.00000357@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article <u9darbppq9om73@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
> <vgermann@socket.net> writes:
>
> >Well, I ** did ** pass the Technician test this evening,
> >with 100 percent.
>
> Val:
>
> Congratulations on the remarkable achievement of passing a test
> that can be passed by any reasonably intelligent 2nd-grader with
> a copy of "Now You're Talking!" Now, to get your General, you've
> got to somehow beat that nasty 'ole 5 WPM Morse hazing ritual.
> Good luck -- you're gonna need it
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry,

That's a fundamental difference between you and me.

I congratulate a newcomer on passing his test and becoming
a ham ... welcoming him, even though we seem to have different
opinions on code testing.

You insult him because you view the test is "too easy."
(At least you didn't outright call him a "knuckle-dragger"
like you've done so many times before.)

Your PR skills for ham radio leave a lot to be desired.

Carl - wa6vse

2011. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 02:40:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C8EE0A8.D50D9580@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38001

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> >I think I've found out
> >> >what I wanted to know here, about these folks, in about 48 hours.
>
> >> Hmmm, this is starting to unravel a bit, Val. Wasn't the premise of your
> >> appearance here that you had been reading this group for about a year and
> >just
> >> now decided to post?
>
> >Hey, there's nothing that will confirm the opinion one forms from merely
> >reading
> >others' posts like engaging them in dialog that brings out front what you
> >have
> >learned to strongly suspect from only reading!
>
> Hmmm, unravels a bit more. I post, and Dick responds, explaining more about why
> "Val" is here...

Well, I suppose you must see things as Cecil, after all you're Mr. Twister's
understudy.
My statement applies fully just as well to anyone reading here.

2012. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 02:40:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C9032D5.ABB81DE8@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38002

CAM wrote:

>
> What other possibility is there besides the ham population declining
> or not declining? I can't think of any.

Uh- how about remaining static?

>
> > You described W0EX's experience as a "one in a million"...
>
> Well, exactly how many Homo sapiens have copied the CW ID of PSK31
> when PSK31 couldn't be copied? And the problem may have been in the
> way Dick mistuned the PSK31 signal. Since the same equipment was
> not being used for each reception, the validity of the observation
> is of limited utility.

Wrong, the same equipment *was* being used, on each of the several stations. All were very weak, coming in from Europe on a nearly dead 20 meter band, and were the only signals noticed. I attempted to tune each station on PSK31, without being able to print any of them. Yet when each signed over I could clearly copy the CW ID. Note that I was experienced at working PSK31 and had done so for some time. Three was no question of my ability to properly tune in a PSK31 signal, which is certainly not a difficult assignment. For all 8 or 10 of those stations to wind up with the same situation, no copy of the PSK but easy copy of the CW, indicated something unusual was happening, probably polar phase shift.

2013. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 02:40:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C9033C7.7C2141DE@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38003

Valentine Germann wrote:

> N2EY wrote, concerning an ARRL survey taken in 1996:
>
> >There was one question about how often the respondent actually
> >used CW. There were 3 choices: "Never", "Rarely", "Regularly".
>
> Ooooops!
>
> Folks, this looks strongly like a question taken from a "survey" that
> was designed to go where the conductor of the survey secretly (or
> not so secretly) wanted to go!
>
> That is, show THIS question to any REAL pollster and then ask
> about it's, er, ah, scientific usefulness!

That poll would well qualify as one that could easily be used to
"prove" which ever way the interpreting authority wanted to go. As indeed
it soon was, by *both* sides of the issue, still in the archives.

2014. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 02:40:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C9034C7.87F656AE@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38004

N2EY wrote:

> Here's a theory for you:
>
> Since the early 1970s, the FCC has had a tiger by the tail in the form of
> pirate/freeband folks. Perhaps FCC thinks that making ham licenses easier to
> get will induce these folks to be licensed, therefore making them easier to
> control.
>
> That may sound "out in left field" at first, but look at FCC's actions since
> 1976 or so.

There's even precedent in the form of the ban on 10 meter-capable amplifiers To keep them put of the hands of the freebanders, FCC mandated a change effecting ham radio.

2015. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 02:40:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C903A65.FFA7AA47@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38005

W1RFI wrote:

> If I do what you say I do,

> say so in your reply post.

That *IS* what I've been doing! What else would I mean by "go back and read it again"?

2016. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 02:40:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C903B4F.A566924E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38006

W1RFI wrote:

>I believe that the number will be smaller because

> of some of the things you say about the mode, such as its not having enough
> value that serious numbers of newcomers will want to study and learn it when it
> isn't part of the test.

There you go again. Please produce a single post where I ever said that. You can't do it.
The value of CW has nothing to do with, and they have no idea of its value, that only comes from learning and using it. Without the incentive of the license few can be expected to do it.
And I say again, that says nothing whatever about its value.

2017. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 02:40:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C90422A.A1F7FBFA@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38007

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > You must compensate the measurements
> > > for bandwidth, throughput, and power for it to be a scientific comparison.
> >
> > Yeah, as I suggested, why don't you just go right ahead with all that, meanwhile I 'll
> > carry on, on the air with CW when I find that it's the mode that holds up and
functions
> > when PSK31 has tanked. See, just be a happy injurneer and I'll be a happier ham.
> > Shannon will forgive us both.
>
> Well, allow me to do something similar to what you reported. If I find a ham who is
> using 1000 watts SSB and is perfectly copyable and ask him to switch over to one watt
> CW, and if I cannot copy him on CW, then SSB beats CW. Does that convince you that
> comparisons should be adjusted for bandwidth, throughput, and power for it to be fair?

It doesn't look like any sort of conversation will ever convince you that a working ham who
is
not a lid doesn't have as a first priority any such unrealistic technical comparisons, in
fact
they won't even be on his radar anywhere in sight. What he is interested in is real live
communications, NOW, not after your theorizing has (hopefully) come to something he can
actually get his hands on.

2018. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 03:15:47 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C97FECD.33E4F2C4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38009

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C96AD17.111D9DDD@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > Buy QST then and read the meeting minutes.
> > >
> > Oops better hurry Bill. The BoD (no doubt on a
> > recommendation by the Newington Crowd) just voted to strike
> > the minutes from the QST. The motion claimed that
> > eliminating 12 b&W pages a year from print would justify the
> > cut.

We are talking here about 12 b&w small print pages out of 12
x 171 pages per year. For the math challenged that is
{[12]/[12 x 171]} x 100 = 0.58%. In other words justifying
the cut based on publishing cost consideration is
ridiculous. IMHO the BoD is cunning, not ridiculous.

> > >
> > > > >Should every volunteer organization be subject to
> > > > >some outside "third party" audit to satisfy people
> > > > >who are NOT members? If yes, WHY?
> > >
> > 501-C3 probably.
>
> ARRL isn't a 501-C3. Neither is NCI.

I realize QST is getting hard to believe, but it says in the
fine print on page 9 March QST " ARRL ... is an exempt
organization under Section 501(c) (3)...".

Care to explain that!

>
> > > Lobbying by organizations that make similar
> > > claims goes on all the time.
> > >
> > Lobbying is prohibited by the ARRL charter or by-laws, I
> > believe.
>
> Depends on what we mean by "lobbying". Clearly
> sending comments on FCC matters via the normal input
> process is not within the legal definition of lobbying.

>
> > > It is the "small groups" that control everything in all
> > > aspects of life. They are NOT without question, but
> > > if no one is dissatisfied, where's the beef.
> >
> > How small? Like Bill Aramony and the United Way of America?
>
> I haven't a clue about what you're talking about.

Mr. Aramony was president of UWA for many years, well
respected, even revered during his reign. He was a small
group of one. He just got out of prison March 1.

> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

2019. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 03:19:10 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020319221910.27626.00000363@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 38011

In article <wJGl8.61$aF.5185@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>Dick Nï¿½BK, from Nebraska -- World's ugliest license plates.

You've obviously never seen Delaware's standard-issue plates. Plain, boring, and butt-ugly. Fortunately, Delaware is pretty flexible and allows almost anything conceivable as a "special" license plate, as long as you keep your "numbers" tag (DE is one of the few states that have strictly numerical license plates) in the vehicle at all times.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2020. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations/problem Hams vs Good Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 03:19:10 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020319221910.27626.00000364@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 38013

In article <217b8ae4.0203190928.2458aaa@posting.google.com>,
RussellTodd@istoreplus.net (Russell Todd) writes:

>Now we've taken a survey of Ham operators in Cornelia, Georgia and
>found that some of them are Shortwave Pirates. KE4ENX is the famous
>Radio Bob and when he ain't jamming the local VHF repeaters here and
>in Cleveland, GA, because he opposes code and won't get a license
>upgrade from Tech, he's yapping on 27.455 Childrens Band causing
>trouble, calling people names, making false accusations.

Just typical no-coder behavior. Nothing new here. Yawn!

>Eveytime he
>tunes up on 6955khz he blocks out TV's all over Mt. Airy and Cornelia
>and us legal Hams get blamed. Considering there aren't but a few of
>us in Cornelia, does anyone have any recomendation as to what we can
>do about KE4ENX and his illegal Radio Bob transmissions? Legal
>suggestions only, he ain't worth going to jail over!

Call your ARRL Section Mangler and find out who the Official Obserer
Coordinator is, then give him a call/E-mail and let him know what's
going on. If he's worth a darn, he'll know what to do about it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2021. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 03:19:11 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020319221911.27626.00000365@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 38014

In article <u9el0mianhbn2c@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>NPR used to be "National Public Radio" and funded
>mostly by "The National Corporation for Public
>Broadcasting," which was funded by Congress, more
>or less. Staring about 20 years ago, NPR & Co. began
>to be seen as WAAAY to liberal and so began to be
>de-funded. Today they're out there on their own and
>have to get money any way they can. It's expand or die.

I've always wondered what would happen to NPR and PBS
if they decided to suddenly adopt a more conservative, or
at least a more moderate, political agenda. My guess is
that they'd suddenly be awash in loot! There are far more
middle-class conservatives with money to use for things
like contributions to NPR/PBS than there are rich liberals
and the terminally-impoverished clients of the Welfare
State created by the guilt of same.

>>And on TV we spend Saturday doing Men in Toolbelts
>>with Norm Abrams' incredible workshop that is increasing
>>looking like one giant infomercial.

All of which makes me think that the whole concept of
"public" broadcasting is an economic non-starter. I'm far
more likely to buy a new De Walt circular saw than I am
to ever send a check to my local PBS/NPR affiliate during
one of their endless "pledge breaks."

>It has to if it wants to stay on the air!

I say, if they want to stay on the air, they should get a clue
not only as to which side their bread is buttered, but to where
the money comes from that buys the butter!

>>The good Mr. Morath at WGBH probably has more
>>special partnerships than Enron.

Don't look now, but I think his name is "Morash."

>>Norm has done more for biscuit-joinery than
>>Armstrong did for FM.
>
>You got that right . . . and I've my biscuit-joiner, you betcha!

Biscuit-joinery is the next best thing to sliced Ponderosa Pine!
I put a picture frame together with biscuits, and you couldn't
blow that thing apart with a whole stick of TNT! But, that's
a whole 'nother network!

>>You couldn't displace Texaco and the Metropolitan Opera
>>with a nuclear device.

Is the Texaco Opera still on-the-air? We don't get it down
here in Radio-Free Delaware.

>No. In fact for me "NPR" means: "National Petroleum
>Radio." After all, Mobile made all those Masterpiece
>Theater and Mystery programs possible!

Not to mention "Mobil," either. I don't know what a city
in Alabama has to do with it.

I know, I know -- give you a break! Sheesh!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2022. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 03:19:12 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020319221912.27626.00000366@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 38012

In article <20020319152158.26064.00000105@mb-fr.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>Quite true, but all of them have much more openness in their
>dealings with the public. Except for one, they accept criticsm
>and roll with it. The NRA seems to have a simple policy: Gun
>down those of opposite views. :-)

Lennie:

That's funny. I've been an NRA member for years, and have read their journals cover-to-cover every month. Nowhere have I ever seen anything like such a "policy" of "gunning down the opposition," except through the legal means of political opposition. It seems to me that you have just accused a large group of law-abiding citizens of murderous anarchy. If this is not so, It would seem to me that an apology is in order.

73 de Larry, K3LT
Member, National Rifle Association

2023. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 04:25:20 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <QaUl8.1465$Jc5.112984@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38018

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020319221910.27626.00000363@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article <wJGl8.61$aF.5185@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard
> McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >Dick N□BK, from Nebraska -- World's ugliest license plates.
>
> You've obviously never seen Delaware's standard-issue plates.
> Plain, boring, and butt-ugly. Fortunately, Delaware is pretty
> flexible and allows almost anything conceivable as a "special"
> license plate, as long as you keep your "numbers" tag (DE
> is one of the few states that have strictly numerical license
> plates) in the vehicle at all times.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

I have and they resemble our old bus and truck plates (now they get the new one, too) although yours do remind me of one I saw some years ago from somewhere in the Empty West that actually said 'Prison Made' on them and looked like they had been made in a dim basement with a large hammer, a blunt instrument, and a bottle of cheap nail polish - the St. Louis Police were duly impressed as they were with our 1963 NE plate that in one of the country's greatest economy moves came out with a blank year for the sticker to be applied next year.

When you see one of our three shades of orange with black letters plates, a sun that looks like an orange or a very raw meatball, complete with the state's website on it you will know it, believe me. Even the artiste who won the design competition dislikes the rendition. NebraskaLand, where the East peters out.

As Val notes, Missouri is right up there for ugly. They managed to presage Y2K in 1970 by starting bright and shiny on 2 January issuing DLs that expired in 1963. The fix worked but the resulting licenses made everyone male.

Looks like DE has not yet caught up with selling your state as a brand. NE shows what can be done with enough idiocy applied to that process.

2024. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 04:27:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C980FC2.4042688E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38019

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Well, allow me to do something similar to what you reported. If I find a ham who is
> > using 1000 watts SSB and is perfectly copyable and ask him to switch over to one watt
> > CW, and if I cannot copy him on CW, then SSB beats CW. Does that convince you that
> > comparisons should be adjusted for bandwidth, throughput, and power for it to be fair?
>
> It doesn't look like any sort of conversation will ever convince you that a working ham
who is
> not a lid doesn't have as a first priority any such unrealistic technical comparisons,
...

What you don't seem to comprehend is that you have been doing unrealistic technical comparisons. Power is only one of the terms. Bandwidth is there and throughput is there. If all three terms are not compensated for in some manner then they are indeed "unrealistic technical comparisons" and you are comparing apples and oranges just like 1000w SSB Vs one watt CW.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2025. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 04:31:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9810BE.51021805@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38020

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > What other possibility is there besides the ham population declining
> > or not declining? I can't think of any.
>
> Uh- how about remaining static?

Uhhhhhhh Dick, remaining static is not declining.

> Wrong, the same equipment *was* being used, on each of the several
> stations.

That's a falsehood, Dick. You were using a computer for PSK31 but not
for the CW ID. The same equipment was NOT being used. Why is that so
hard for you to comprehend?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2026. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 04:33:11 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <a793e7$11nr$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 38029

Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote:
>On Tue, 19 Mar 2002 16:41:37 -0600, CAM wrote:
>>Highly technical people, on the average, are not interested
>>in efficient international communications.
>
> How do they expect their precious Internet and cell-phone systems to
> exisy without same?

Not to mention wired phones. Someone being interviewed on NPR this
morning said that the number of overseas telephone calls made from the
US had increased from 200 million in 1990 to 5.2 billion last year.

> Can't compare Morse with either......

That's true.

>>A lot of them are millionaires UN-interested in efficiency or cost.
>
> They are nouveau-riche and that won't last long if they spend
> blindly. A very distant branch of my family has OLD money and
> you better believe that they are interested in cost and efficiency.

Isn't the goal to spend it or give it all away before you die? The
government will take the lion's share of anything left over when
you're gone (unless you are lucky enough to die in 2009, the one year
that GWB repealed the death tax) so your kids will need to figure
out how to make their own money anyway. Better to redistribute your
own wealth than to have the government do it for you.

Dennis Ferguson

2027. Re: NCI/ARRL memership (was Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 04:35:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020319233535.16055.00000201@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 38022

In article <3c97cbbd_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse-shack@fast.net> writes:

>"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020319063457.05983.00002305@mb-dd.aol.com...
>> From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>
>> >Okay, should I give up NCI-4234 that I've held since Sunday?
>>
>> One down, one to go. Are we going to see you as an ARRL member soon? :-)
>>
>> 73,
>> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>>
>
>Ed,
>
>While I somehow doubt that Len's answer is going to be
>a resounding "Yes!" I feel compelled to point out that NCI
>has NO problems with its members being ARRL members.
>I am ... and many of the other NCI directors are as well.

I request of both the ARRL and NCI personnel to refrain on
either saying, guessing or impying on what another
individual will do next. None of you have crystal balls.

I'll publicly thank Carl for his attention to NCI membership
matters and his work on behalf of getting a US position
on rewriting ITU-R S25.5 for WRC-03.

On anything else in this newsgroup I'll choose to remain
independent.

2028. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 04:35:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020319233537.16055.00000202@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 38023

In article <u9fb1dcugsvt1f@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>Dennis Ferguson wrote, concerning a difference of
>about 10,000 people in the Technician class between
>CA and other state groupings of 100,000 Hams, and
>a similiar difference in the numbers of people holding
>the higher license classes. I said that this difference
>was significant:
>
>>Not really. Here are the 2001 estimates for the
>>populations of those states:
>>
>>CA: 34,501,130
>>NY, OH, PA & MO: 48,301,776
>>TX, FL, NM & AZ: 44,858,010
>>
>>California has more hams per capita in all classes. It
>>just has somewhat more of the higher classes and a
>>lot more Techs.
>
>No, it has LESS of the higher classes, in absolute
>numbers, and VASTLY less per capita! Ah, yeah,
>CA has a lot more Techs, absolutely and relatively,
>and, er, that's what I was referring to!

You seem to be using the standard N2EY "I alone set
the boundary conditions here" tactic of predefining
conclusions to achieve. That's not a "statistical tool,"
that's just a transparent bit of propaganda.

>Ask any statistician . . . it IS significant. That is, the
>factors behind those numbers are important to Ham
>Radio and it's future, most likely.

Define "what is important to the future" of anything and
then prove that definition is "correct."

>>Trying to correlate this with anything in particular seems
>>hopeless.
>
>To you, maybe, but the folks at ARRL likely care!

Why? They already have their little monopoly on influence
but I'm sure they want more membership monies to make
the museum spiffier and pay the heating bills, etc.

>>For example, California also has a signficantly larger
>>economy per capita then your other two groups, so
>>maybe it proves that people with higher discretionary
>>income are more likely to blow some of it on radios?
>
>That would seem arguable BUT, it would not necessarily
>explain the internal differences by itself.

The people of California aren't tied or bound hand and foot to tradition and the ways that have always been so. We've gone on DOING things and attracted others who want to DO things, new things, advanced things, more and better things. Californians invented the Space Transportation System that some refer to as "shuttle." The bikini was born here. The personal computer got started here and is still being made despite IBM shutting down Boca Raton. There wouldn't be the plethora of semiconductors and integrated circuits for all of electronics without Silicon Valley or the various centers for semiconductors throughout this state. The first flying wing was born here and is still being built here as the B-2. Lockheed and Douglas and North American and Convair all showed the rest of the aviation world how to make airplanes, rivalled only by Boeing up in Washington state, another westerner. This state is the largest producer of cotton of any state in the union. The giant San Joaquin Valley is the breadbasket for the rest of the country. You want to know how to grow, ferment, and bottle wine for the relatively new Missouri wine industry? Come to the middle of California to see how it is done year around. There are no "bad" years, they are all good.

Want to communicate on the largest single repeater net begun without a single microprocessor? Sign into the Condor net and talk over a chain that takes a full days driving from one end to another. Want to see the variety of amateur radio stations and antennas used in the examples of stations sampled for RF exposure? Read about just Southern California stations in a government report. One out of 8 Americans live in California because we've DONE things, pushed the envelopes of performance of many technologies. While our public school system is lagging badly after using eastern methods of "new" education, this state has the highest number of Nobel Prize winners. Californians and California companies built most of the comm sats and the deep space probes with JPL as a "boss" with the Deep Space Network tracking them and receiving their data. DX truly "far out."

If your boundary conditions for your numbers mean defining the amateur classes by old standards and practices, go ahead and skew your data any way you want. This isn't a state stuck forever in the past, re-enacting some historical events in quaint costumes using ancient tools and technologies while dreaming dreams of glory and

accomplishment. We've gone ahead and pushed technology farther out, farther up, farther inward to miniaturization by experiementation, trying something on just an idea, then succeeding at it. Dreams of the future, not the past, looking ahead, not backwards.

>Sorry, can't do that! I'm interested in what's actually
>going on with those numbers!

Go ahead, make some morsemen's day, champion manual telegraphy all you want. Exhult in "pioneering HF radio" all the way to 2030 even though it was actually pioneered in 1930. Pardon us if we don't see the value in hanging on to something old, something borrowed, while you are so blue. Californians don't want to be bothered with advancing to the past. We've been there, didn't like it enough to stay, have gone on to the future and better things.

Skew the boundary conditions any which way you want.
What you'll have as a result is a skewed set good only for reinforcing your own personal desires. Hang onto that. It will make you feel very good.

2029. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations/problem Hams vs Good Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 04:35:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9811A1.E446BF9F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38021

W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> "Russell Todd" <RussellTodd@istoreplus.net> wrote:
> > Considering there aren't but a few of
> > us in Cornelia, does anyone have any recomendation as to what we can
> > do about KE4ENX and his illegal Radio Bob transmissions? Legal
> > suggestions only, he ain't worth going to jail over!
>
> You just may end up in court for the above, yourself. You have other
> avenues available, such as a report to the FCC, with recordings of the
> things you speak of. All you get here in this newsgroup is...well, nothing.
> And, if this person happens to see your post--you are the one who may end up
> in court on the wrong side of a lawsuit.
>
> Caution advised.

Still, a needle in the coax is pretty effective. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2030. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 04:40:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9812BC.EF72098@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38024

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> >I believe that the number will be smaller because
>
> > of some of the things you say about the mode, such as its not having enough
> > value that serious numbers of newcomers will want to study and learn it when it
> > isn't part of the test.
>
> There you go again. Please produce a single post where I ever said that. You can't
> do it.
> The value of CW has nothing to do with, and they have no idea of its value, that
> only comes from learning and using it. Without the incentive of the license few can
> be expected to do it.
> And I say again, that says nothing whatever about its value.

Dick, have you or have you not said that potential hams will not learn Morse code unless they are required to do so by the FCC regulations? With that attitude supported by numerous postings from you, why would any newcomer think Morse code was worth learning?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2031. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 04:43:19 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a79456$14v$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38026

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C97FECD.33E4F2C4@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > "Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C96AD17.111D9DDD@worldnet.att.net...
> > >
> > >
> > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > > Buy QST then and read the meeting minutes.
> > > >
> > > Oops better hurry Bill. The BoD (no doubt on a
> > > recommendation by the Newington Crowd) just voted to strike
> > > the minutes from the QST. The motion claimed that
> > > eliminating 12 b&W pages a year from print would justify the
> > > cut.
>
> We are talking here about 12 b&w small print pages out of 12
> x 171 pages per year. For the math challenged that is
> {[12]/[12 x 171]} x 100 = 0.58%. In other words justifying
> the cut based on publishing cost consideration is
> ridiculous. IMHO the BoD is cunning, not ridiculous.
>
> > > >
> > > > >Should every volunteer organization be subject to
> > > > >some outside "third party" audit to satisfy people
> > > > >who are NOT members? If yes, WHY?
> > >
> > > 501-C3 probably.
> >
> > ARRL isn't a 501-C3. Neither is NCI.
>
> I realize QST is getting hard to believe, but it says in the
> fine print on page 9 March QST " ARRL ... is an exempt
> organization under Section 501(c) (3)...".
>
> Care to explain that!

My mistake then. It is, then, a non-profit. I don't
know how much that means to the issue of third party
audits...but Ed already indicated ARRL has an annual
audit done.

> > > > Lobbying by organizations that make similar
> > > > claims goes on all the time.
> > >
> > > Lobbying is prohibited by the ARRL charter or by-laws, I
> > > believe.
> >
> > Depends on what we mean by "lobbying". Clearly
> > sending comments on FCC matters via the normal input
> > process is not within the legal definition of lobbying.
> >
> > > > It is the "small groups" that control everything in all
> > > > aspects of life. They are NOT without question, but
> > > > if no one is dissatisfied, where's the beef.
> > >
> > > How small? Like Bill Aramony and the United Way of America?
> >
> > I haven't a clue about what you're talking about.
>
> Mr. Aramony was president of UWA for many years, well
> respected, even revered during his reign. He was a small
> group of one. He just got out of prison March 1.

And I should give a hoot about that because????

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2032. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 04:48:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020319234831.11757.00000144@mb-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 38027

In article <20020319221912.27626.00000366@mb-fi.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>That's funny. I've been an NRA member for years, and have read
>their journals cover-to-cover every month. Nowhere have I ever seen
>anything like such a "policy" of "gunning down the opposition,"
>except through the legal means of political opposition. It seems to
>me that you have just accused a large group of law-abiding citizens
>of murderous anarchy. If this is not so, It would seem to me that
>an apology is in order.

LARRIE,

Here's your deserved apology: BITE ME.

2033. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 04:54:25 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a794q1$2dl$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38028

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020318204838.21361.00002141@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net
>
> >Your question and answer about 5 wpm shows you may have been
> >less than experienced with HF morse operation. The 5 wpm
> >was the entry level just to allow one to get a CW Keyed rig
> >on the air in the novice subbands to begin to get ones speed
> >up to a "minimum" level suitable for operation in the larger
> >portions of spectrum outside the novice subbands. 5 wpm was
> >for entry level novices. Historically, 5 wpm was never
> >intended to be an on-going minimum. Historically, it took
> >10 to 13 wpm to be introduced to general use in the
> >international arena of code not only amateur, but ship to
> >ship, ship to shore, and other commercial use. 13 wpm was
> >judged by many to be the minimum operating speed where one
> >could say one had developed the ear/wetware modem
> >coordination required for proper utilization of CW Morse.
> >
> >Of course now these facts will all be declared fabrications,
> >and mythology by NCIists, ARRL Zombies, etc., in order to
> >justify their beliefs and actions. Isn't it funny how
> >historical revisionism works?
>
> No, I would say that your history of the intent of 5 wpm vs 13 wpm is
> reasonably accurate.
>
> Bill, do you think he was correct in his assessment of the recent history
of
> code speeds?

Ed,
I posted a response to that several days ago. In short...once 5 wpm was
the permanent accepted level for techs that could operate on Novice
HF segments, then and from that day forward 5 wpm was accepted
as the minimu for HF.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2034. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 04:56:07 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <a794p7$131h$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 38030

Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net> wrote:
>Dennis Ferguson wrote, concerning a difference of
>about 10,000 people in the Technician class between
>CA and other state groupings of 100,000 Hams, and
>a similiar difference in the numbers of people holding
>the higher license classes. I said that this difference
>was significant:

Here's the thing you said that the comment was referring to:

>>>Also, summing the "Top Three" licesnse classes,
>>>EX, AD, GEN, we get:
>>>
>>>For CA a total of 39,700.
>>>For NY, OH, PA & MO we have 48,500.
>>>For TX, FL, NM and AZ we have 47,800.
>>>
>>>Once again, a significant difference between
>>>CA and the other two groups.

About this I pointed out:

>>Not really. Here are the 2001 estimates for the
>>populations of those states:
>>
>>CA: 34,501,130
>>NY, OH, PA & MO: 48,301,776
>>TX, FL, NM & AZ: 44,858,010
>>
>>California has more hams per capita in all classes. It
>>just has somewhat more of the higher classes and a
>>lot more Techs.
>
>No, it has LESS of the higher classes, in absolute
>numbers, and VASTLY less per capita!

Boy, either math must work different where you live than where I live
or "per capita" must have a radically different meaning. Here's the
number of E/A/G and Tech hams per 1,000,000 of total population for the
entire country:

E/A/G T
USA: 1135 782

Here are comparable numbers for the particular states you seem interested
in:

CA: 1150 1202
NY, OH, PA & MO: 1004 631
TX, FL, NM & AZ: 1066 746

California has about the expected number of E/A/G hams, but has more Techs than the rest of the country on a per capita basis. The other groups of states are about 10% light in both categories compared to the country as a whole.

>Ask any statistician . . . it IS significant. That is, the
>factors behind those numbers are important to Ham
>Radio and it's future, most likely.

Just trying to help you get the factors straightened out.
Per capita, California has about the number of E/A/G hams you would expect from the national population, so that doesn't seem very significant. It has more Techs and more hams overall, so that may be significant. The other states you mention are short of hams in both groups, I don't know whether that is significant or not.

I don't think there's any statistician who would find the fact that in absolute terms California has only about 80% of the higher-class hams that either of those other groups of states have to be surprising or significant, since California has only 75% of the total population of either group.

>>Trying to correlate this with anything in particular seems
>>hopeless.
>
>To you, maybe, but the folks at ARRL likely care!

About too many Techs, like California has, or about too few hams, like those other states you mentioned have? I'll bet the latter bothers them more.

Dennis Ferguson

2035. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 05:01:03 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9g4r5ql2ht4cc@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38025

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>Congrats on passing your tech test.

Thanks! I'm only sorry I did not take the plunge
years ago. Sometimes mistakes are made!

Val

2036. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 05:04:10 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a795c8$k4n$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38032

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C96BBBE.76DA823E@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> >
> > > And when ARRL elected officials don't conduct themselves according
> > > to acceptable standards, THEY get recalled.
>
> Check p. 60, March QST: Now the ARRL executive committee
> can banish elected Section Managers and keep them banished,
> "for the good of amateur radio" of course. No recall
> required. Guess who makes up the executive committee?
>
>
>
> > Nope...the representatives CAN use whatever input they
> > want to vote on a position. There's NO requirement that they
> > follow some undefined majority. In the end, the next
> > election will bear out how far afield an individual may have gone
> > yet still be re-elected.
>
> That is if the membership can find out how the Div.Dir.
> voted.

All you have to do is ask the individual director. He/she
will either answer with how they voted...to which you are
then free to agree or disagree and do whatever you like...or
the director can choose to not tell you, in which case I'd
be really ticked off and would not vote that person to
be reelected at the next election.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2037. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 05:15:21 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a796r7$r34$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38035

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020319003228.09247.00001994@mb-cs.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test
> >From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
> >Date: 03/18/02 18:59 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <a75v5hnuq2@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
>
> >So does your representative always vote as you wish?
> >Does s/he always "poll" everyone to know the latest position of the
masses?
>
> Voting as >>I<< wish..??? Of course not, not always, but they
CERTAINLY
> do not simply do as they see fit, either!

And you know that based on what evidence.
More to the point, just how does any director instantly
know the "majority" stance of the hams in the region he
or she represents on any given issue?

> One very popular US President tried that "silent majority" tack for
taking
> his own advice, and you see what it got him!

What?

> > When my local officials start acting on thier own accord, they get
> >> recalled.
> >
> >Not all places have recall. Sometimes ya just gotta wait
> >until the next election.
>
> Don't have recall? What public office cannot be recinded by popular
or
> Congressional vote?

Many. Recall is NOT universal...it varies based on jurisdiction.

> >> And when ARRL elected officials don't conduct themselves according
> >> to acceptable standards, THEY get recalled.
> >
> >Pretty rare event.
>
> Excuse me? Without going back through the last couple month'sQST's,
an SM
> was removed for just such reasons.

I said rare! I didn't say NEVER!

> >I note also that there has been no movement
> >to do so after the recent policy decision to not oppose dropping
> >the treaty requirement for morse.
>
> EXACTLY what I have been saying to Clay. While it certainly remains
a
> topic of conversation, the "Morse Code" issue is not the firebrand it used
to
> be.

So much for any efforts at recall then.

> Just as I said of my own opinions...I don't particularly like it, but
it
> was given it's day in the court of public opinion, and now it's time to
move
> on. There are REAL policy issues to get on with, yet they still are
ignored by
> those who figure someone else will do something about it.

Situation normal.

> >Nope...the representatives CAN use whatever input they
> >want to vote on a position. There's NO requirement that they
> >follow some undefined majority.
>
> In my Congressional District there is no "undefined majority". It IS
my
> fellow voters in this district.

Is that the fellow voters that voted last election...or those
that might in the next election...or is it anyone who calls
the congress critter.

> And there IS a requirement that they represent us per our wishes.

PLEASE show us where that is spoecifically stated in the constitution
or any other law. Other than the elective process itself (and recall
where it may be an option) there is NO other means to hold anyone
accountable for how they vote. How many times have we heard the
explanation "I voted my conscience" when the known public opinion
would have "dictated" a vote the other way.

> >In the end, the next
> >election will bear out how far afield an individual may have gone
> >yet still be re-elected.
>
> If the representitive has stayed the course with popular opinion of
the
> constituents all-the-while having not been caught doing dope or molesting
> teenage pages, they stand a pretty good chance of keeping thier job.

Even those that don't always vote public opinion get reelected.

> >Reality, deal with it.
>
> I am not the one having the problem here, Bill.

Could have fooled me.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2038. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 05:22:34 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9g63ra03gmk94@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38031

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>Congratulations on the remarkable achievement of passing
>a test that can be passed by any reasonably intelligent 2nd-
>grader with a copy of "Now You're Talking!" Now, to get your
>General, you've got to somehow beat that nasty 'ole 5 WPM
>Morse hazing ritual. Good luck -- you're gonna need it

As you know, it won't be a matter of luck at all. Application
to the task at hand will get the job done. And I know from my
long-suffering Ham neighbor that 5 wpm is nowhere with
code and I'm going to have to about triple that . . . and that
I ** WILL ** triple that if I stay with it, which I intend to do.

I guess I've really been of two minds about this Technician test.
That is, it turned out to be fun, mostly because of the QRZ site.
I had read the "Now You're Talking" book thoroughly and had
gone over the questions there but, well, using that site really
put the icing on the cake. I took their sample tests several
dozen times.

So, in the end, some of the material I simply memorzed, like
the frequency limits and things like that. Some material I just
knew, such as electrical theory and components and whatnot.
Much of the rest I locked in on after the reading and from that
QRZ site, which is great.
.
Today, with the QRZ site able to put up sample tests of almost
any kind, I think the pools could be done away with, or
made larger, or whatever, thus making the tests "harder." If
if the student could take sample tests, even if they were only
approximate, it would give a lot of confidence, and success
would be assured for any serious-minded person, even with
the more difficult task.

Of course, not everyone has internet access, so . . .

Anyway, it may have been a relatively simple test but ace-ing
it was still a kick, without a doubt!

Val

2039. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 05:23:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C981CC4.60359165@earthlink.net>
Source record: 38034

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20020319221912.27626.00000366@mb-fi.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >That's funny. I've been an NRA member for years, and have read
> >their journals cover-to-cover every month. Nowhere have I ever seen
> >anything like such a "policy" of "gunning down the opposition,"
> >except through the legal means of political opposition. It seems to
> >me that you have just accused a large group of law-abiding citizens
> >of murderous anarchy. If this is not so, It would seem to me that
> >an apology is in order.
>
> LARRIE,
>
> Here's your deserved apology: BITE ME.

Now THERE'S one happy old man!

Dave K8MN

2040. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 05:23:58 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a796r8$r34$2@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38037

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9darbppq9om73@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all!
>
> Well, I ** did ** pass the Technician test this evening,

Congrats!

Bill K2UNK

2041. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 05:29:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a796r9$r34$3@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38036

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020319204808.27626.00000357@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article <u9darbppq9om73@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
> <vgermann@socket.net> writes:
>
> >Well, I ** did ** pass the Technician test this evening,
> >with 100 percent.
>
> Val:
> Congratulations on the remarkable achievement of passing a test
> that can be passed by any reasonably intelligent 2nd-grader with
> a copy of "Now You're Talking!" Now, to get your General, you've
> got to somehow beat that nasty 'ole 5 WPM Morse hazing ritual.
> Good luck -- you're gonna need it
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Val,
You really gotta love Larry. Amazing too how his
comments underscore the phrase: "Life is better
than fiction."
No one could make up the junk that
Larry keeps popping up with.

Cheers...and congrats again on becoming a ham.
Bill K2UNK

2042. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 05:35:00 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9g6r32e1deb34@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38033

Dennis Ferguson wrote:

>I don't think there's any statistician who would find the fact that
>in absolute terms California has only about 80% of the higher-
>class hams that either of those other groups of states have to
>be surprising or significant, since California has only 75% of
>the total population of either group.

My, and a statistician friend's, comment: ???????

>About too many Techs, like California has, or about too few
>hams, like those other states you mentioned have? I'll bet the
>latter bothers them more.

It's not "too many" Technicians, or "too few" higher-class
licensees, it's the difference, which I think is very large.
I wasn't making a moral judgement!

In any event, there's a research project here somewhere!

More later, now that I have a professional on my team!

Val

2043. Re: Death to Ham Radio at the hands of it's own operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 05:45:22 UTC
From: Steve Lewis N8TFD <n8tfd@one.net>
Message-ID: <3C9821F2.20B318E1@one.net>
Source record: 38038
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.amateur,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Phil:

Comments below.

"Phillip A Manning (KC8TAU)" wrote:
>
> I have been recently toying with the idea of putting a dual band
> (2m/440) amateur rig in my car. To assess if the investment would be
> worth it (seeing as how I already have a mod'ed commercial 440 rig in
> my car for amateur and GMRS) I borrowed a friend's scanner and
> listened to many of the "active" frequencies in this area, the greater
> Cincinnati area. I found a few very active places, which got my hopes
> up until I started listening to the content of these channels.

It's probably not wise to admit that you're trying to do things that are bad practice if not overtly illegal. It makes it harder for the "old guard" to take you seriously, even if you have a valid point(s).

> It appears to me that the Greater Cincinnati area is "under siege" by
> a very few groups of amateurs. I noticed that the diversity in radio
> is nil the same people on all the used frequencies, and even thou they
> clam to be an "open" group if you listen to them new people with new
> ideas are ran off. On some of the repeaters just a normal
> conversation is cut off for tying up the repeater. On a clear sunny
> day not during peak traffic times why should a conversation on a Ham
> repeater that it observing the courtesies of normal ham communications
> (i.e. waiting for the repeater to drop so any other station calling
> could get in if they wanted to) be cut for the reason of wanting empty
> air. That to me sounds like non-effective use of frequency space.

What repeater was this on? How long were you talking? The rest of us might be listening. I don't know you personally...but I can say that I would tire of listening to even my closest amateur radio friends for a long period of time.

> Now that we are on frequency space let me just say that it seems a
> little excessive for one group to control six different repeater pairs
> across two different bands. Five of those in the 2m band alone. This
> to me sounds like a lack of diversity, and if you track some of there
> frequencies you will find that one of them is in a garage on a mag.
> mount antenna just to tie up the space so that no one else can use
> that space for a new repeater and haven forbid some new opinions and
> views.

Maybe. But I don't think you have any MORE or LESS right to the frequencies than they do. If the repeaters are as idle as you say, isn't there plenty of

bandwidth for you to spread your opinions and views. Of course, this is a two-way communications hobby, it's not about BROADCASTING your opinions and views.

I haven't heard you on the repeaters that I listen to, so I can't imagine that there isn't one for you to use and not be bothered.

> If you live in or near Cincinnati you may know who I am talking about.
> CRA (Cincinnati Repeater Association) seems to be the only way to get
> on the air in this city, and if you try to put up a repeater of your
> own you will find that all the vhf pairs are taken. Now, if this
> group is truly interested in keeping ham radio alive they would
> welcome new people and points of view, but to the contrary if you
> disagree with any member of the group you will find yourself subject
> to jamming and "the cold shoulder" until you just give up. These
> people do not extent their damaging attitude into just a standard
> radio group, but the "leaders" of the group also seem to run all
> activity available to hams in this area like: Sky Warn Group, QCEN
> (Queen City Emergency Net), and ARPSC (Amateur Radio Public Service
> Corps). So as you can see if you want to do anything in this city in
> ham radio you have to subject your self to a group that I have heard,
> aptly referred to as the CRM (Cincinnati Repeater Mafia).

Plenty of other clubs have at least 2 repeater pairs of their own. I'm not a CRA member, never have been (ask my cohorts about this), but I'm guessing you had a bad experience on one of their machines because you haven't talked about any other club's repeaters?

Also...have you been to an ARPSC meeting? How about a QCEN meeting? (You haven't been to a QCEN meeting). Can you name some of the leadership from each group? You'll find very little in common.

Have you checked into a WARN net? No. Will you attend the annual WARN meeting/training? After this, you'd better!

> So you may ask, what can be done about such atrocities? Well I have
> added contact information to a key person at the bottom of this post
> if you know of anyone else who may help please let them know and if
> you would let me know and I will forward a copy of this letter to them
> so they may hear my argument as well. Please contact someone and let
> them know that the hams in Cincinnati are being oppressed by local
> radio groups of, and we would like to take the air waves back for the
> hams and not leave them to the death they are suffering here in this
> great city.

What makes Ken a key person? What is his position exactly?

> Ohio Coordinator:
>
> Kin Bird, W8SMK
> 244 North Parkway Dr.
> Delaware, OH 43015-8788
> Ken@midohio.net
>

> Phil Manning
> KC8TAU
> kc8tau@fuse.net

Ok Phil:

I'm guessing that what happened is you jumped on a CRA repeater, at drive time, and monopolized the thing. I don't know about your operating practices, but good or not, no one wants to hear YOUR opinions and ideas for hours at a time.

You seem to be like many other UseNet posters. You have a lot of complaints, but you don't tell the whole story. And since you've NEVER been at meetings of the organizations in question, I expect that you will cease trashing them until you've met the people you seem to despise, and they've had a chance to meet you.

SkyWARN, ARES/RACES, and Red Cross are always looking for new hams. Ham radio is much more than ragchewing on or complaining about 2 meters.

But I get the impression that you're in the hobby because you think it will provide you a soapbox to share some kind of "opinions and ideas".

If so, you've probably joined the wrong hobby. Or you've been influenced by amateur radio operators who are misinformed.

I challenge you to explore ALL the repeaters and ALL the groups around Cincinnati, and report back honestly.

Otherwise, I won't take the time to invite you to join the real hobby, and won't offer my time to help in any way I can (which is what I'm trying to do here).

-73-

2044. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 05:48:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7981n$t6a$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38039

"Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote in message
news:a793e7$11nr$1@heap.juniper.net...
> Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote:
> >On Tue, 19 Mar 2002 16:41:37 -0600, CAM wrote:
> >>Highly technical people, on the average, are not interested
> >>in efficient international communications.
> >
> > How do they expect their precious Internet and cell-phone systems to
> > exisy without same?
>
> Not to mention wired phones. Someone being interviewed on NPR this
> morning said that the number of overseas telephone calls made from the
> US had increased from 200 million in 1990 to 5.2 billion last year.

Probably true. Calling overseas today is just about as
easy as calling long distance (i.e. 1+10 digit dialing)
and the costs of a call have been driven down to
the point that an international call isn't all that more
expensive than domestic.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2045. Re: For Discussion: ARRL Fee's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 06:00:41 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a7a0kh31827@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 38053

Brian... I was looking at this idea from a marketing stance. If ya can hook 'em on a piece of bait, ya may keep them. True some may drop out after the first year but many more may stick around. After all, if they weren't getting any money from these people in the first place, it is actually a gain in some respects. Again for any others who like to read it differently, this idea was for FIRST TIME member applications who never held a ARRL membership only.

This idea has worked in other applications and was just curious if it would work with the ARRL if they pursued it...

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:3Rwl8.7750$g47.1510628545@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C960B33.EFB755F5@IEEE.org...
> > KC8PMX wrote:
> > > Your ideas and thoughts....
> >
> > Lots of publications give discounted rates for new subscribers.
> > I'm just waiting for next year when I get the senior discount.
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> Cecil, what age is that?
>
> I think Ryan is on to something. Hey Ed...
>
> Brian
>
>

2046. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 06:04:17 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a7a0ki41827@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 38054

No.... they only speak for their membership. They are not obligated to the other 3/4 of the ham population.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message news:20020319152154.26064.00000102@mb-fr.aol.com...
> In article <Rxxl8.7802$KG.1516912864@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> Since Morse testing was only required for HF operations, why
> >> not survey the HF operators?
> >
> >Why not just let the ARRL speak for all amateurs?
>
> You mean they aren't doing so?!? Gasp...! :-)

2047. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 06:06:09 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a7a0ki51827@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 38055

Jeesh Ed, that goes against some people here that insist there must be some time limit before a person *must* upgrade! :)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message news:20020319062554.05983.00002303@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam (Bert Craig)
>
> >Congratulations! Best of luck to you on the General and Element 1.
>
> Assuming he wants to upgrade right away. Some hams want to have fun with the
> license they just passed before worrying about the next one. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

2048. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 06:10:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020320011024.19499.00001395@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 38040

>Subject: Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test
>From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>Date: 03/20/02 00:15 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <a796r7$r34$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>

>> Voting as >>I<< wish..??? Of course not, not always, but they
>CERTAINLY
>> do not simply do as they see fit, either!
>
>And you know that based on what evidence.
>More to the point, just how does any director instantly
>know the "majority" stance of the hams in the region he
>or she represents on any given issue?

By my experience, observation and interaction with others interested in the issue at hand. Discussions at club meetings, local newsletters, discussion on the air, etc.

It does not require the services of A.C. Nielsen to know what's going on or what my peer's opinions are, Bill, whether it is my interest in an ARRL/Amateur Radio matter, or local politics. Just a keen ear and a willingness to make myself informed on the issues.

>>One very popular US President tried that "silent majority" tack for
>taking
>> his own advice, and you see what it got him!
>
>What?

Feigned ignorance does not suit you, Bill.

>>Don't have recall? What public office cannot be recinded by popular
>or
>> Congressional vote?
>
>Many. Recall is NOT universal...it varies based on jurisdiction.

I asked for some sort of specific, Bill. Are you unable to produce even one? Not ONE single elected office that cannot be recalled by popular or Congressional vote?

If the President of the United States can be recalled or impeached, what lesser office could be impervious to the whims of the electorate?

Just one, Bill. Please.

>> >> And when ARRL elected officials don't conduct themselves according
>> >> to acceptable standards, THEY get recalled.
>> >
>> >Pretty rare event.
>>
>> Excuse me? Without going back through the last couple month'sQST's,
>an SM
>> was removed for just such reasons.
>
>I said rare! I didn't say NEVER!

But not by recent events, it's not. There have been several premature changes in ARRL field leadership in RECENT years that were precipitated by "cause", rather than by resignation for personal reasons or death of the office holder.

>So much for any efforts at recall then.

My point is that there wil be no such effort since the recent actions of the ARRL generally reflect the opinions and desires of the membership.

>There are REAL policy issues to get on with, yet they still are
>ignored by
>> those who figure someone else will do something about it.
>
>Situation normal.

Apathy fits you even less than feigned ignorance, Bill.

>In my Congressional District there is no "undefined majority". It IS
>my
>> fellow voters in this district.
>
>Is that the fellow voters that voted last election...or those
>that might in the next election...or is it anyone who calls
>the congress critter.

Since balloting is secret and participation in the electorial process is solely at the discretion of the voter, it would be all citizens. But voting or NOT voting is irrelevent. The representitive is required to represent ALL citizens of thier district/state to the best of thier ability.

>> And there IS a requirement that they represent us per our wishes.
>
>PLEASE show us where that is spoecifically stated in the constitution
>or any other law.

That obscure part that says "We, The People". Is thre a specific line that says "You will do this or else"? Of course not. But neither is there a line in the Constitution that says "The Government is responsible for providing shelter, substinence and health care for otherwise able bodied people who refuse to work", but it does it anyway, now doesn't it, Bill?

>Other than the elective process itself (and recall
>where it may be an option) there is NO other means to hold anyone
>accountable for how they vote. How many times have we heard the
>explanation "I voted my conscience" when the known public opinion
>would have "dictated" a vote the other way.

And it should be the responsiblity of his/her constituents to "fire" them.
I agree it happens, Bill. I never said it doesn't. I said it isn't right.

>Even those that don't always vote public opinion get reelected.

One of the anomolies of a society that will elect and subsequently reelect
a known drug user, coward and womanizer, I guess. "Feces Ominus Occurum".

>> >Reality, deal with it.
>>
>> I am not the one having the problem here, Bill.
>
>Could have fooled me.

It seems easy to do.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2049. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 08:39:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020320033935.03373.00003077@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 38041

>Subject: Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/19/02 23:48 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020319234831.11757.00000144@mb-bj.aol.com>

>>That's funny. I've been an NRA member for years, and have read
>>their journals cover-to-cover every month. Nowhere have I ever seen
>>anything like such a "policy" of "gunning down the opposition,"
>>except through the legal means of political opposition. It seems to
>>me that you have just accused a large group of law-abiding citizens
>>of murderous anarchy. If this is not so, It would seem to me that
>>an apology is in order.
>
>LARRIE,
>
>Here's your deserved apology: BITE ME.

I think Lennie has once again proven to one and all just what kind of a scumbag, antisocial POS he really is.

Even more laughable his frequent accusations against myself and other veterans for alleged neo-violent behaviour.

Thanks, Lennie. It makes my job so much easier when you contribute to your own NG demise so willingly and liberally.

What a P U T Z ! ! ! !

Steve

2050. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 11:22:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020320062225.15164.00002217@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38042

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Those words will ring in my head for, maybe the next .005 seconds!

Perhaps you need a capacitor with a higher Q.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2051. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 11:27:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020320062703.15164.00002218@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38043

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>The value of CW has nothing to do with, and they have no idea of its value,
>that
>only comes from learning and using it. Without the incentive of the license
>few can
>be expected to do it.
> And I say again, that says nothing whatever about its value.

Then why don't you say that CW Morse has value and is worth learning even if one is not tested for it? When you say that it has value but that no one will learn it unless they are required to do so by the circumstance of the test you are sending a very confused message.

You choose the latter every time, and argue with me when I say the former. What conclusion do you expect people to draw from that, Dick?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2052. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 11:29:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020320062919.15164.00002219@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38044

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> What other possibility is there besides the ham population declining
>> or not declining? I can't think of any.

> Uh- how about remaining static?

That is "not declining."

It is also very unlikely that the number of ham radio operators will remain static.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2053. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 11:30:46 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020320063046.15164.00002220@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38045

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>For all 8 or 10 of those stations to wind up with the
>same situation, no copy of the PSK but easy copy of the CW, indicated
>something unusual was happening, probably polar phase shift.

So it would have been much more informative to say that CW provides better copy
than phase-shift keying when unusual propagation contains rapid phase shifts.

That would be a bit more informative to newcomers than "Shannon was wrong."

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

Un

2054. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 11:32:50 UTC
From: Garvin@Truss.net
Message-ID: <1f9b816.6kw6arjdi977N%Garvin@Truss.net>
Source record: 38046

Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net> wrote:

> Hello, all!
>
> Well, I ** did ** pass the Technician test this evening,
> with 100 percent. I was in competition with another
> fellow (we're both long-time members of the local
> astronomy club) and he got 100 percent as well. If
> I had missed one, well, I never would have heard the
> end of it, just because . . .
>
> We both took the test seriously and studied hard.
>
> My neighbor down the street, the guy who started me
> down this road, took my dues for the local club last
> week and they voted me in a few days ago, on his
> word that I would pass. So, the heat was REALLY on!
>
> I'm very happy to at last be a ham and have already
> started on the General book and the CW. Also, the
> amateur satellite programs have a lot of interest for
> me, particularly because I give fifteen to twenty
> programs per year on astronomy, about half of them
> to schools. Now, I can have a radio component in
> those programs!
>
> Val Germann
> Columbia, Missouri
> (waiting for a call sign on the QRZ site!)

Congrats Val! Welcome to ham radio! The satellites are a blast!

--
If people from Poland are called Poles, why
aren't people from Holland called Holes?
- George Carlin

2055. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 11:34:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020320063419.15164.00002221@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38047

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>You really gotta love Larry.

And it really shot holes in his claims that he doesn't blame newcomers for the state of the tests and only insults those that are lazy.

I think Larry is only here because he has proclaimed usenet to be a place where social rules need not apply.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2056. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 11:39:42 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020320063942.15164.00002222@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38048

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>And you know that based on what evidence.
>More to the point, just how does any director instantly
>know the "majority" stance of the hams in the region he
>or she represents on any given issue?

They don't, although they are all asking for member input on a regular basis. Tom Frenaye has told me that I am one of a handful of people who regularly give him their views.

We vote for people whose judgement we trust and I have the expectation of Tom that he will research issues and make the correct decision. He will certainly be in a better position to make the right decision about things I know nothing about. I regularly hear from ARRL Directors, asking me for technical information that will help them decide how to handle a particular issue.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2057. Re: NCI/ARRL memership (was Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 11:48:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020320064828.15164.00002223@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38049

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>In fact, I would encourage NCI members to join ARRL as
>well, if they're not already members. First, ARRL does do
>a lot of good things for amateur radio. Second, the more
>NCI members we have contacting their ARRL directors
>with their views and voting in ARRL elections, the more
>we'll be able to influence ARRL policy on issues where we
>may have historically had diverging views.

This is a good example of an opportunity to vote early and vote often. :-)
While I don't think people should be pests about it, at each milestone in this process, people should reinforce their major viewpoints to their ARRL Division Directors. This may be especially true if they set a policy you agree with.

I am sure that the members of the Board heard from those who did not agree with its decision to not use ARRL resources to oppose dropping the code test as an international treaty requirement. I wonder if they heard from the same percentage of those who agreed with the decision.

I would not want to see the Board scramble at the last minute to make decisions about ARRL's policy position wrt the US rules. They want, and need, to hear from members on a regular basis.

I have an influence on the ARRL Board out of proportion to that of most hams -- not because I work in the ARRL Lab, but because I have developed a relationship with Tom that is as open and productive, as I can make it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2058. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 11:50:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020320065028.15164.00002224@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38050

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>The ARRL has a board of directors elected by the
>members of their Division. We can vote 'em in. We can vote 'em out.

And you can even be 'em, if you are willing to devote that much time as a
volunteer.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2059. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 13:15:48 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9h1qqldu0bs0f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38051

Bill Sohl wrote:

>Cheers...and congrats again on becoming a ham.

Thanks! I intend to enjoy radio!

Val

2060. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 13:19:27 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9h21tpsnpmk87@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38052

Fred Garvin wrote:

> Congrats Val! Welcome to ham radio!
>The satellites are a blast!

Thanks! Yeah, I know satellites are big
fun. AND, I just saw a site on balloons,
and, er, high-power rocketry . . . and radio!
Oooh, this hobby could be VERY bad for
my exchequer!

Val

2061. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 15:00:19 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9h7v0gvetmi80@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38056

Hello, all!

W1RFI wrote, in connection with a comment that without
the licensing requirement CW, which has great intrinsic
value, will likely fall into disuse:

>Then why don't you say that CW Morse has value and is worth
>learning even if one is not tested for it? When you say that it
>has value but that no one will learn it unless they are required
>to do so by the circumstance of the test you are sending a very
>confused message.

I think that the concern revolves around the band plans and
what will happen when a relatively small number of amateurs
use CW in an environment where the changing of standards
is swelling the ranks of Hams in general, no pun intended,
and airspace is getting more and more crowded with every
passing year. That is, what else can the ultimate goal of the
testing changes be other than, in the end, more hams, and
by extension, more hams who know nothing about CW? This
seems pre-ordained to me.

Sure, the mode is "valuable" and sure it will remain "in use"
for that reason. But once it loses its official support, and
once it falls to a fringe within the fringe that is amateur radio,
how long before the band plans change and it becomes
a fugitive on the waves, which will start the ultimate slide?
Hasn't all of this been in the works for about 30 years now?

That is, from my reading and talking to other hams, it seems
that very few of the "all-in-one" rigs that have ever been made
can do a truly top-notch job with CW. That is, for today's big
commercial makers it's NEVER been a priority. And what do
I see this month in big, glossy ads in QST? A lot of all-in-one
rigs, as the flagships. So, it's a bit, er, ah, of a dodge to say
that CW will just get along once testing goes away. Where is
any commercial support for it, hm? I don't see much, other
than QRP . . . which by its very nature is small potatoes
expense-wise, at least in comparison with towers, beams
and amps. There isn't likely to ever be big money in little
tiny amps and antennas, I don't think.

It seems to me that there's an avalanche, a slow-motion one,
headed down the mountain, and in my view, CW is at the
bottom of the hill ready to be buried. And I don't think anything
is going to stop it.

Am I wrong?

Val

2062. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 16:00:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C98B23A.2116836@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38057

Valentine Germann wrote:
> Sure, the mode is "valuable" and sure it will remain "in use"
> for that reason. But once it loses its official support, and
> once it falls to a fringe within the fringe that is amateur radio,
> how long before the band plans change and it becomes
> a fugitive on the waves, which will start the ultimate slide?
> Hasn't all of this been in the works for about 30 years now?

But CW can be used on virtually every ham frequency and gets
through when the other modes don't. So there is nothing to
worry about. I don't foresee the day when CW will be outlawed
or even prohibited from the voice bands.

> It seems to me that there's an avalanche, a slow-motion one,
> headed down the mountain, and in my view, CW is at the
> bottom of the hill ready to be buried. And I don't think anything
> is going to stop it.

If you're right, then nothing can stop it. Someday, you are going
to die. I assume you don't like that either. My Daddy told me to
just accept the things that I cannot change. If CW doesn't have
enough merit to survive in a free market of modes, then it doesn't
deserve to survive.

> Am I wrong?

Why is CW at the bottom of the hill ready to be buried? CW is alive
and well. I often work CW right through foreign broadcasts on 40m.
CW can be used virtually anywhere on all ham bands. I don't know of
any other mode about which that can be said. What more could you
ask for?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2063. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 16:08:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C98B3E9.803C91C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38058

Valentine Germann wrote:
> Anyway, it may have been a relatively simple test but ace-ing
> it was still a kick, without a doubt!

Hope you realize that Dick and Larry will view you forever as
a post restructuring dumbed-down amateur radio operator. How
many IQ points did you sacrifice by passing the Tech exam? :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2064. Straight Dope on CW's Future?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 16:38:15 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9hdmfbpekgo8e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38059

Hello, all!

This message is inspired by another one buried deep
in another thread. But the exchange was of sufficient
interest that I thought it might be placed here in a
new thread. That is, I am looking for some serious
illumination, emotion aside. There seem to be some
leaders in this group, and leaders look ahead while
planning for the likely future, they do NOT equivocate
and mince words. What is going to happen with CW?

[I haven't seen N2EY's fourth installment on the
history of amateur radio. Has it appeared? Also,
in a thread that contained some valuable information
from N2EY, elsewhere on this board, I implied that
another poster's output was "important" while his
was, by extension, not important. I want to apologize
for that.]

Here is the original message:

--

W1RFI wrote, in connection with a comment that without
the licensing requirement CW, which has great intrinsic
value, will likely fall into disuse:

>Then why don't you say that CW Morse has value and is
>worth learning even if one is not tested for it? When
>you say that it has value but that no one will learn it
>unless they are required to do so by the circumstance
>of the test you are sending a very confused message.

Perhaps it is your message that is just a bit confused.
I think that the concern revolves around the band plans and
what will happen when a relatively small number of amateurs
use CW in an environment where the changing of standards
is swelling the ranks of Hams in general, no pun intended,
and airspace is getting more and more crowded with every
passing year. That is, what else can the ultimate result
of the testing changes be other than, in the end, more hams,
and by extension, more hams who know nothing about CW?
This seems pre-ordained to me. Am I wrong?

Sure, the mode is "valuable" and sure it will remain "in use"
for that reason. But once it loses its official support, and
once it falls to a fringe within the fringe that is amateur

radio, how long before the band plans change and it becomes
a fugitive on the waves, which will start the ultimate slide?
Hasn't all of this been in the works for about 30 years now?

That is, from my reading and talking to other hams, it seems
that very few of the "all-in-one" rigs that have ever been made
can do a truly top-notch job with CW. That is, for today's big
commercial makers it's NEVER been a priority. And what do
I see this month in big, glossy ads in QST? A lot of all-in-one
rigs, as the flagships. So, it's a bit, er, ah, of a dodge to
say that CW will just get along once testing goes away. Where
is any commercial support for it, hm? I don't see much, other
than QRP . . . which by its very nature is small potatoes
expense-wise, at least in comparison with towers, beams
and amps. There isn't likely to ever be big money in little
tiny amps and antennas, I don't think.

It seems to me that there's an avalanche, a slow-motion one,
headed down the mountain, and in my view, CW is at the
bottom of the hill ready to be buried. And I don't think
anything is going to stop it.

Am I wrong?

Val

-- End original message --

Now, I'm sure I've made some errors, perhaps of fact, perhaps
of interpretation. But, the main elements are:

** How can the end of code testing NOT lead, eventually,
to a dramatic decline in the use of the mode, especially in
relative terms. Won't this happen because the combination
of the already extant relative decline in CW use, coupled
with the undoubted relative increase in the numbers of
un-coded hams, will lead, as sure as night follows day,
to ever-increasing pressure on CW in the band plans? For
instance, what will NCI do when the code test goes way?
I think I can guess, can't you? And who will resist this
pressure, with any effectiveness? I don't see anyone.

** Sooner or later, won't CW be severely cut back, or
even removed, in the band plans, especially since there
is very likely to be organized pressure to do exactly that?

** Finally, and at the last ditch, isn't it true that CW is
hardly a cash-cow for the big commercial makers?
That is, isn't it VERY unlikely that their economic interests
would ever lie in promoting the voluntary use of code on the
bands? I think this statement is likely true. And won't that
lack of economic interest create a subtle, or even non-subtle,
atmosphere at QST to, er, ah, not rock any mode boats?

Human nature is human nature, after all, and their advertising budget is already under pressure, or so it says in the March issue. The gun looks loaded to me, regardless of what anyone on the staff actually thinks or believes!

Once again, how far off am I, regardless of the goodness or badness or the whateverness of the outcome, in your individual opinion? That is, what IS gonna happen, do you think, to CW and to the band plans? And WHY is that going to happen?

Now, I guess it's anyone's Constitutional right to say something like "The future is hard to predict, yadda, yadda. . ." but that would hardly be either interesting or helpful. How about some intellectual activity!

Val

2065. Re: Straight Dope on CW's Future?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 16:47:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C98BD26.D6DF8D85@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38061

Valentine Germann wrote:
> What is going to happen with CW?

Probably the same thing that happened to bows and arrows, antique cars, stick shifts, horseback riding, walking, etc. In my home town of 4000 people, there is a bow and arrow store.

The question is: Will there be any mode or modes that can perform the function of CW so much better than CW that CW will be discarded in favor of the new mode(s) (like the slide rule was discarded in favor of calculators). Since part of the function of CW is having fun, I suspect not. AND coherent CW is hard to beat by any other mode. Take a look at the on-line QST articles about coherent CW. The tone that one copies is a pure sine wave without any noise AND it has almost a 20dB advantage over normal CW.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2066. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 16:55:31 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9hempmc8kq3e7@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38060

CAM wrote

>Hope you realize that Dick and Larry will view you forever
>as a post restructuring dumbed-down amateur radio operator.

Well, I'm not sure of that at all. However, a certain amount of uncomfortableness with the "new standard" is inevitable, in my view. We're all only human and therefore have weaknesses. In amateur astronomy, we now have totally "GoTo" telescopes, instruments that can find anything in the sky at the touch of a few buttons. All you need is the money to afford them and you can do things that astro Old Timers still can't dream of doing. This has inevitably caused some resentment, in the same way that the "RUBIE" phenomenon has P-O'd some Old Timers among bikers. I guess I'm old enough to simply expect a certain amount of that.

Val

2067. Re: Straight Dope on CW's Future?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 17:34:34 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9hh02ep1mdbe6@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38062

CAM wrote, about the future existence of CW:

>Probably the same thing that happened to bows and arrows,
>antique cars, stick shifts, horseback riding, walking, etc.
>In my home town of 4000 people, there is a bow and arrow
>store.

I'm reading . . . though, of course, one of the reasons the
bow and arrow got replaced was because of its short
range. CW, even low-power CW, doesn't have that problem.

>The question is: Will there be any mode or modes that can
>perform the function of CW so much better than CW that CW
>will be discarded in favor of the new mode(s) (like the
>slide rule was discarded in favor of calculators). Since
>part of the function of CW is having fun, I suspect not.

That's fine, but the questions are deeper than this. That
is, the function of repeaters has been taken over by the Big
Guys and now everyone has a cell phone, and repeaters
and what-not are strictly in the shade. Combine cell
phones with the internet and, well, who needs ANY of this
Ham stuff at all, if it's "function" you're concerned about?
Isn't the whole avocation sort of lost in the backdraft, if
it's only some vague notion of "function" that you're con-
cerned about? That is, isn't Ham Radio MORE than that?

>AND coherent CW is hard to beat by any other mode. Take a
>look at the on-line QST articles about coherent CW. The
>tone that one copies is a pure sine wave without any
>noise AND it has almost a 20dB advantage over normal CW.

But it's still, you know, like a bow and arrow with better paint,
isn't it? Who cares?

And what about the public policy angle, that is, the band plans.
And what about the future of NCI with regard to said plans?
Surely you have some ideas there, or do your "libertarian"
ideals prevent you from even THINKING about those coercive
"rules and regs," or even custom and convenience!

Val

2068. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 17:46:36 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9hhmhfltqo993@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38063

Dick Carroll wrote, concerning an ARRL survey taken in 1996:

> That poll would well qualify as one that could easily be used to
>"prove" which ever way the interpreting authority wanted to go.
>As indeed it soon was, by *both* sides of the issue . . .

Yes, but two of the three items seem er, ah, less than encouraging
for CW, don't they? I've been involved in some pretty complicated
preference testing surveys and, well, questions like that one would
have been "right-out" for us! But we were really and truly and
vitally interested to sift out the real situation and then to have that
result stand up to peer review!

Val

2069. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 17:52:35 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9hi1ofp3pmv59@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38064

CAM wrote:

>Pass the code test along with your Tech and let's set up a
>schedule. I'm trying to gain a modicum of competence on
>an electronic keyer. You seem to be confusing the code
>test requirement with CW the mode, strangely enough,
>just like Dick does.

No, I don't think that's true. Rather, I think you are
separating the two, which is bizarre considering the
actual Ham Radio situation.

I hope by the summer to be fairly proficient at code,
and to pass the General exams in April. I've already
passed the Technician test.

Val

P.S. Ask yourself why some millionaire engineer would
want to talk on a repeater . . . when he's got a cell phone?

Light come on for you yet?

**

2070. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 17:54:02 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9hi4l70v4gd8e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38065

Bill Sohl wrote:

>Calling overseas today is just about as
>easy as calling long distance (i.e. 1+10 digit dialing)
>and the costs of a call have been driven down to
>the point that an international call isn't all that more
>expensive than domestic.

So, there we go, another reason for the existence
of Ham Radio . . . nearly eliminated.

What's left, if it's "mode function" we're all worried
about? I don't know.

Val

2071. Re: Death to Ham Radio at the hands of it's own operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 18:17:45 UTC
From: "Phillip A Manning (KC8TAU)" <kc8tau@fuse.net>
Message-ID: <eahh9uob3fggs24an8tg3khcue0s9h7515@4ax.com>
Source record: 38066
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.amateur,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Steve,

I appreciate your comments and time. Very well put and I am not saying that all of the aforementioned groups are bad. In fact some of the work that is done by them is in the best of intentions. I do think, however, that you would have been wiser not to assume to know what my experiences out of life have been.

Broadcasting is not what I would like to do and I to not tend to get up on a soapbox about things (this time the thorn had dug too deep). In fact the conversation that I was talking about was less than a minuet long. The removal was an almost immediate response to someone talking on the repeater, and that is the reason that most of the repeater space is tied up and there is little place to talk. BTW I have looked around the spectrum and found a few good repeaters to talk on one in northern Kentucky and Indiana and one or two out in "fringe" counties of Southwestern Ohio.

Now as for WARN that you seem to think so highly ofi¿½I was listening to the last weather related WARN net during a heavy wind and rain storm that passed through a couple of weeks ago and do you know what I heard. I heard some guy talking about his trees and a garbage can in his back yard for about an hour. So let me see a rag chew about a tree during a weather net is acceptable but me saying hi to one of my friends on a quiet repeater on a sunny day in the after noon is scolded, that really gives me a lot of faith in this great hobby.

Steve, I know if your position with WARN, and I appreciate the work you do. You are right I have not been to any of the meetings or tanning, but I know, first hand, of people who have been very active and donated time equipment and money to your you cause and in return have faced ego and a poor attitude toward the work that was done. That is my reason for not jumping on the bandwagon and joining right up.

I am sorry for coming off very harsh in my first post, but I do like the hobby and I want to see it flourish. I do not want you to think me just a hateful individual, and I do understand that most hams are very nice and considerate people. I have traveled a bit and had some great experiences with hams in other areas. It just seams to me that this area, like with many other things, is just stuck in it's ways and refuses to accept change. And just possibly I have some miss information from other people that I have talked to about this so please tell me all the sides of the story I would love to hear them, and I promise I will listen to anyone with an intelligent point.

Now onto the "illegal" comment I made in my last post. I spoke to a
very nice gentleman at the FCC and he told me that it was all right to
have a "commercial" radio that would do amateur band just not the
other way around. So if I miss stated my self I am sorry for that too.

"73" to all

On Wed, 20 Mar 2002 00:45:22 -0500, Steve Lewis N8TFD <n8tfd@one.net>
wrote:

>Phil:
>
>Comments below.
>
>"Phillip A Manning (KC8TAU)" wrote:
>>
>> I have been recently toying with the idea of putting a dual band
>> (2m/440) amateur rig in my car. To assess if the investment would be
>> worth it (seeing as how I already have a mod'ed commercial 440 rig in
>> my car for amateur and GMRS) I borrowed a friend's scanner and
>> listened to many of the "active" frequencies in this area, the greater
>> Cincinnati area. I found a few very active places, which got my hopes
>> up until I started listening to the content of these channels.
>
>It's probably not wise to admit that you're trying to do things that are bad
>practice if not overtly illegal. It makes it harder for the "old guard" to
>take you seriously, even if you have a valid point(s).
>
>> It appears to me that the Greater Cincinnati area is "under siege" by
>> a very few groups of amateurs. I noticed that the diversity in radio
>> is nil the same people on all the used frequencies, and even thou they
>> clam to be an "open" group if you listen to them new people with new
>> ideas are ran off. On some of the repeaters just a normal
>> conversation is cut off for tying up the repeater. On a clear sunny
>> day not during peak traffic times why should a conversation on a Ham
>> repeater that it observing the courtesies of normal ham communications
>> (i.e. waiting for the repeater to drop so any other station calling
>> could get in if they wanted to) be cut for the reason of wanting empty
>> air. That to me sounds like non-effective use of frequency space.
>
>What repeater was this on? How long were you talking? The rest of us might
>be listening. I don't know you personally...but I can say that I would tire
>of listening to even my closest amateur radio friends for a long period of time.
>
>> Now that we are on frequency space let me just say that it seems a
>> little excessive for one group to control six different repeater pairs
>> across two different bands. Five of those in the 2m band alone. This
>> to me sounds like a lack of diversity, and if you track some of there
>> frequencies you will find that one of them is in a garage on a mag.
>> mount antenna just to tie up the space so that no one else can use
>> that space for a new repeater and haven forbid some new opinions and
>> views.

>
>Maybe. But I don't think you have any MORE or LESS right to the frequencies
>than they do. If the repeaters are as idle as you say, isn't there plenty of
>bandwidth for you to spread your opinions and views. Of course, this is a two-
>way communications hobby, it's not about BROADCASTING your opinions and views.
>
>I haven't heard you on the repeaters that I listen to, so I can't imagine that
>there isn't one for you to use and not be bothered.
>
>> If you live in or near Cincinnati you may know who I am talking about.
>> CRA (Cincinnati Repeater Association) seems to be the only way to get
>> on the air in this city, and if you try to put up a repeater of your
>> own you will find that all the vhf pairs are taken. Now, if this
>> group is truly interested in keeping ham radio alive they would
>> welcome new people and points of view, but to the contrary if you
>> disagree with any member of the group you will find yourself subject
>> to jamming and "the cold shoulder" until you just give up. These
>> people do not extent their damaging attitude into just a standard
>> radio group, but the "leaders" of the group also seem to run all
>> activity available to hams in this area like: Sky Warn Group, QCEN
>> (Queen City Emergency Net), and ARPSC (Amateur Radio Public Service
>> Corps). So as you can see if you want to do anything in this city in
>> ham radio you have to subject your self to a group that I have heard,
>> aptly referred to as the CRM (Cincinnati Repeater Mafia).
>
>Plenty of other clubs have at least 2 repeater pairs of their own. I'm not
>a CRA member, never have been (ask my cohorts about this), but I'm guessing
>you had a bad experience on one of their machines because you haven't talked
>about any other club's repeaters?
>
>Also...have you been to an ARPSC meeting? How about a QCEN meeting? (You
>haven't been to a QCEN meeting). Can you name some of the leadership from
>each group? You'll find very little in common.
>
>Have you checked into a WARN net? No. Will you attend the annual WARN
>meeting/training? After this, you'd better!
>
>> So you may ask, what can be done about such atrocities? Well I have
>> added contact information to a key person at the bottom of this post
>> if you know of anyone else who may help please let them know and if
>> you would let me know and I will forward a copy of this letter to them
>> so they may hear my argument as well. Please contact someone and let
>> them know that the hams in Cincinnati are being oppressed by local
>> radio groups of, and we would like to take the air waves back for the
>> hams and not leave them to the death they are suffering here in this
>> great city.
>
>What makes Ken a key person? What is his position exactly?
>
>> Ohio Coordinator:

>>
>> Kin Bird, W8SMK
>> 244 North Parkway Dr.
>> Delaware, OH 43015-8788
>> Ken@midohio.net
>>
>> Phil Manning
>> KC8TAU
>> kc8tau@fuse.net
>
>Ok Phil:
>
>I'm guessing that what happened is you jumped on a CRA repeater, at drive time,
>and monopolized the thing. I don't know about your operating practices, but
>good or not, no one wants to hear YOUR opinions and ideas for hours at a time.
>
>You seem to be like many other UseNet posters. You have a lot of complaints,
>but you don't tell the whole story. And since you've NEVER been at meetings of
>the organizations in question, I expect that you will cease trashing them until
>you've met the people you seem to despise, and they've had a chance to meet
>you.
>
>SkyWARN, ARES/RACES, and Red Cross are always looking for new hams. Ham
>radio is much more than ragchewing on or complaining about 2 meters.
>
>But I get the impression that you're in the hobby because you think it will
>provide you a soapbox to share some kind of "opinions and ideas".
>
>If so, you've probably joined the wrong hobby. Or you've been influenced by
>amateur radio operators who are misinformed.
>
>I challenge you to explore ALL the repeaters and ALL the groups around
>Cincinnati, and report back honestly.
>
>Otherwise, I won't take the time to invite you to join the real hobby, and
>won't offer my time to help in any way I can (which is what I'm trying to
>do here).
>
>-73-

2072. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 18:36:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C98D6C5.5E477246@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38067

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote, concerning an ARRL survey taken in 1996:
> > That poll would well qualify as one that could easily be used to
> >"prove" which ever way the interpreting authority wanted to go.
> >As indeed it soon was, by *both* sides of the issue . . .
>
> Yes, but two of the three items seem er, ah, less than encouraging
> for CW, don't they?

Not if you have faith that, "Once Morsed, Always Morsed!" :-) If only
10% of all hams use CW regularly, that is 70,000 regular CW users.
I believe that 10% of all new hams will choose to learn Morse code
and use CW after the requirement is dropped - maybe more.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2073. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 18:52:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C98DA5E.1235370C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38068

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >Pass the code test along with your Tech and let's set up a
> >schedule. I'm trying to gain a modicum of competence on
> >an electronic keyer. You seem to be confusing the code
> >test requirement with CW the mode, strangely enough,
> >just like Dick does.
>
> No, I don't think that's true. Rather, I think you are
> separating the two, which is bizarre considering the
> actual Ham Radio situation.

As a Libertarian, I have no choice except to vote for
freedom from unnecessary governmental requirements. Seems
even the FCC considers it unnecessary.

Why should CW be singled out and tested as a skill? Especially
since it is never re-tested. Especially since a CW capable
ham station is not required. Why should Morse code skill, for
testing purposes, be considered as important as everything else
in ham radio combined?

> P.S. Ask yourself why some millionaire engineer would
> want to talk on a repeater . . . when he's got a cell phone?

In the Phoenix area, it was because he wanted to be able to
use mountain top repeaters to talk to a group of camping
buddies. Additionally, to the best of my knowledge, none of the
millionaires in my group of camping buddies owned a cellphone.

> Light come on for you yet?

Mine's been on for 51 years. How about yours?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2074. Re: Straight Dope on CW's Future?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 19:19:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C98E0B2.51A31F3F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38070

Valentine Germann wrote:
> I'm reading . . . though, of course, one of the reasons the
> bow and arrow got replaced was because of its short
> range. CW, even low-power CW, doesn't have that problem.

The longbow had enough range to win a considerable number of battles. And there were some crossbows so massive that they had to have wheels. Technology, i.e. chemistry, replaced the bow and arrow for purposes of war. For purposes of sport and fun, the bow and arrow has NOT been replaced. The State of Texas has a bow and arrow deer season before the regular deer season gets underway.

If the alleged supporters of CW would realize that CW is fun, they might convince some newcomers to learn it and use it. As long as those alleged supporters keep telling newcomers that they won't learn Morse code unless they are forced to do so by a governmental requirement, most newcomers will be turned off and find the mode unattractive.

With friends like that, CW doesn't need any enemies and is probably doomed. When those alleged supporters of CW start pushing the fun and merits of the mode instead of the forced learning, I will feel much better about its survival.

> Isn't the whole avocation sort of lost in the backdraft, if
> it's only some vague notion of "function" that you're con-
> cerned about? That is, isn't Ham Radio MORE than that?

Nope, ham radio is no more than its function. IMO, its primary function is emergency communications. Its secondary function is fun. Ham radio is going to die unless we convince the newcomers that we are having fun. "Nose-to-the-grindstone" approaches don't work. "Force someone to learn Morse code and they will love CW", is 19th century thinking akin to a rapist saying, "Relax and enjoy it." The world just doesn't work that way anymore.

> But it's (CCW) still, you know, like a bow and arrow with better paint,
> isn't it? Who cares?

Research and development is still ongoing in the field of bows and arrows. It is a dynamic and living sport. You seem to feel that CW is dying - it is not. There is no governmental requirement to keep bows and arrows alive. Why does it thrive without a governmental requirement?

> And what about the public policy angle, that is, the band plans.

As a Libertarian, if I were the FCC I would say, "Here's your
band edges and here's your power limits - have fun." If all
modes were allowed on all ham frequencies, the best ones would
win. I believe CW would be among that group of survivors.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2075. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 19:31:58 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <Os5m8.2425$aF.191119@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38071

Valentine Germann, (callsign on its way!) wrote, in part:

> That is, from my reading and talking to other hams, it seems
> that very few of the "all-in-one" rigs that have ever been made
> can do a truly top-notch job with CW. That is, for today's big
> commercial makers it's NEVER been a priority. And what do
> I see this month in big, glossy ads in QST? A lot of all-in-one
> rigs, as the flagships. So, it's a bit, er, ah, of a dodge to say
> that CW will just get along once testing goes away. Where is
> any commercial support for it, hm? I don't see much, other
> than QRP . . . which by its very nature is small potatoes
> expense-wise, at least in comparison with towers, beams
> and amps. There isn't likely to ever be big money in little
> tiny amps and antennas, I don't think.

I don't know who you've been talking to about "all-in-one" rigs,
Val, but every HF transceiver I've had a look at has been soooo
much better at CW operation than any of the 'legacy' rigs from
the 'golden age' of amateur radio. My own rigs are a pair of
Kenwood TS-850's. While not 'modern' (ie: loaded with DSP), it
is instructive to note the CW-only features incorporated into them:

(1) Built-in Keyer (with 3 memories)
(2) Provisions for 500 Hz and 250 Hz Crystal Filters
(easily installed and relatively cheap)
(3) Full Break-in
(4) Adjustable BFO tone (pitch) in CW mode.
(5) Selectable BFO placement (above or below rec'd signal)
(6) Transmit sidetone in CW mode.

Additionally, there are features that, while not exclusively
incorporated for CW operation, make it much more enjoyable:

(7) 1 kHz/rev "fine" tuning
(8) Manual IF notch
(9) IF passband tuning
(10) "chirpless" transmit VFO
(11) RIT/XIT
(12) IF Noise Blanker
(13) Two independent VFO's + memory channels
(14) Accurate frequency readout to 10 Hz
(15) Fully adjustable power output from <5 w to 100 w

I go back to the era of Hallyscratchers and DX-100's and
I'm here to tell you that CW operation with any of the
current HF transceivers is an absolute dream compared to

those old clunkers.

It is also my take that as we transition to Software Defined Radios in the 21st century that it will be increasingly easy to incorporate top-notch CW features with no impact on unit cost. Case in point: I had to spend extra money to get narrow IF crystal filters for my TS-850's. Now those narrow filters are just subroutines in the IF DSP's of current rigs like the Icom IC-756pro.

73 de K7JEB

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb @ arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

2076. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 19:33:18 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9hnul4l0o16fe@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38069

CAM wrote, concerning the code and code testing:

>As a Libertarian, I have no choice except to vote for
>freedom from unnecessary governmental requirements.
>Seems even the FCC considers it unnecessary.

It's obvious that the FCC does not CARE one way or
another. It's WE who care. Now, what I want to know,
REALLY, is what your deal IS! Are you truly basing
your position vis-a-vis code on "Libertarianism" and
not on what's best, in the long run, for amateur radio?
It sure seems that way since I find your position extreme,
considering the other things you have said relative to
code itself. But then, you know, I have read in the papers
about people who are "pro life" -- but who shoot doctors
in the head. So, I guess I shouldn't be surprised that
you seem willing to execute the thing you use the most!
Of course, you won't be around, most likely, when the
hammer finally falls, will you? Apre mois, le deluge?

>[Why should] CW be singled out and tested as a skill?

Lots of reasons, especially to get on HF, especially as,
say, an Extra.

>Especially since it is never re-tested.

Have you ever advocated re-testing?

>Especially since a CW capable ham station is
>not required.

Have you ever advocated that? Oh, I forgot, you're against
these kinds of things. Er, my head hurts since your glaring
inconsistencies are so, ah, glaring.

>Why should Morse code skill, for testing purposes, be
>considered as important as everything else in ham
>radio combined?

It is? I don't think that's true at all. I will be getting a
Technician license soon (since I have passed the test)
that will allow me to do all kinds of things, all kinds of
high-tech things, and no code required at all. There's
a whole WORLD of radio I will be able to do in a few
days, and no code required at all. What in heaven's
name are you talking about?

[Concerning millionaire engineers with Technician
licenses using low-tech repeaters]

>In the Phoenix area, it was because he wanted to be
>able to use mountain top repeaters to talk to a group
>of camping buddies. Additionally, to the best of my
>knowledge, none of the millionaires in my group of
>camping buddies owned a >cellphone.

OK, now I know you're just making stuff up, like the engineer
who tried low-power CW and found it "unreliable." Quit doing
this; it doesn't look good . . . and it completely trivializes
Ham Radio. Wow!

>Mine's been on for 51 years.

No, it hasn't, not the one I was talking about!

>How about yours?

I was BORN with it on, apparently, which makes it hard
for us to communicate!

Val

2077. Re: Straight Dope on CW's Future?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 20:01:49 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9hpk4bl9klpbc@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38072

CAM wrote, vis-a-vis code testing and code as bow & arrow
technology in a modern world:

>The longbow had enough range to win a considerable
>number of battles. And there were some crossbows so
>massive that they had to have whees. Technology, i.e.
>chemistry, replaced the bow and arrow for purposes of
>war. For purposes of sport and fun, the bow and arrow
>has NOT been replaced. The State of Texas has a bow
>and arrow deer season before the regular deer season
>gets underway.

But what about the public policy aspects. Is there a band plan
for bow and arrow? Is there any FCC involvement in that sport?
Are there organized groups out there sharpening their knives
to do away with ranges for bow and arrow? No, sorry, your
analogy is, as usual, off the point.

>If the alleged supporters of CW would realize that CW
>is fun, they might convince some newcomers to learn it
>and use it. As long as those alleged supporters keep
>telling newcomers that they won't learn Morse code
>unless they are forced to do so by a governmental
>requirement, most newcomers will be turned off and
>find the mode unattractive.

This is simply bizarre. As has been pointed out before,
ad nausem, this argument cuts no ice at all, none. Under
this rubric we just get rid of testing, or most of it, in toto.
Do you advocate that?

>With friends like that, CW doesn't need any enemies
>and is probably doomed. When those alleged supporters
>of CW start pushing the fun and merits of the mode
>instead of the forced learning, I will feel much better
>about its survival.

Same song, second verse. Nolo contendre, on your
side of the argument.

[Concerning Ham Radio in a more general way.]

>Nope, ham radio is no more than its function. IMO, its primary
>function is emergency communications.

Ooops! Aahoooga! Aahoooga! Check the question
pool I just took!

>Its secondary function is fun.

Well, this is just WRONG! Man, no wonder we have problems!
Here we see the gaping black hole at the very center of all
Libertarian "thought" -- it's all about ME and the FUN that might
be had by each individual, like ME. That there might be a
meta-purpose to "rules and regulations" beyond the miniature
thought processes and desires of "Libertarians" -- just NEVER
occurs to them. Nope, they got it all locked up.

>Ham radio is going to die unless we convince the newcomers
>that we are having fun. "Nose-to-the-grindstone" approaches
>don't work. "Force someone to learn Morse code and they will
>love CW", is 19th century thinking akin to a rapist saying, "Relax
>and enjoy it." The world just doesn't work that way anymore.

Well, the world of Ham Radio NEVER worked the way YOU
just described it! And now I don't feel so bad about the "pro-life"
example with the doctor being shot!

[About CW's future]

>You seem to feel that CW is dying - it is not. There is no
>governmental requirement to keep bows and arrows alive.
>Why does it thrive without a governmental requirement?

I guess there's just no point, is there? Good God.

>> And what about the public policy angle, that is, the band
>plans.

>As a Libertarian, if I were the FCC I would say, "Here's your
>band edges and here's your power limits - have fun." If all
>modes were allowed on all ham frequencies, the best ones
>would win. I believe CW would be among that group of
>survivors.

Yes, sirree, it's all about HAVING FUN! And gee, I thought
we boomers were the FUN generation! Little did I know that
REAL GEEZERS were all about FUN!

Turn out the lights, folks, its all over.

Val

2078. Re: For Discussion: ARRL Fee's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 20:30:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020320153006.12257.00000116@mb-mt.aol.com>
Source record: 38075

In article <a74rra91906@enews1.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>Since it has been brought up here so many times in arguments and debates
>that only 1/4 of the licensed population of hams are ARRL members, would it
>stand to reason that it may be of benefit to the ARRL to create an incentive
>membership rate for licensee's who never had a membership before? (for
>long-time licensees or newbies both) I was thinking something like $20 for
>the FIRST YEAR ONLY and then the second year and on are normal rates. Again
>this is for licensees who are pursuing a FIRST TIME MEMBERSHIP.
>Granted, some are of the mind that they will never pursue membership
>ever......
>
>Is this something that may encourage more growth in their numbers? (They
>didn't have these people beforehand so it is actually a gain in some
>respects.)
>
>Is this something that "may" encourage these people possibly to stay after
>the first year?

The membership fee as it is seems to be a good price for a
subscription to QST. QST may be a propaganda organ for the
ARRL but it does offer information for radio amateurs.

For a better rounding-out of information, particularly technical
information on radio and electronics, a radio hobbyist MUST
have at least one more periodical subscription, preferrably an
independent periodical.

It's not a terribly bad thing to become totally dependent on the
ARRL for ALL information on amateur radio...just as its not a
terribly bad thing to wear blinders all the time. Many prefer
that condition in life, to have others make the "big" decisions
for them. They have an organization to belong to, a "tribe" or
"clan" of sorts, fulfilling a primal need of belonging to
something. Where it starts to go "bad" is changing a hobby to
a Lifestyle and adopting a singular organization as a temple
to worship, assuming a strong emotional kinship. Where it
definitely goes bad is to the fundamentalist-like viewpoint of
the True Believer where emotionalism overrides everything,
excluding everything but The True Way.

Right now I see the ARRL in the beginnings of a "change-
over" period in their organization. They seem to be up to the
inescapable brick wall of economic reality. While they are
technically a "non-profit organization," it is obvious that they

must make a profit on books, other periodicals and resale items to continue providing services. QST, rated solely as a magazine, can continue its monetary independence on advertising alone but is feeling the pinch of fewer ad sales. They must cut back or siphon off monies from the general ARRL budget. The latter does not seem an option.

ARRL executives en masse are faced with a deep division of opinion among radio hobbyists regarding old standards and practices versus the new. The "core" ARRL membership adheres to the old standards and practices and that will unlikely not change until life attrition takes its toll. The ARRL has not only reinforced the old beliefs but, through its "voluntary" executives being a part of those old beliefs, has mandated "this is the way it must be" in amateur radio and expected "all" to follow their "guidance." That has not happened. The ARRL has been in denial for some time and the rationalizations have been many and varied...but are not enough to increase membership.

ARRL executives are just going to have to bite their collective bullets and realize that succeeding generations aren't buying into their belief system rooted in old standards and practices. A few have. Some remain steadfast and will likely remain so until their last switch is shut off.

As an independent observer, I'd say that the ARRL would have to give out FREE trial subscriptions to QST to begin making any sort of membership increase. That's economically inviable. The only other way is about as difficult: Start changing their attitude towards the hobby with its "Big Brother" approach. The ARRL competed for leadership of a group of hobbyists and got it from older generations but most of those are gone now. There are new generations who don't buy into old standards and practices. Leadership is not demonstrated by an insular mindset of "we know what is best for ham radio." Assumption of authority is not the same as actually being authority.

2079. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 20:30:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020320153007.12257.00000118@mb-mt.aol.com>
Source record: 38073

In article <3C981CC4.60359165@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Now THERE'S one happy old man!

It takes about 42 muscles to frown. I takes only 4 to extend my
finger and say "bite me!" Clue: I'm not frowning.

honk, honk... :-)

2080. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 20:30:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020320153007.12257.00000117@mb-mt.aol.com>
Source record: 38074

In article <3C97BC1B.55AA8A1F@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> The NRA seems to have a simple policy: Gun down those of opposite views.
>:-)
>
>How many deaths per year are prevented by guns?

How many are CAUSED by guns?

When gunnery and NRA membership has something to do with
amateur radio policy or even about any radio, we can talk about
it. I don't see that NRA, AARP, or even the DAR having anything
to do with the subject.

The ARRL is definitely within the loop concerning amateur radio
policy.

2081. Re: Straight Dope on CW's Future?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 20:30:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020320153010.12257.00000119@mb-mt.aol.com>
Source record: 38076

In article <u9hh02ep1mdbe6@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>CAM wrote, about the future existence of CW:
>
>>Probably the same thing that happened to bows and arrows,
>>antique cars, stick shifts, horseback riding, walking, etc.
>>In my home town of 4000 people, there is a bow and arrow
>>store.
>
>I'm reading . . . though, of course, one of the reasons the
>bow and arrow got replaced was because of its short
>range. CW, even low-power CW, doesn't have that problem.
>
>>The question is: Will there be any mode or modes that can
>>perform the function of CW so much better than CW that CW
>>will be discarded in favor of the new mode(s) (like the
>>slide rule was discarded in favor of calculators). Since
>>part of the function of CW is having fun, I suspect not.
>
>That's fine, but the questions are deeper than this.

Not really. Technically, OOK CW has not proven to be useful
as a communications mode. If it had actually been so, it
would have been retained by many, many other radio services
engaged in communications.

That last radio service holdout for morse modes as a license
requirement is amateur radio. It is a hobby mode. It isn't
vital or necessary to demonstrate radio competence to obtain
a federal amateur radio license.

>That
>is, the function of repeaters has been taken over by the Big
>Guys and now everyone has a cell phone, and repeaters
>and what-not are strictly in the shade.

Only one in four Americans are cell phone subscribers,
not "everyone.".

>Combine cell
>phones with the internet and, well, who needs ANY of this
>Ham stuff at all, if it's "function" you're concerned about?

One needs to embrace the totality of old standards and
practices to "demonstrate commitment and dedication" to

some members of the ARS. :-)

Never mind that a recent poll has half of all US households
having some form of Internet access at the end of 2001.

>Isn't the whole avocation sort of lost in the backdraft, if
>it's only some vague notion of "function" that you're con-
>cerned about? That is, isn't Ham Radio MORE than that?

To some (particularly the True Believers) it is SOLELY
"working DX on HF with CW." :-)

>>AND coherent CW is hard to beat by any other mode. Take a
>>look at the on-line QST articles about coherent CW. The
>>tone that one copies is a pure sine wave without any
>>noise AND it has almost a 20dB advantage over normal CW.
>
>But it's still, you know, like a bow and arrow with better paint,
>isn't it? Who cares?

To keep with the archery analogue, coherent CW over
conventional CW is more like a compound bow versus an
ordinary straight bow. More power, easier handling, truer
launch.

>And what about the public policy angle, that is, the band plans.
>And what about the future of NCI with regard to said plans?

The publicly stated policy of NCI is to cease existance when
the morse code test is removed from amateur radio license
requirements.

>Surely you have some ideas there, or do your "libertarian"
>ideals prevent you from even THINKING about those coercive
>"rules and regs," or even custom and convenience!

Many have thought about morse code modes. Opinions
vary widely. Tell us why a certain way of THINKING is the
"only way to think?"

2082. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 20:30:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020320153011.12257.00000120@mb-mt.aol.com>
Source record: 38077

In article <20020320063046.15164.00002220@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
>>For all 8 or 10 of those stations to wind up with the
>>same situation, no copy of the PSK but easy copy of the CW, indicated
>>something unusual was happening, probably polar phase shift.
>
>So it would have been much more informative to say that CW provides better copy
>than phase-shift keying when unusual propagation contains rapid phase shifts.
>
>That would be a bit more informative to newcomers than "Shannon was wrong."

Various combinations of phase and amplitude modulation have been used on HF successfully by other radio services for a decade. See Fed Std 4075 for modes used with ALE.

Why is it "informative" to say that "CW provides better copy than phase-shift keying when unusual propagation..." without giving any quantitative information?

FSK has been used on HF for about seven decades now in spreads from 850 to 170 Hz, with and without error-correction codes, throughput from 60 to over 100 WPM. It would seem that the "phase shift problem" on HF is another myth promulgated by the PCTAs.

The major problem on HF over the long paths is still selective fading. That can
cause a drop-out of EVERY mode at low signal levels.

2083. Conditions, Covenants and Cue-Ess-Tee!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 21:33:23 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9huvr94ft4423@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38078

Hello, all!

Let me preface my remarks by saying that I am getting ready to put up some antennas on my property, and a 45-foot tower is under consideration. That is, I am allowed that here. BUT, I'm not going to do that until I check with the six neighbors nearest to me and see how they feel about it. That is, 45-feet is UP THERE in this area and would be something my neighbors would have to look at A LOT. And my kid plays with some of their kids so, well, I'm not going to do a thing to cause a rift.

Anyway, I hold in my hand, or was until just now, the March issue of QST. In it are no less than three pages concerning the problems hams are having with restrictive covenants in many housing developments. To me, the most interesting part of this whole display is to be found on page 90, where, following a discussion of "reasonable accommodation of amateur communications," we read the following:

"So I can erect a 44-foot tower in Saratoga Springs, New York. Big deal. I need an array that's going to bust through the pileups for P5 so I can get that last country on the list. Forty-four feet won't cut it."

Whoooaah, there, podner! The discussion in QST had been framed around what was happening when hams moved into "nice homes" in good developments. There really wasn't much, or actually, ANYTHING in those pieces about THE NEIGHBORS and how to approach them. No, it was all about how to get the government, namely, the CONGRESS of the UNITED STATES, currently at war and still cleaning the anthrax out of the mail hoppers, to make it possible for hams to do what they want, no matter WHAT the neighbors want, even if the ham was putting up . . . well, see below.

That is, QST had a discussion of a ham who put up, on a six-acre lot, no less than three, 100-foot towers, which led to a suit against the city, for issuing the permit, which led to an order calling for the dismantling of the towers! The case is still in litigation and the ham in question is going to have to convince someone, somewhere, that those towers are necessary for a "reasonable accommodation of

amateur communications." One hopes the opposition will not quote QST, above, about that pileup, and about how a maximum-establishment antenna system is "reasonable." I also hope his neighbors are not Libertarians, at least not Libertarians with a finely-honed sense of their property values and how they are being individually affected by those towers in terms of their property's resale value.

Is it really true that "reliable international communi-cations" require all that hardware? Well, no, it does not, if you're using CW. No, something tells me that this kind of an outfit is required for phone, since my near neighbor can work the world on a low-impact antenna and 100 watts, CW. Of course, maybe he doesn't need ONE CARD bad enough to risk the ire of his friends nearby. I don't know. But, SURELY, there is a better test case than * 3 *, ONE-HUNDRED-FOOT towers? Surely!

I have a relative living in a development with lot-sizes comparable to those above, and house prices up in the quarter- to half-million dollar range. None of those folks moved to that area to live next to a radio station or other artifact that looks industrial. I don't think Ham Radio, which QST seems to be re-positioning as a "Civic Organization," is going to get very far, in the end, bucking the high rollers about covenants. That's a battle that makes CW look small-time, indeed.

Finally, in these days of sprawling cities and high home prices, CW, the efficient, low-impact mode, seems to be more and more indicated by the times, perhaps? Will more-and-more forever, in the way of big rigs and P-O'd neighbors, get Ham Radio where it wants to go? I wonder.

Val

2084. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 21:45:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9902F2.BDA1ADF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38080

K7JEB wrote:
>
> Valentine Germann, (callsign on its way!) wrote, in part:
> > That is, from my reading and talking to other hams, it seems
> > that very few of the "all-in-one" rigs that have ever been made
> > can do a truly top-notch job with CW.
>
> I don't know who you've been talking to about "all-in-one" rigs,
> Val, but every HF transceiver I've had a look at has been soooo
> much better at CW operation than any of the 'legacy' rigs from
> the 'golden age' of amateur radio.

Hi Jim, methinks Val is being coached by Dick, W0EX. Methinks it
is time to fire the coach. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2085. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 21:50:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C99043D.42F12EB7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38081

Len Over 21 wrote:
> It would seem that the "phase shift problem" on HF is another
> myth promulgated by the PCTAs.

It can be a problem in PSK systems without FEC. Such systems, IMO,
are not serious systems. RTTY has lots of problems known for decades.
PSK31 shares many of those same problems. Just because something is
relatively new doesn't mean it has solved all the problems known to
man. PACTOR II is a serious mode. I can raise a PACTOR II mailbox
in Germany when I can't even hear the signal.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2086. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 22:00:46 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9i0j5ka7g5e52@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38079

CAM wrote:

Something off the point about surveys, viz:

>Not if you have faith that, "Once Morsed, Always Morsed!" :-)
>If only 10% of all hams use CW regularly, that is 70,000 regular
>CW users. I believe that 10% of all new hams will choose to
> learn Morse code and use CW after the requirement is
>dropped - maybe more.

My comments were about the survey question itself, and
by implication, about the whole thing, which contained only
this ONE question about a burning issue of the day. An
odd sort of survey, that was!

Val

2087. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 22:01:34 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020320170134.06011.00002163@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 38082

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>It takes about 42 muscles to frown. I takes only 4 to extend my
>finger and say "bite me!" Clue: I'm not frowning.

And all I got was a boo hoo.

More n' likely, Len will start feeling better and actually be able to carry on rational conversation again. He is capable of better responses than "bite me."

Does this rank right up there with Dick's "go soak your head" on the trollometer?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2088. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 22:05:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020320170518.06011.00002164@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 38083

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>It's obvious that the FCC does not CARE one way or
>another.

It was the FCC that initiated the rulemaking that ultimately led to the restructuring of Amateur Radio. If they didn't care, the easiest path was to leave well enough alone. They could have dealt with the waiver problem with a lot less work.

>>[Why should] CW be singled out and tested as a skill?

>Lots of reasons, especially to get on HF, especially as,
>say, an Extra.

The code test speed to obtain an Extra is the same as that required to obtain a Tech plus.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2089. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 22:08:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020320170820.06011.00002165@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 38085

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>>Calling overseas today is just about as
>>easy as calling long distance (i.e. 1+10 digit dialing)
>>and the costs of a call have been driven down to
>>the point that an international call isn't all that more
>>expensive than domestic.

>So, there we go, another reason for the existence
>of Ham Radio . . . nearly eliminated.

Not at all, Val. I bet that at no time in its history, have the majority of amateur communications with other amateur stations overseas been conversations that would have taken place on the telephone without ham radio. Now, as then, hams are interested in communicating with systems they have assembled or built themselves.

>What's left, if it's "mode function" we're all worried
>about? I don't know.

Hams are also very much interested in their operating mode. The medium IS the message, in many cases.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2090. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 22:08:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C990869.EE21D038@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38084

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3C97BC1B.55AA8A1F@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >> The NRA seems to have a simple policy: Gun down those of opposite views.
> > >
> > >How many deaths per year are prevented by guns?
>
> How many are CAUSED by guns?

Many, many fewer than are prevented by guns. It is just not politically
correct to report the rational use of guns to save lives during an act
of self-defense.

Here's a typical event from the People's Republic of Massachusetts:

"Three Men, armed with guns and knives, rushed the cash register at
a Boston-area liquor store just before closing one night. During the
melee, one clerk's hand was cut, and another was shot in the arm. Then
in a moment's distraction, a third clerk armed with a handgun turned
the tide, shooting all three suspects and sending them fleeing. Two
of the suspects were picked up on the street, amidst a pool of blood
and cash. The third man was found in a hallway of a nearby building
with a gunshot wound to his arm." Boston Globe, 12/29/01
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2091. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 22:09:55 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020320170955.06011.00002166@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 38086

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>My comments were about the survey question itself, and
>by implication, about the whole thing, which contained only
>this ONE question about a burning issue of the day. An
>odd sort of survey, that was!

Now, ask yourself which is more likely -- the ARRL wanting to cook the books or
the ARRL not being very good at writing surveys. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2092. Re: For Discussion: ARRL Fee's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 22:18:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020320171814.06011.00002167@mb-dd.aol.com>
Source record: 38087

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>It's not a terribly bad thing to become totally dependent on the
>ARRL for ALL information on amateur radio..

It would be a very bad thing to be dependent on ARRL for all information on Amateur Radio! There is a lot more good information being developed within Amateur Radio than can be developed by a handful of people in Newington, CT. There is a lot more expertise in ham radio than can be found in Newington, CT.

In most cases, the best role ARRL can play is to utilize its resources to help direct people to where they can find such information. That very much is the tact taken on the ARRL Tech Info pages. Virtually every page contains both ARRL information and links to other sites that have even more information, and often better information, on the subject.

http://www.arrl.org/tis

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2093. Re: Straight Dope on CW's Future?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 22:27:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C990CC8.3684FABA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38088

Valentine Germann wrote:
> Is there any FCC involvement in that sport?

If you're going to play that game, I can say that someone
who doesn't even have a license yet, cannot possibly know
anything about ham radio. You cannot have it both ways.
Being (or pretending to be) a rank newcomer has its
disadvantages.

> Under
> this rubric we just get rid of testing, or most of it, in toto.
> Do you advocate that?

Nope, I agree with the FCC. If you disagree with the FCC, take
it up with them.

> Well, this is just WRONG! Man, no wonder we have problems!
> Here we see the gaping black hole at the very center of all
> Libertarian "thought" -- it's all about ME and the FUN that might
> be had by each individual, like ME.

If you are not going to have fun being a ham, why would you choose
to become a ham? You are not going to be able to convince anyone that
you are entering ham radio so you can sacrifice your self interests
on the alter of altruism. If ham radio gave you more pain than pleasure,
you would never enter it.

> Well, the world of Ham Radio NEVER worked the way YOU
> just described it!

You should know? How long have you been licensed again? The Morse
code exams have been used as a hazing ritual for about 25 years.
Thank goodness, those 19th century approaches are being given up
as we enter the 21st century.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2094. Re: Conditions, Covenants and Cue-Ess-Tee!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 22:35:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C990EA0.1EDEABDF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38089

Valentine Germann wrote:
> Is it really true that "reliable international communi-
> cations" require all that hardware? Well, no, it does
> not, if you're using CW.

How many actual CW QSO's have you had, Val? Why should anyone
listen to what you have to say about CW since you've never
used the mode? You cannot have it both ways. You cannot be a
brand new ham and also be an expert on CW QSO's or QSO's of
any kind for that matter.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2095. Re: Straight Dope on CW's Future?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 22:50:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020320175056.19837.00002392@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 38090

>Subject: Re: Straight Dope on CW's Future?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/20/02 15:30 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020320153010.12257.00000119@mb-mt.aol.com>

>Not really. Technically, OOK CW has not proven to be useful
>as a communications mode. If it had actually been so, it
>would have been retained by many, many other radio services
>engaged in communications.

Yeah...that first 70 years that it WAS a staple communications mode really proved how useless it was!

Riiiiiiight.

>>Combine cell
>>phones with the internet and, well, who needs ANY of this
>>Ham stuff at all, if it's "function" you're concerned about?
>
>One needs to embrace the totality of old standards and
>practices to "demonstrate commitment and dedication" to
>some members of the ARS.

One doesn't need, but Lennie needs to say it to justify his lying.

>To some (particularly the True Believers) it is SOLELY
>"working DX on HF with CW."

I suppose that if even one person believes this, then it COULD be true, however Lennie would have the uninformed and unaware bypasser think it referes to "everyone", which is NOT true.

>Many have thought about morse code modes. Opinions
>vary widely. Tell us why a certain way of THINKING is the
>"only way to think?"

Why don't YOU tell US, Lennie? You certainly have gone to lengths to deride and antagonize ANYONE who dares to suggest that Morse Code use OR testing is "improper" thought..ancient and somehow damaging.

So you go on and answer this specific question, why a certain way of "thinking" is "the only way to think", especially when it's YOUR way? You have some special insight to what is absolutely correct or absolutely incorrect?

2096. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 22:52:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020320175257.19837.00002394@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 38091

>Subject: Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test
>From: w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
>Date: 03/20/02 17:01 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020320170134.06011.00002163@mb-dd.aol.com>

>More n' likely, Len will start feeling better and actually be able to carry
>on
>rational conversation again.

To say "again" is to suggest he ever could.

>Does this rank right up there with Dick's "go soak your head" on the
>trollometer?

40/S9, I'd say.....

73

Steve, K4YZ

2097. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 22:56:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020320175612.19837.00002395@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 38092

>Subject: Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/20/02 15:30 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020320153007.12257.00000117@mb-mt.aol.com>

>>How many deaths per year are prevented by guns?
>
>How many are CAUSED by guns?

Unless there is a mechanical failure of the weapon, none.

Deaths by firearms are "caused" by the improper or criminal use of them.
The weapons themselves, with the exception of mechanical failure, cannot
themselves "cause" a death anymore than a car can cause a death.

Steve

2098. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 23:20:26 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9i58j1j31j7a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38093

W1RFI wrote, concerning some satire on my part, viz:

>>What's left, if it's "mode function" we're all worried
>>about? I don't know.

[That was ME, above.]

>Hams are also very much interested in their operating mode.
>The medium IS the message, in many cases.

Yes, I know! I just wonder if the guy with 51 years in grade
knows it!

Val

2099. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 23:34:24 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9i62odjtlo374@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38094

W1RFI wrote, about the FCC and code, after I indicated
that the FCC didn't really care about the code problem:

>It was the FCC that initiated the rulemaking that ultimately
>led to the restructuring of Amateur Radio. If they didn't care,
>the easiest path was to leave well enough alone. They could
>have dealt with the waiver problem with a lot less work.

Well, yes. And it would be most interesting to be privy to
exact sequence that led to that FCC "initiation." Let me
rephrase: They don't seem to care as much as they used
to, one way or another, and code to them surely is something
they respond to with refererence to the Ham Community itself,
and not because of any overriding government interest.
In addition, they seem to want out of as much as they can
get out of, including enforcement, apparently. Of course,
I could be wrong in this. It simply seems this way, to me.

[Also, with reference to testing exclusively for code, which
I indicated had an unspecified respectable purpose, par-
ticularly at the Extra level, W1RFI wrote:

>The code test speed to obtain an Extra is the same as
>that required to obtain a Tech plus.

Yes, and THIS is something that really is a bit strange.
OK, so code is a problem for some, so the new Technician
class is installed. And, hey, I can't really gripe. And perhaps
any level of code is sufficient for a General license. But
surely a case can be made for reserving a small slice of
ancient custom for the Extra, the ne plus ultra of Hamdom?

Surely that is not unreasonable?

Val

2100. Re: Conditions, Covenants and Cue-Ess-Tee!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 23:47:37 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9i6rdo9v6199f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38095

CAM wrote

>How many actual CW QSO's have you had, Val? Why should
>anyone listen to what you have to say about CW since you've
>never used the mode? You cannot have it both ways. You cannot
>be a brand new ham and also be an expert on CW QSO's or
>QSO's of any kind for that matter.

Well, maybe not. But I know about neighbors and how they react when somebody starts doing strange things in high-end subdivisions! And I've been hanging around my near neighbor for several years, off and on, and watching and listening while he commuicates with folks all over the place, with equipment that can hardly be seen from the road. I don't know, I just thought it was relevant. But then, for you, maybe you'd just rather lash out . . . since my argument makes a little sense. But that couldn't be true, could it?

Val

2101. Re: Conditions, Covenants and Cue-Ess-Tee!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 23:49:16 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gtahtr0.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 38096

On Wed, 20 Mar 2002 15:33:23 -0600, Valentine Germann wrote:

>Hello, all!

Hello Val - welcome to the zoo......
>
>Let me preface my remarks by saying that I am getting
>ready to put up some antennas on my property, and a
>45-foot tower is under consideration. That is, I am
>allowed that here. BUT, I'm not going to do that until
>I check with the six neighbors nearest to me and see
>how they feel about it. That is, 45-feet is UP THERE
>in this area and would be something my neighbors
>would have to look at A LOT.

Only if they intend to get a crick in their neck after two minutes
of staring at your antenna. What they will see "a lot" is your
lower tower section(s) which can be made eye-pleasing with little
or no offort. Set a 50-foot level line and my neighbors will see
the trees at the edges of our and their property (if only I could put
a long wire between them.....).

>And my kid plays
>with some of their kids so, well, I'm not going to do
>a thing to cause a rift.

A wise attitude as long as you don't play the perpetual loser.

>Whoooaah, there, podner! The discussion in QST had
>been framed around what was happening when hams
>moved into "nice homes" in good developments. There
>really wasn't much, or actually, ANYTHING in those
>pieces about THE NEIGHBORS and how to approach
>them.

If it comes down to a CC&R complaint, the neighbors have long since
declared that they will not be reasonable.

>No, it was all about how to get the government,
>namely, the CONGRESS of the UNITED STATES,
>currently at war and still cleaning the anthrax out of the
>mail hoppers, to make it possible for hams to do what
>they want, no matter WHAT the neighbors want, even if
>the ham was putting up . . . well, see below.

The FCC has declared that they want The Congress to give them that
specific direction. We're just accomodating that desire.....

>That is, QST had a discussion of a ham who put up,
>on a six-acre lot, no less than three, 100-foot towers, which
>led to a suit against the city, for issuing the permit, which
>led to an order calling for the dismantling of the towers!
>The case is still in litigation and the ham in question is
>going to have to convince someone, somewhere, that those
>towers are necessary for a "reasonable accommodation of
>amateur communications."

>Is it really true that "reliable international communi-
>cations" require all that hardware?

My expert-witness-of-choice, a very successful PhD, corporate
founder and executive in the communications industry and professor
of radio communication engineering at one of the "name" prestige
engineering schools in the country, can (and has) prove that easily.
He's a well-known DXer and contester, too.

>But, SURELY,
>there is a better test case than * 3 *, ONE-HUNDRED-
>FOOT towers? Surely!

If ya' got 'em, flaunt 'em......

>house prices up in the
>quarter- to half-million dollar range. None of those
>folks moved to that area to live next to a radio station
>or other artifact that looks industrial.

The courts have held for about the last fifty years that amateur
radio is a proper ancillary use of residential property, and by
definition is not "industrial".

>I don't think Ham
>Radio, which QST seems to be re-positioning as a
>"Civic Organization," is going to get very far, in the
>end, bucking the high rollers about covenants.

Those of us who are on the front lines of that war are convinced
that the "heavy artillery" of Federal pre-emption is the only
thing that will bust the stranglehold of the know-nothings
supporting that kind of deed restriction.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
ARRL Volunteer Counsel

2102. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-20 23:53:32 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <0i9m8.2712$aF.216604@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38097

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020320170955.06011.00002166@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
> >My comments were about the survey question itself, and
> >by implication, about the whole thing, which contained only
> >this ONE question about a burning issue of the day. An
> >odd sort of survey, that was!
>
> Now, ask yourself which is more likely -- the ARRL wanting to cook the
books or
> the ARRL not being very good at writing surveys. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Val, the marketing efforts at HQ really stunk and the survey system
provided a complementary odor.

I was, however, somewhat impressed that an online app could be referenced
to a mailing and cause the system first to check that it was valid and
second to deliver the promised goodie. So somewhere at great expense no
doubt the ARRL is entering the 1970s and charging mightily into the 80s
which is more than likely the consultant learning to deal with a
cantankerous bunch like us and not having had to deal with techies since
surviving Toaster and Litebulb 106 at B-school.

Dick BK

2103. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 00:10:50 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gtaitt1.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 38098

On Wed, 20 Mar 2002 17:34:24 -0600, Valentine Germann wrote:

>They [the FCC] don't seem to care as much as they used
>to, one way or another, and code to them surely is something
>they respond to with refererence to the Ham Community itself,
>and not because of any overriding government interest.
>In addition, they seem to want out of as much as they can
>get out of, including enforcement, apparently.

That is true of those Washington types in the agnecy who are not the folks who actually have to DO the enforcement. That pizzing contest has been going on for at least twenty years. See my earlier comments about the necessity of splitting the agency in two.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2104. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 00:30:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9929B9.1E95D44@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38099

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote, concerning some satire on my part, viz:
> >Hams are also very much interested in their operating mode.
> >The medium IS the message, in many cases.
>
> Yes, I know! I just wonder if the guy with 51 years in grade
> knows it!

Of course, the content of most ham messages is irrelevant -
the medium IS the message.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2105. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 00:33:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C992A54.D6E33A1B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38100

Valentine Germann wrote:
> But
> surely a case can be made for reserving a small slice of
> ancient custom for the Extra, the ne plus ultra of Hamdom?
>
> Surely that is not unreasonable?

The purpose of the federal government is NOT to preserve
ancient customs. That is entirely up to groups of
individual citizens.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2106. Re: Conditions, Covenants and Cue-Ess-Tee!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 00:37:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C992B67.26DC1A28@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38151

Valentine Germann wrote:
> But then, for you,
> maybe you'd just rather lash out . . . since my argument
> makes a little sense. But that couldn't be true, could it?

Not if you are who you say you are. No newcomer would attempt
to tie towers and Morse code together. That's even a logical
stretch for experienced hams like Dick.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2107. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 00:40:01 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C992BE9.DC9C5EE3@adelphia.net>
Source record: 38152

Congrats, Valentine! I'm sure you'll enjoy the hobby

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> Hello, all!
>
> Well, I ** did ** pass the Technician test this evening,
> with 100 percent. I was in competition with another
> fellow (we're both long-time members of the local
> astronomy club) and he got 100 percent as well. If
> I had missed one, well, I never would have heard the
> end of it, just because . . .

This reminds me of when they launched that amateur satellite that school students were supposed to listen for. It was going to broadcast a signal that you could pick up when the satellite passed overhead. I set my handi-talkie for the frequency, and promptly forgot about it. I went to bed, and sometime in the middle of the night all hell breaks loose, scares the bejabbers out of my wife, and I got yet *another* admonition to turn that thing off when I'm done for the night. But we heard it!

- Mike -

> I'm very happy to at last be a ham and have already
> started on the General book and the CW. Also, the
> amateur satellite programs have a lot of interest for
> me, particularly because I give fifteen to twenty
> programs per year on astronomy, about half of them
> to schools. Now, I can have a radio component in
> those programs!

2108. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 00:43:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C992CBC.D5F522D0@adelphia.net>
Source record: 38153

The journey is the fun part, and it sounds like your having fun
already. What kind of antenna are you building for the satellites? I
never thought about tracking with GOTO, but it's interesting.

- Mike -

Valentine Germann wrote:

> I hope to have some fun AND study for the General!
> For instance, I'm now shopping for a radio to use on
> the club repeater, which is definitely fun, and I'm assembling
> parts to make an antenna to raise those satellites!
> I have access to a computer-controlled telescope
> that could track satellites while mounting that antenna.
> It's gonna be great -- I hope!

2109. Re: Death to Ham Radio at the hands of it's own operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 01:02:46 UTC
From: JJ <radiojim0@hotmail.net>
Message-ID: <3C99222B.87950662@hotmail.net>
Source record: 38154
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.amateur,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

>
> What repeater was this on? How long were you talking? The rest of us might
> be listening. I don't know you personally...but I can say that I would tire
> of listening to even my closest amateur radio friends for a long period of time.

That is why your equipment has the ability to change frequencies
or turn it off. If you are bored with the conversation then do one
or the other.
No one should have to limit their conversation just to please you.

2110. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 01:43:24 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7be55$sv9$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38155

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020320011024.19499.00001395@mb-cb.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test
> >From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
> >Date: 03/20/02 00:15 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <a796r7$r34$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
>
> >> Voting as >>I<< wish..??? Of course not, not always, but they
> >CERTAINLY
> >> do not simply do as they see fit, either!
> >
> >And you know that based on what evidence.
> >More to the point, just how does any director instantly
> >know the "majority" stance of the hams in the region he
> >or she represents on any given issue?
>
> By my experience, observation and interaction with others interested
in
> the issue at hand. Discussions at club meetings, local newsletters,
discussion
> on the air, etc.
>
> It does not require the services of A.C. Nielsen to know what's going
on
> or what my peer's opinions are, Bill, whether it is my interest in an
> ARRL/Amateur Radio matter, or local politics. Just a keen ear and a
> willingness to make myself informed on the issues.

All of that will tune you in to those that are vocal and involved...to wit,
the
small percentage of movers and shakers...not necessarily any true
majority. Nothing wrong with that, but it sure ain't "representative".

> >>One very popular US President tried that "silent majority" tack for
> >taking
> >> his own advice, and you see what it got him!
> >
> >What?
>
> Feigned ignorance does not suit you, Bill.

I have no clue what your comment is intended to convey.

> >>Don't have recall? What public office cannot be recinded by popular
> >or

> >> Congressional vote?
> >
> >Many. Recall is NOT universal...it varies based on jurisdiction.
>
> I asked for some sort of specific, Bill. Are you unable to produce
even
> one? Not ONE single elected office that cannot be recalled by popular or
> Congressional vote?

I already said there are some. Which ones, who cares?

> If the President of the United States can be recalled or impeached,
what
> lesser office could be impervious to the whims of the electorate?

The president can't be "recalled". Impeached - Yes, recalled No.
There is a difference.

> Just one, Bill. Please.

I already said there are some. Which ones, who cares?

> >> >> And when ARRL elected officials don't conduct themselves according
> >> >> to acceptable standards, THEY get recalled.
> >> >
> >> >Pretty rare event.
> >>
> >> Excuse me? Without going back through the last couple
month'sQST's,
> >an SM
> >> was removed for just such reasons.
> >
> >I said rare! I didn't say NEVER!
>
> But not by recent events, it's not.

Even by recent events it is rare. One such incident does not
make it commonplace.

> There have been several premature
> changes in ARRL field leadership in RECENT years that were precipitated by
> "cause", rather than by resignation for personal reasons or death of the
office
> holder.

I'm only aware of one.

> >So much for any efforts at recall then.
>
> My point is that there wil be no such effort since the recent actions
of
> the ARRL generally reflect the opinions and desires of the membership.

Glad we agree. The ARRL is following the general intent
of membership on not opposing an end to the treaty requiremenmt.

> >There are REAL policy issues to get on with, yet they still are
> >ignored by
> >> those who figure someone else will do something about it.
> >
> >Situation normal.
>
> Apathy fits you even less than feigned ignorance, Bill.

Who said I was apathetic. I merely pointed out that MOST folks
just go with the flow. Reality...deal with it.

> >In my Congressional District there is no "undefined majority". It IS
> >my
> >> fellow voters in this district.
> >
> >Is that the fellow voters that voted last election...or those
> >that might in the next election...or is it anyone who calls
> >the congress critter.
>
> Since balloting is secret and participation in the electorial process
is
> solely at the discretion of the voter, it would be all citizens. But
voting or
> NOT voting is irrelevent. The representitive is required to represent ALL
> citizens of thier district/state to the best of thier ability.

But ONCE elected, the indivdiual makes his/her own judgements
on how to vote. Piss off enough constituents and s/he won't get reelected.

> >> And there IS a requirement that they represent us per our wishes.
> >
> >PLEASE show us where that is spoecifically stated in the constitution
> >or any other law.
>
> That obscure part that says "We, The People".

That's great philosophy, but it isn't "The law". No one
has ever been impeached for breaking "we the people" concepts.

> Is thre a specific line
> that says "You will do this or else"? Of course not. But neither is there
a
> line in the Constitution that says "The Government is responsible for
providing
> shelter, substinence and health care for otherwise able bodied people who
> refuse to work", but it does it anyway, now doesn't it, Bill?

Your point?

> >Other than the elective process itself (and recall
> >where it may be an option) there is NO other means to hold anyone

> >accountable for how they vote. How many times have we heard the
> >explanation "I voted my conscience" when the known public opinion
> >would have "dictated" a vote the other way.
>
> And it should be the responsiblity of his/her constituents to "fire"
them.
> I agree it happens, Bill. I never said it doesn't. I said it isn't
right.

It has come to pass that such votes have ultimately
been the correct way to go. Not always, but sometimes. The point is that
elected reps DON'T always follow the vox popular.

> >Even those that don't always vote public opinion get reelected.
>
> One of the anomolies of a society that will elect and subsequently
reelect
> a known drug user, coward and womanizer, I guess. "Feces Ominus Occurum".

Like I said, reality.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2111. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 01:54:17 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7bfascor1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38158

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9i62odjtlo374@corp.supernews.com...
>
> W1RFI wrote, about the FCC and code, after I indicated
> that the FCC didn't really care about the code problem:
>
> >It was the FCC that initiated the rulemaking that ultimately
> >led to the restructuring of Amateur Radio. If they didn't care,
> >the easiest path was to leave well enough alone. They could
> >have dealt with the waiver problem with a lot less work.
>
> Well, yes. And it would be most interesting to be privy to
> exact sequence that led to that FCC "initiation." Let me
> rephrase: They don't seem to care as much as they used
> to, one way or another, and code to them surely is something
> they respond to with refererence to the Ham Community itself,
> and not because of any overriding government interest.
> In addition, they seem to want out of as much as they can
> get out of, including enforcement, apparently. Of course,
> I could be wrong in this. It simply seems this way, to me.
>
>
> [Also, with reference to testing exclusively for code, which
> I indicated had an unspecified respectable purpose, par-
> ticularly at the Extra level, W1RFI wrote:
>
> >The code test speed to obtain an Extra is the same as
> >that required to obtain a Tech plus.
>
> Yes, and THIS is something that really is a bit strange.
> OK, so code is a problem for some, so the new Technician
> class is installed. And, hey, I can't really gripe. And perhaps
> any level of code is sufficient for a General license. But
> surely a case can be made for reserving a small slice of
> ancient custom for the Extra, the ne plus ultra of Hamdom?
>
> Surely that is not unreasonable?

Perhaps you should read the NPRM R&O. You'll find not
one argument that sustained your viewpoint for any
requirement based on "ancient custom" or for any other
reason.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2112. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 02:04:08 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C993F81.B8166A5E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38156

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
> >It's obvious that the FCC does not CARE one way or
> >another.
>
> It was the FCC that initiated the rulemaking that ultimately led to the
> restructuring of Amateur Radio. If they didn't care, the easiest path was to
> leave well enough alone. They could have dealt with the waiver problem with a
> lot less work.

It was the FCC (Reed Hundt, "the chairman from Mars", and
his band of merry commissioners, all lawyers, none Ham) that
initiated the rulemaking...". If they really cared, why
were there no Hams? (couldn't pass the code test??).

W5YI, the leader of that other great Hamdom enterprise,
claims it was He who led the council of volunteer examiners
in an 11th hour appeal, and used their powers of persuasion
to tilt the FCC to drop code testing. He said the waiver
problem had a big effect. Does the poster dispute his
claims?

It is interesting that after reconstruction (three code
tests to one, 5 licenses to 3, electronic filing, etc.) the
exam fees have tripled. Inflation, I suspect. ;-)

>
> >>[Why should] CW be singled out and tested as a skill?
>
> >Lots of reasons, especially to get on HF, especially as,
> >say, an Extra.
>
> The code test speed to obtain an Extra is the same as that required to obtain a
> Tech plus.

Which does not make alot of sense. Approx. half of the
QSO's on HF are OOK CW Morse. Probably 1% of QSO's on
VHF/UHF (the traditional tech homeland) are OOK CW Morse.

>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

73,
Clay N4AOX

2113. Re: Straight Dope on CW's Future?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 02:06:19 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7bfatcor2@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38159

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9hpk4bl9klpbc@corp.supernews.com...
>
> CAM wrote, vis-a-vis code testing and code as bow & arrow
> technology in a modern world:
> >The longbow had enough range to win a considerable
> >number of battles. And there were some crossbows so
> >massive that they had to have whees. Technology, i.e.
> >chemistry, replaced the bow and arrow for purposes of
> >war. For purposes of sport and fun, the bow and arrow
> >has NOT been replaced. The State of Texas has a bow
> >and arrow deer season before the regular deer season
> >gets underway.
>
> But what about the public policy aspects. Is there a band plan
> for bow and arrow? Is there any FCC involvement in that sport?
> Are there organized groups out there sharpening their knives
> to do away with ranges for bow and arrow?

Are there organized groups out there sharpening their knives
to do away with morse code, or "ranges" where
morse code can be used?

> No, sorry, your
> analogy is, as usual, off the point.

I strongly disagree.

> >If the alleged supporters of CW would realize that CW
> >is fun, they might convince some newcomers to learn it
> >and use it. As long as those alleged supporters keep
> >telling newcomers that they won't learn Morse code
> >unless they are forced to do so by a governmental
> >requirement, most newcomers will be turned off and
> >find the mode unattractive.
>
> This is simply bizarre. As has been pointed out before,
> ad nausem, this argument cuts no ice at all, none. Under
> this rubric we just get rid of testing, or most of it, in toto.
> Do you advocate that?

This is an old saw...end all testing. There are good
reasons for theory and regulations testing. No, I'm
not going to waste my time explaining or defending them since
they are NOT under any threat. Morse testing, as
a separate pass/fail is what can't be justified. I and others

have NO issue with incorporation of some knowledge of morse
as a mode in the written tests...there is just no reason to
have a skill test anymore at all.

> >With friends like that, CW doesn't need any enemies
> >and is probably doomed. When those alleged supporters
> >of CW start pushing the fun and merits of the mode
> >instead of the forced learning, I will feel much better
> >about its survival.
>
> Same song, second verse. Nolo contendre, on your
> side of the argument.

Do YOU seriously believe that code use will only
survive IF there is mandatory testing?

> [Concerning Ham Radio in a more general way.]
>
> >Nope, ham radio is no more than its function. IMO, its primary
> >function is emergency communications.
>
> Ooops! Aahoooga! Aahoooga! Check the question
> pool I just took!

I agree, emergency comms is not stated as a primary
purpose.

> >Its secondary function is fun.
>
> Well, this is just WRONG!

Depends on how you read Part 97.

> [About CW's future]
>
> >You seem to feel that CW is dying - it is not. There is no
> >governmental requirement to keep bows and arrows alive.
> >Why does it thrive without a governmental requirement?
>
> I guess there's just no point, is there? Good God.

The point is that many things survive with NO mandates
from government. CW will exist on that same basis.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2114. Re: Death to Ham Radio at the hands of it's own operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 02:08:01 UTC
From: Wayne <wayneleake@wayneleake.net>
Message-ID: <u9ig419vmojc74@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38157
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.amateur,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

It seemed that you ran across one of the groups with narrow minds...

--
Wayne. <|:^)>
KG6KFE@charter.nospam.net
http://www.wayneleake.net

"Phillip A Manning (KC8TAU)" <kc8tau@fuse.net> wrote in message
news:eahh9uob3fggs24an8tg3khcue0s9h7515@4ax.com...
> Steve,
>
> I appreciate your comments and time. Very well put and I am not
> saying that all of the aforementioned groups are bad. In fact some of
> the work that is done by them is in the best of intentions. I do
> think, however, that you would have been wiser not to assume to know
> what my experiences out of life have been.
>
> Broadcasting is not what I would like to do and I to not tend to get
> up on a soapbox about things (this time the thorn had dug too deep).
> In fact the conversation that I was talking about was less than a
> minuet long. The removal was an almost immediate response to someone
> talking on the repeater, and that is the reason that most of the
> repeater space is tied up and there is little place to talk. BTW I
> have looked around the spectrum and found a few good repeaters to talk
> on one in northern Kentucky and Indiana and one or two out in "fringe"
> counties of Southwestern Ohio.
>
> Now as for WARN that you seem to think so highly of.I was listening to
> the last weather related WARN net during a heavy wind and rain storm
> that passed through a couple of weeks ago and do you know what I
> heard. I heard some guy talking about his trees and a garbage can in
> his back yard for about an hour. So let me see a rag chew about a
> tree during a weather net is acceptable but me saying hi to one of my
> friends on a quiet repeater on a sunny day in the after noon is
> scolded, that really gives me a lot of faith in this great hobby.
>
Seems to be par for the course with some users.
One should use some logic when there may be some emergency conditions.

> Steve, I know if your position with WARN, and I appreciate the work
> you do. You are right I have not been to any of the meetings or
> tanning, but I know, first hand, of people who have been very active
> and donated time equipment and money to your you cause and in return
> have faced ego and a poor attitude toward the work that was done.

> That is my reason for not jumping on the bandwagon and joining right
> up.
>
> I am sorry for coming off very harsh in my first post, but I do like
> the hobby and I want to see it flourish. I do not want you to think
> me just a hateful individual, and I do understand that most hams are
> very nice and considerate people. I have traveled a bit and had some
> great experiences with hams in other areas. It just seams to me that
> this area, like with many other things, is just stuck in it's ways and
> refuses to accept change. And just possibly I have some miss
> information from other people that I have talked to about this so
> please tell me all the sides of the story I would love to hear them,
> and I promise I will listen to anyone with an intelligent point.
>
> Now onto the "illegal" comment I made in my last post. I spoke to a
> very nice gentleman at the FCC and he told me that it was all right to
> have a "commercial" radio that would do amateur band just not the
> other way around. So if I miss stated my self I am sorry for that too.
>

Many of the early VHF FM units were simply converted commercial gear.
And it did the job quite nicely, but, of course, limited in channels till
the synthesizers came along...

> "73" to all
>
> On Wed, 20 Mar 2002 00:45:22 -0500, Steve Lewis N8TFD <n8tfd@one.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Phil:
> >
> >Comments below.
> >
> >"Phillip A Manning (KC8TAU)" wrote:
> >>
> >> I have been recently toying with the idea of putting a dual band
> >> (2m/440) amateur rig in my car. To assess if the investment would be
> >> worth it (seeing as how I already have a mod'ed commercial 440 rig in
> >> my car for amateur and GMRS) I borrowed a friend's scanner and
> >> listened to many of the "active" frequencies in this area, the greater
> >> Cincinnati area. I found a few very active places, which got my hopes
> >> up until I started listening to the content of these channels.
> >
> >It's probably not wise to admit that you're trying to do things that are
bad
> >practice if not overtly illegal. It makes it harder for the "old guard"
to
> >take you seriously, even if you have a valid point(s).
> >
> >> It appears to me that the Greater Cincinnati area is "under siege" by
> >> a very few groups of amateurs. I noticed that the diversity in radio

> >> is nil the same people on all the used frequencies, and even thou they
> >> clam to be an "open" group if you listen to them new people with new
> >> ideas are ran off. On some of the repeaters just a normal
> >> conversation is cut off for tying up the repeater. On a clear sunny
> >> day not during peak traffic times why should a conversation on a Ham
> >> repeater that it observing the courtesies of normal ham communications
> >> (i.e. waiting for the repeater to drop so any other station calling
> >> could get in if they wanted to) be cut for the reason of wanting empty
> >> air. That to me sounds like non-effective use of frequency space.
> >
> >What repeater was this on? How long were you talking? The rest of us
might
> >be listening. I don't know you personally...but I can say that I would
tire
> >of listening to even my closest amateur radio friends for a long period
of time.
> >
> >> Now that we are on frequency space let me just say that it seems a
> >> little excessive for one group to control six different repeater pairs
> >> across two different bands. Five of those in the 2m band alone. This
> >> to me sounds like a lack of diversity, and if you track some of there
> >> frequencies you will find that one of them is in a garage on a mag.
> >> mount antenna just to tie up the space so that no one else can use
> >> that space for a new repeater and haven forbid some new opinions and
> >> views.
> >
> >Maybe. But I don't think you have any MORE or LESS right to the
frequencies
> >than they do. If the repeaters are as idle as you say, isn't there
plenty of
> >bandwidth for you to spread your opinions and views. Of course, this is
a two-
> >way communications hobby, it's not about BROADCASTING your opinions and
views.
> >
> >I haven't heard you on the repeaters that I listen to, so I can't imagine
that
> >there isn't one for you to use and not be bothered.
> >
> >> If you live in or near Cincinnati you may know who I am talking about.
> >> CRA (Cincinnati Repeater Association) seems to be the only way to get
> >> on the air in this city, and if you try to put up a repeater of your
> >> own you will find that all the vhf pairs are taken. Now, if this
> >> group is truly interested in keeping ham radio alive they would
> >> welcome new people and points of view, but to the contrary if you
> >> disagree with any member of the group you will find yourself subject
> >> to jamming and "the cold shoulder" until you just give up. These
> >> people do not extent their damaging attitude into just a standard
> >> radio group, but the "leaders" of the group also seem to run all
> >> activity available to hams in this area like: Sky Warn Group, QCEN

> >> (Queen City Emergency Net), and ARPSC (Amateur Radio Public Service
> >> Corps). So as you can see if you want to do anything in this city in
> >> ham radio you have to subject your self to a group that I have heard,
> >> aptly referred to as the CRM (Cincinnati Repeater Mafia).
> >
> >Plenty of other clubs have at least 2 repeater pairs of their own. I'm
not
> >a CRA member, never have been (ask my cohorts about this), but I'm
guessing
> >you had a bad experience on one of their machines because you haven't
talked
> >about any other club's repeaters?
> >
> >Also...have you been to an ARPSC meeting? How about a QCEN meeting?
(You
> >haven't been to a QCEN meeting). Can you name some of the leadership
from
> >each group? You'll find very little in common.
> >
> >Have you checked into a WARN net? No. Will you attend the annual WARN
> >meeting/training? After this, you'd better!
> >
> >> So you may ask, what can be done about such atrocities? Well I have
> >> added contact information to a key person at the bottom of this post
> >> if you know of anyone else who may help please let them know and if
> >> you would let me know and I will forward a copy of this letter to them
> >> so they may hear my argument as well. Please contact someone and let
> >> them know that the hams in Cincinnati are being oppressed by local
> >> radio groups of, and we would like to take the air waves back for the
> >> hams and not leave them to the death they are suffering here in this
> >> great city.
> >
> >What makes Ken a key person? What is his position exactly?
> >
> >> Ohio Coordinator:
> >>
> >> Kin Bird, W8SMK
> >> 244 North Parkway Dr.
> >> Delaware, OH 43015-8788
> >> Ken@midohio.net
> >>
> >> Phil Manning
> >> KC8TAU
> >> kc8tau@fuse.net
> >
> >Ok Phil:
> >
> >I'm guessing that what happened is you jumped on a CRA repeater, at drive
time,
> >and monopolized the thing. I don't know about your operating practices,

but
> >good or not, no one wants to hear YOUR opinions and ideas for hours at a
time.
> >
> >You seem to be like many other UseNet posters. You have a lot of
complaints,
> >but you don't tell the whole story. And since you've NEVER been at
meetings of
> >the organizations in question, I expect that you will cease trashing them
until
> >you've met the people you seem to despise, and they've had a chance to
meet
> >you.
> >
> >SkyWARN, ARES/RACES, and Red Cross are always looking for new hams. Ham
> >radio is much more than ragchewing on or complaining about 2 meters.
> >
> >But I get the impression that you're in the hobby because you think it
will
> >provide you a soapbox to share some kind of "opinions and ideas".
> >
> >If so, you've probably joined the wrong hobby. Or you've been influenced
by
> >amateur radio operators who are misinformed.
> >
> >I challenge you to explore ALL the repeaters and ALL the groups around
> >Cincinnati, and report back honestly.
> >
> >Otherwise, I won't take the time to invite you to join the real hobby,
and
> >won't offer my time to help in any way I can (which is what I'm trying to
> >do here).
> >
> >-73-
>

2115. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 02:11:25 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C994138.E15DC8B2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38160

The "March Hare", W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
> >My comments were about the survey question itself, and
> >by implication, about the whole thing, which contained only
> >this ONE question about a burning issue of the day. An
> >odd sort of survey, that was!
>
> Now, ask yourself which is more likely -- the ARRL wanting to cook the books or
> the ARRL not being very good at writing surveys. :-)

I sure am glad to see that smiley face emoticon after that
rhetoric!

73,
Clay N4AOX

2116. Re: Conditions, Covenants and Cue-Ess-Tee!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 02:13:25 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7bfo3kmj1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38161

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gtahtr0.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Wed, 20 Mar 2002 15:33:23 -0600, Valentine Germann wrote:
> >house prices up in the
> >quarter- to half-million dollar range. None of those
> >folks moved to that area to live next to a radio station
> >or other artifact that looks industrial.
>
> The courts have held for about the last fifty years that amateur
> radio is a proper ancillary use of residential property, and by
> definition is not "industrial".

Additionally, many of those "fine" neighbors get equally pissed
off at anything they see that doesn't fit their own mold of
proper suburban gentile living. Don't change the oil in
your driveway, etc.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2117. Re: Conditions, Covenants and Cue-Ess-Tee!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 02:20:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020320212048.24104.00000192@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 38163

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gtahtr0.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>>house prices up in the
>>quarter- to half-million dollar range. None of those
>>folks moved to that area to live next to a radio station
>>or other artifact that looks industrial.
>
> The courts have held for about the last fifty years that amateur
> radio is a proper ancillary use of residential property, and by
> definition is not "industrial".

Agreed, but there is a continual 24-hour huge "gray line" on
what constitutes esthetic acceptibility in a residential
neighborhood. The typical 1/4 to 1/2 acre residence lots
in city neighborhoods can't support a lot of skywires and/or
multiple beams and still be pleasing to everyone all around
such a "non-industrial" place, however much a within-his-
rights radio amateur states.

That has nothing to do with "conditions and covenants" but
is one of simply getting along with the neighbors. That's a
personal task for every radio amateur who wants to live IN a
radio station. In a typical urban residential area, the radio
amateur is simply outnumbered by neighbors at least 20:1.
In most urban residential areas those neighbors are as much
a citizen as the ham.

Agreed that some care and planning of a residential amateur
station to make it look more pleasing to neighbors is a good
thing, but it doesn't end there. Courts may find for the ham
on "rights" to be a "non-industrial" radio station but that isn't
a final situation. Failure to get along with neighbors leads to
things such as complaints about RFI and possibly worse
situations. All the righteousness in the world may wind up a
Pyrric Victory...for everyone but the attorneys who don't live
in that area anyway...

Those who want to live IN a big radio station should plan to do
so where they have few or no neighbors.

2118. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 02:20:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020320212054.24104.00000193@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 38164

In article <3C99043D.42F12EB7@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>> It would seem that the "phase shift problem" on HF is another
>> myth promulgated by the PCTAs.
>
>It can be a problem in PSK systems without FEC. Such systems, IMO,
>are not serious systems. RTTY has lots of problems known for decades.
>PSK31 shares many of those same problems. Just because something is
>relatively new doesn't mean it has solved all the problems known to
>man. PACTOR II is a serious mode. I can raise a PACTOR II mailbox
>in Germany when I can't even hear the signal.

I will go along with what you've said. A system designed to work
in the presence of very strong noise PLUS having a correction
coding is hard to beat. There are many such in the larger radio
world. Some applications deliberately add pseudo-random
sequences to data to gain a few db of processing power; pseudo-
random sequences are synchronizeable and can be removed by
identical PRSG generators.

What I was referring to is the HF selective fading, quite narrowband
selective fading, which can lead to 20+ db drops in received signal
level. If a circuit is already running with received signal level AT the
noise floor, it will be touch and go if it makes it through such a null.
Commercial and military applications in the TTY-data of the past
simply doubled up the tone pairs of AFSK to overcome the
selective fading. Crude and brute-force though it may have been,
it worked just dandy and was used for decades on commercial
sideband...right on through WW2 and into the 1970s.

The PCTA myth that "phase shift systems can't work on HF"
probably traces back to some disgruntled PCTA wrongly promoting
morsemodes on some "re-arranged" technical data along with very
selective quoting. That sort of thing was tried to "prove" the badness
of GMDSS by pulling out some retired old-time maritimer's posting
from somewhere...and trying to use that in front of the larger body
of mariners who lobbied for and got a worldwide system now in use.

2119. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 02:20:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020320212055.24104.00000194@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 38162

In article <20020320170134.06011.00002163@mb-dd.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>It takes about 42 muscles to frown. I takes only 4 to extend my
>>finger and say "bite me!" Clue: I'm not frowning.
>
>And all I got was a boo hoo.

Consider yourself lucky.

>More n' likely, Len will start feeling better and actually be able to carry on
>rational conversation again. He is capable of better responses than "bite
me."

Yes, but in the atmosphere polluted by some in here who have
failed their basic anger-management sessions, one has to resort
to the primitive once in a while.

Electroncs and EM waves just don't respond to threats, orders,
commands, insults, or sweet talk. Human emotions don't affect
them. One meets electrons and EM waves on THEIR terms only.
No doubt some of the angry types haven't been able to
capitulate to physical laws, meet their terms, or much else and
try to take it out on others who have...

>Does this rank right up there with Dick's "go soak your head" on the
>trollometer?

Does your question rank right up there with "I'm with the ARRL and
I'm here to tell you what is good for you all?"

We can exist here for all of 2002 sending questions back and forth.
Some of us have taken stands and expressed opinions based on
our relative experiences. Some try to play a "moderator" role with
lots of questions substituting for replies but don't have much effect
at all in this newsgroupy environment.

No head-soaking required.

2120. Re: For Discussion: ARRL Fee's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 02:45:36 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <kPbm8.58$ye3.4067395@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38165

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:a7a0kh31827@enews1.newsguy.com...
> Brian... I was looking at this idea from a marketing stance. If ya can
hook
> 'em on a piece of bait, ya may keep them. True some may drop out after
the
> first year but many more may stick around. After all, if they weren't
> getting any money from these people in the first place, it is actually a
> gain in some respects. Again for any others who like to read it
> differently, this idea was for FIRST TIME member applications who never
held
> a ARRL membership only.
>
> This idea has worked in other applications and was just curious if it
would
> work with the ARRL if they pursued it...
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR

Ryan, perhaps its not economically feasable for the ARRL to do this, but I sure wish the national organization has greater participation from the average ham. I think we would have a more balanced organization if this were so.

Send Jim Haynie a message with your suggestion. I think its ARRL numbergram #7147 (discount to first-timers).

;^)
Brian

Brian

2121. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 02:57:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C994C0F.3E92E62D@adelphia.net>
Source record: 38166

Shame on you.

Mike

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> Congratulations on the remarkable achievement of passing a test
> that can be passed by any reasonably intelligent 2nd-grader with
> a copy of "Now You're Talking!" Now, to get your General, you've
> got to somehow beat that nasty 'ole 5 WPM Morse hazing ritual.
> Good luck -- you're gonna need it
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

2122. DARC didn't fly with Germany's administration

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 03:06:11 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7bir4$80d$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38167

```
-------------------------------------------------------------------
A G Z - P r e s s R e l e a s e
-------------------------------------------------------------------
-------------------------------------------------------------------
WRC-03: "National Group" confirms NO to CW exams
-------------------------------------------------------------------
Bonn, March 18th, 2002.

On March 18th 2002 the National Group preparing Germany's position
for WRC-03 met in Bonn again at the Federal Ministry of Economics.
AGZ e.V. and No Code International (NCI) were represented by Dr.
Ralph P. Schorn, DC5JQ.

Again the Group discussed the expected alteration of RR-article
S25.5. Already at their September 2001 meeting, the Group's members
decided to advise the Minister to vote against compulsory Morse
telegraphy exams.

In this context the National Group took note of an opinion poll
that Germay's largest amateur radio club performed among their
members. 52 percent voted in favour of keeping compulsory Morse
exams for shortwave access. The Group, however, expressed no
necessity to change the position defined in September 2001, as
already then a 50:50 situation was assumed among radio amateurs
in Germany. The National Group regards the outcome of the opinion
poll as a confirmation of their September decision against CW
exams.

The National Group supported the position of CEPT's Conference
Preparatory Group (CPG), that on it's Oslo meeting in February
2002 decided on a new text for Article S25.5 being the
preliminary European position:

> Administrations shall determine whether or not a person
> seeking a license to operate an amateur station shall
> prove that he is able to send and receive correctly texts
> in Morse code signals.

Only a single member of the National Group (i.e. DARC) voted against
this position.

According to this, the decision to ask for a Morse exam would be
up to each individual administration. A frequency barrier, being at
30 MHz today, is not desired any more. Representatives of the
Federal Ministry of Economics pointed out, however, that Germany
would not continue Morse telegraphy exams after a change of S25.5
```

and that Germany will not create any national regulation that
deviates from a common European CEPT position.
--------end of AGZ Press Release-------------

2123. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 03:32:57 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gtas4t2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 38168

On Thu, 21 Mar 2002 02:04:08 GMT, Clay N4AOX wrote:

>It was the FCC (Reed Hundt, "the chairman from Mars", and
>his band of merry commissioners, all lawyers, none Ham) that
>initiated the rulemaking...

One click of the BACK button...it was The Congress that mandated that the Commish' review all its rules biennially to deregulate as much as possible. It was just Part 97's time.....

You ought to hear what lunacy the broadcast engineers got to gripe about (loyal member and chapter officer of the Society of Broadcast Engineers).

>If they really cared, why were there no Hams? (couldn't pass the
>code test??).

There hasn't been a ham (or engineer) commissioner since George Sterling in the early 50s. My protege, Dane Ericksen N6AJY whe became a big wheel in the SBE after he left the Commission for the private consulting engineering field actually submitted a Petition for Rulemaking which would jave required one of the Commissionera to be an engineer. It wass roundly voted down by the sitting Vommision.

Anyhow, the staff prepared the revisions and the Commish' just voted on it.

There have been managers and chiefs at the Commish' who felt that staff members who were hams were "fifth columnists" (one bad example who shall remain nameless but some folks here remember him) and therefore no employee should be a ham and those of us who were already hams should not have any contact with ham radio policy or enforcement (but they couln't find support for either of those views) . I had the "good fortune" to work directly for two such chiefs for extended [eriods of time. It wasm't easy.

As far as privitization, the Feds (and now the states and the locals) have found that it is always easier to close their eyes and get someone else to do it (poof - it's not our problem any more) than to do it in-house and make sure that it's done correctly. Yechhhhh...

>It is interesting that after reconstruction (three code
>tests to one, 5 licenses to 3, electronic filing, etc.) the
>exam fees have tripled. Inflation, I suspect. ;-)

Exam fees are set by the "private sector", not by the Commission. Welcome to "privitization"....

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2124. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 04:01:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020320230126.02713.00000428@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 38169

In article <20020319234831.11757.00000144@mb-bj.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>
>LARRIE,
>
>Here's your deserved apology: BITE ME.

Lennie:

How charming. Nevertheless, I don't believe that truly qualifies as an apology, so I must respectfully not accept it as such. Feel free to try again. OBTW -- I'm sure you'll also be hearing from Mr. Robeson about this!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2125. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 04:01:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020320230126.02713.00000429@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 38171

In article <3c97fe38$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Val:
>>
>> Congratulations on the remarkable achievement of passing a test
>> that can be passed by any reasonably intelligent 2nd-grader with
>> a copy of "Now You're Talking!" Now, to get your General, you've
>> got to somehow beat that nasty 'ole 5 WPM Morse hazing ritual.
>> Good luck -- you're gonna need it
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>Val, meet the very dark side of amateur radio. Then promptly ignore it, as
>most of us do.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Val:

I couldn't have said it better myself. Kim has officially been declared
by a high-ranking FCC enforcement official as taking the ARS "One
Step Closer To Extinction." Therefore, she is, truly, the very
personification of amateur radio's "dark side." As she says, feel free
to ignore her. Most of us do.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2126. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 04:01:27 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020320230127.02713.00000431@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 38170

In article <3C98B3E9.803C91C@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Valentine Germann wrote:
>> Anyway, it may have been a relatively simple test but ace-ing
>> it was still a kick, without a doubt!
>
>Hope you realize that Dick and Larry will view you forever as
>a post restructuring dumbed-down amateur radio operator. How
>many IQ points did you sacrifice by passing the Tech exam? :-)

Cecil:

Obviously, not nearly as many as you have sacrificed to spoiled
grape juice!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2127. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 04:01:27 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020320230127.02713.00000430@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 38173

In article <20020320063419.15164.00002221@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>You really gotta love Larry.
>
>And it really shot holes in his claims that he doesn't blame newcomers for
>the
>state of the tests and only insults those that are lazy.
>
>I think Larry is only here because he has proclaimed usenet to be a place
>where
>social rules need not apply.

Ed:

If the "social rules" you refer to are the rules of mush-minded, mealy-mouthed Political Correctness, then no, I don't believe they apply here. Of course, I don't believe they apply anywhere else, either. I am a person who speaks his mind, doesn't pull his punches, and takes the heat that follows. I don't take popular positions merely for the sake of getting along with whatever majority I am facing at the time. If I disagree, then I let my disagreement be known. And when faced with typical liberal thought-Nazi's, who demand absolute agreement, then I take the gloves off and start letting the good times roll.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2128. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 04:01:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020320230128.02713.00000432@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 38172

In article <u9hempmc8kq3e7@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>CAM wrote
>
>>Hope you realize that Dick and Larry will view you forever
>>as a post restructuring dumbed-down amateur radio operator.
>
>Well, I'm not sure of that at all.

Val:

Well, now you can be sure of it. You are (through no fault of
your own), a post-restructuring, dumbed-down amateur radio
operator. Now, having said that, I'll also say that I don't hold
this against you, personally. However, you must recognize,
acknowledge, and live with the fact that there are now two
separate and distinct "classes" of radio amateurs -- those who
ascended through a more comprehensive, challenging, and
beneficial licensing regime, which included the requirement
to learn and be tested in a highly useful communications skill
at a proven-to-be achievable proficiency level -- and those
who have had full amateur privileges handed to them for
significantly less effort spent in developing practical knowledge
and skill. Yes, I do accept you as a full-fledged radio amateur
at whatever license class you hold, but I do not agree with
the "dumbing-down" process which you have, and will, be
forever associated. Personally, I have no doubt that you
could have become a ham and achieved Amateur Extra
class under the pre-1991 licensing requirements. I just
feel that there was no need for these requirements to be
reduced to the level at which they now stand.

>However, a certain amount of
>uncomfortableness with the "new standard" is inevitable, in
>my view.

And that, IMHO, is a very healthy and mature point-of-view.

>We're all only human and therefore have weaknesses.

I agree, and the "weakness" of those who lobbied for, and
received, reduced licensing standards have done nothing to
further the cause of amateur radio. Unfortunately, all they
have done is to permanently install a "Balkanized" relationship
between hams who are separated by a date on a timeline.

>In amateur astronomy, we now have totally "GoTo" telescopes,
>instruments that can find anything in the sky at the touch of a
>few buttons. All you need is the money to afford them and you
>can do things that astro Old Timers still can't dream of doing.

I would accept this as nothing more than the effect of
"consumerism" on the hobby of amateur astronomy. The
reduction of amateur radio licensing standards was born out
of the same gene pool. I cannot speak for the impact this
will have on amateur astronomy, but it is not a good thing
for amateur radio, since the overall learning experience has
been foreshortened in a hobby which is supposed to be all
about learning.

>This has inevitably caused some resentment, in the same way
>that the "RUBIE" phenomenon has P-O'd some Old Timers
>among bikers.

You'll have to explain that one to me.

>I guess I'm old enough to simply expect a certain amount of that.

Again, a healthy point of view. You are obviously not a whiner.
Regardless of how it came to be, welcome to Amateur Radio,
and I hope it will be for you everything that you expect of it. One
thing I know, and have said repeatedly is: Amateur Radio is what
amateur radio operators make of it; and amateur radio operators
are what they make of themselves. That was true in the past,
and always will be true in the future.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2129. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 04:30:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9961E0.6DFE61D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38175

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Valentine Germann wrote:
> >> Anyway, it may have been a relatively simple test but ace-ing
> >> it was still a kick, without a doubt!
> > >
> > >Hope you realize that Dick and Larry will view you forever as
> > >a post restructuring dumbed-down amateur radio operator. How
> > >many IQ points did you sacrifice by passing the Tech exam? :-)

> Obviously, not nearly as many as you have sacrificed to spoiled
> grape juice!

Spoiled red grape juice is loaded with antioxidants. That's why
200 year old bottles of the stuff are still good.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2130. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 04:31:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C99623A.C70EB37D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38178

```
Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> And when faced with typical liberal
> thought-Nazi's, who demand absolute agreement, then I take
> the gloves off and start letting the good times roll.

"liberal Nazis"?????
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2131. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 04:31:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C916568.1BC69A9@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38177

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> So first you tell everyone that Morse code does not have enough value that
> >> people should learn it
>
> >> Ed, Ed, please repost any post I ever made with those words in it. Not
> >> *your* interpretation but that actual statement. You cannot do it for it
> >> never happened.
>
> Dick, you have said so many times that the only reason people will learn the
> code is to pass a code test. I see absolutely no need to do a google search and
> repost what I am certain people remember.
>

Then how about repeating *what I said* if you must, instead of your interpretation of what I said? It's no secret that many beginners have no idea of the benefits or sheer communications usefulness of CW until they have learned it well enough that they gain experience enough to be able to use it well.
I'm aware that there are some clubs where there is an emphasis on newcomers becoming CW literate, but there is a substantial resistance, demonstrated here, to the continuation of that emphasis. It shows up in posts where some advocated of advancement in communications arts denigrate CW in terms we know so well. You know the drill. Why don't you use some of the energy you waste on me in challenging those posters? Do *you* not believe that CW is worth defending? Sure seems like it.

2132. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 04:32:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C916628.5ADDA39E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38179

CAM wrote:

> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > Something here does NOT smell right
> > in that I don't see any actual recent DATA on this. That is, could
> > it be that ARRL did not WANT to know the real story here?
>
> How could a rank newcomer such as yourself possibly have enough knowledge
> to ask such a question?
>
> > The whole thing is very strange, isn't it?
>
> What is strange is the necessary breadth of knowledge a rank newcomer has
> developed in order to conclude that "The whole thing is very strange".

Because he had no license -he just passed his first exam- you automatically categorize him a "rank newcomer"? How do you know what he knows about the ARS, after all he has said he is fulfilling a longtime dream, to become a ham. Maybe he has kept up with the ARS, and he has stated he has read this NG for a year. That alone pretty well qualifies him as knowledgeable on many of the issues.

2133. Re: NCI/ARRL memership (was Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 04:32:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C916F7A.C259AA11@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38180

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> While I somehow doubt that Len's answer is going to be
> a resounding "Yes!" I feel compelled to point out that NCI
> has NO problems with its members being ARRL members.
> I am

And I wonder if anyone reading here besides me recalls why it was you said you joined-

"To keep an eye on those 'illegitimate children'.

2134. Re: Conditions, Covenants and Cue-Ess-Tee!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 04:32:19 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9inh7d12o9gdd@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38174

Phil Kane wrote, about the CC&R wars:

> Those of us who are on the front lines of that war are
>convinced that the "heavy artillery" of Federal pre-emption
>is the only thing that will bust the stranglehold of the know-
>nothings supporting that kind of deed restriction.

I'll be watching with interest though in my particular case there aren't any severe problems with antennas. What is happening here in this town is that lot sizes are getting smaller and smaller, even for houses in the $250,000 class, as good building sites are finally about all used up on the level land in town. This puts even very nice homes chock-a-block on top of each other, not very nice for antenna building. Yuck!

The advent of cable has nearly purged this place of antennas around here. Unfortunately, they are the mark now of the parts of town where people can't, or won't, afford antenna-free service. That is, antennas are now viewed by many as eyesores, no matter what kind of antenna you're talking about.

Ouch!

Val

2135. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 04:49:41 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9iohrcu8p41dc@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38176

Mike Coslo wrote:

>The journey is the fun part, and it sounds like your having
>fun already. What kind of antenna are you building for the
>satellites? I never thought about tracking with GOTO, but
>it's interesting.

Well, it's gonna be, as a first attempt, a very lightweight yagi, kind of an Arrow clone, only with wire. It's got to be light to sit on the scope and not drag down the slewing motors. But there seem to be a lot of ways to skin this particular cat so I'm not sure what I'll finally end up with. I'll report on progress as it occurs . . . assuming there will BE progress! This is new territory for me. Apparently there is reliable satellite tracking software available for the scope I have access to, and the speeds required do not overload the motors, IF the load is kept down. My goal is to have TV on the optical tube and combine that image with the audio signal. That might be waay cool!

Val

2136. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 04:51:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9966D1.2C5F5B39@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38181

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > What is strange is the necessary breadth of knowledge a rank newcomer has
> > developed in order to conclude that "The whole thing is very strange".
>
> Because he had no license -he just passed his first exam- you automatically
> categorize him a "rank newcomer"? How do you know what he knows about the
> ARS, after all he has said he is fulfilling a longtime dream, to become a
> ham. Maybe he has kept up with the ARS, and he has stated he has read this NG
> for a year.

Or maybe he's being "helped" in his postings by someone like you.
He simply cannot posture himself as both a newcomer and a long time
authority. To do so simply stinks to high heaven.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2137. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 05:10:04 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9ipo769ljlu8b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38182

[Larry Roll K3LT wrote, quite a number of things about post-restructuring Balkanization of amateur radio, and the fact that I am a "post-restructuring" ham.]

Well, there you go . . . I almost started down this road in 1997 (and so could have been a pre-restructuring Ham), but my wife put her foot down, "No new hobbies until you drop one! So, motorcycling has had to go on the back burner, a penalty of age, and that took four-plus years to adjust to. I'm gonna keep my Honda Helix but my 350 and 750 are gone gooses!

I'm giving up a lot for radio!

Val

P.S. I'm very glad to have made the decision to join amateur radio and intend to "give back" as much as I can here locally. I think the combination of radio and astronomy, for me, is a natural!

**

2138. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 05:15:34 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9iq2otos16s10@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38183

Mike Coslo wrote:

>Congrats, Valentine! I'm sure you'll enjoy the hobby.

Thanks! I know I will!

>This reminds me of when they launched that amateur satellite
>that school students were supposed to listen for. It was going
>to broadcast a signal that you could pick up when the satellite
>passed overhead. I set my handi-talkie for the frequency, and
>promptly forgot about it. I went to bed, and sometime in the
>middle of the night all hell breaks loose, scares the bejabbers
>out of my wife, and I got yet *another* admonition to turn that
>thing off when I'm done for the night. But we heard it!

I get in trouble when I forget to turn off the transceiver I've already got hooked up (for listening) and suddenly a whole bunch of heterodyning breaks out . . . and panics the natives over in front of the television . . . which is sometimes ME! As for the satellites, I hope to track them, listen to them, and photograph them -- at the same time. We'll see!

Val

2139. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 05:24:57 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9iqk4db691t19@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38184

W1RFI wrote:

>Now, ask yourself which is more likely -- the ARRL wanting
>to cook the books or the ARRL not being very good at writing
>surveys. :-)

Well, yes, you likely have a point! I was being unnecessarily harsh, I'm sure. In our case, we had a colleage, who was an expert in preference testing, advising us. She had us use three different "modes", each supposedly independent of the others, and what a pain in the rear they were. Then we had to travel several thousand miles, on our own dime, to adminster the things, in person, one-on-one, to assure total reliability, or at least the semblence of same. Yeowww!

Val

2140. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 05:32:42 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c9971e6_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38187

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020320170955.06011.00002166@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
> >My comments were about the survey question itself, and
> >by implication, about the whole thing, which contained only
> >this ONE question about a burning issue of the day. An
> >odd sort of survey, that was!
>
> Now, ask yourself which is more likely -- the ARRL wanting to cook the
books or
> the ARRL not being very good at writing surveys. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Er, Ed ... I hate to bring this up, and it is possible that
another survey is being discussed, but, if this is the
"Should we keep the Morse test?" survey of a few years
ago, as I recall, that survey was supposedly designed
by a professionall polling company ... am I recalling
correctly? Or was a different survey being discussed?
(I didn't see the preceeding parts of the thread ...)

Carl - wa6vse

2141. Re: Death to Ham Radio at the hands of it's own operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 05:33:40 UTC
From: Steve Lewis N8TFD <n8tfd@one.net>
Message-ID: <3C9970B4.AB513BD7@one.net>
Source record: 38186
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.amateur,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Certainly.

Where in my comments did I advocate that he had to limit his conversation?

The problem with UseNet is that people just don't read.

I think I'll resume ignoring UseNet ham radio groups and return to paying
attention to ham radio itself!

JJ wrote:
>
> >
> > What repeater was this on? How long were you talking? The rest of us might
> > be listening. I don't know you personally...but I can say that I would tire
> > of listening to even my closest amateur radio friends for a long period of time.
>
> That is why your equipment has the ability to change frequencies
> or turn it off. If you are bored with the conversation then do one
> or the other.
> No one should have to limit their conversation just to please you.

2142. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 05:38:15 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9irdjlssb1ga4@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38185

Dick Carroll wrote, in reply to a comment that this poster,
a brand new ham, is talking out of school:

>Because he had no license - he just passed his first exam - you
>automatically categorize him a "rank newcomer"? How do you
>know what he knows about the ARS, after all he has said he is
>fulfilling a longtime dream, to become a ham. Maybe he has kept
>up with the ARS, and he has stated he has read this NG
>for a year. That alone pretty well qualifies him as knowledgeable
>on many of the issues.

Mr. Carroll is right! I have in my hand the notebook I started
FOUR years ago, and it begins with a clip from QST, April '98,
entitled "The Joy of Morse." Then I have clipped an article
from CQ VHF called: "Are You a REAL Ham?" Then there's
a long article that I have marked up, from the April '98 issue
of CQ, called "Restructuring in the Amateur Service." Then
I have a bunch of downloads from the NCI site, and then a
long message from N2EY, from this newsgroup, dated
07May98 and entited, "Give Me A Good Reason to Learn
Code." And then he DOES!

I have over one hundred pages in this notebook, including
many messages from Mr. Heil, Jon Bloom, Mr. Roll, CAM,
and others. I have done some homework on this subject
and would have been a ham in 1997 or 1998 if my wife had
not laid down the law about the number of things I was doing.
I've had to basically abandon motorcycling to do radio, in
a sad testimony to the shortness of life and time.

Val

>
>
>
>

2143. ARNewsline 1283 - March 15 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 06:07:35 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020321010735.08627.00004013@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 38188

Amateur Radio Newsline Report 1283 – March 15, 2002

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1283 with a release date of Friday, March 15th, 2002 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T.

Restructuring at the FCC should not impact on Amateur Radio and a first for the Dayton Hamvention. These stories are first on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1283 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

REGULATORY ISSUES : FCC REORGANIZES LATER THIS MONTH

A reorganization of the Federal Communications Commission is set to become final later this month. This, as the agency stresses that realignment of responsibilities between various bureaus will make it more efficient and help it better respond to a changing technological marketplace. Amateur Radio Newsline's David Black, KB4KCH, takes a look at some of the changes.

--
It's an independent government agency that reports directly to Congress. It's mission is to regulate communications. One of the services it oversees is Amateur Radio, but most observers of the reorganization of the Federal Communications Commission see little impact on hobby communications.

As part of the reorganization a new Media Bureau will combine the duties of the current Cable and Mass Media bureaus. The goal of the combined bureau? To treat competitors of multiple entertainment delivery systems equally and consistently. This includes broadcasters, cable operators and satellite service providers to name only a few.

Other changes include a renamed Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau. Also, a realigned International Bureau still will handle satellite licensing but most policy issues will now be the domain of the newly created Media Bureau.

These are just a few of many changes taking place. Most appear aimed at commercial interests. For ham radio, C-B, G-M-R-S and most two-way radio users the shift will probably be transparent. In other words, for these spectrum users and most others, it looks like business as usual within a soon to be restructured FCC.

From the South-East Bureau in Birmingham Alabama, I'm David Black, KB4KCH, reporting for the Amateur Radio Newsline. Don.

--

Congress endorsed the plan late last year. The FCC then approved the overhaul in January. The changes will take effect March 25th. You can read more on the web at www.fcc.gov. (ARNewsline (tm) from published news reports)

**

RADIO LAW: FCC REFUSES TO SIDE WITH CB'ER IN LOCAL CITATION CASE

The FCC has refused to hear an appeal by an Illinois C-B operator who was convicted of Disorderly Conduct for using an 11 meter Class D Citizens Band Radio. Amateur Radio Newsline's Norm Seeley, KI7UP, has the details:

--
Gary D. White is among the first C-B operators dinged under a new authority granted by the Federal Government to states and municipal law enforcement agencies. Authority to control interference caused by operators of Class D 11 Meter C-B radio sets.

White was convicted on a state Disorderly Conduct charge of operating his C-B equipment in an unreasonably loud, offensive, harassing or threatening manner. He was not convicted of violating any FCC rules. White believed that the citation was based on interference to a neighbors telephone and television receiver. This in itself is not a violation of FCC Part 95 rules. And because of this he also believed that local authorities had no justification to sanction him. So he appealed the conviction to the FCC.

But the FCC says that the proof of guilt on the Disorderly conduct allegation is not in its preview to consider. This is because no FCC rules were violated. Also, under a law enacted by Congress in November of 2000, state and local governments are free to enact laws to enforce existing Part 95 Citizens Radio Service rules.

Bottom line. The FCC will not interfere in the case and White will have to find other avenues if he wishes to continue his appeals.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Norm Seeley, KI7UP.

--

Congress enacted the law to give state and local authorities enforcement authority over 11 meter C-B operators due to the rising tide of unnecessary and harmful interference to other people using radio devices in near-by spectrum. This includes corded and wireless telephones, television receivers, stereo Hi-Fi sets and other consumer electronic gear. Ham radio is specifically exempted from the law and any ordinance it may be used to create. (W5YI Report)

**

HAM RADIO RIGHTS: NM. AND W.VA. JOIN THE PRB-1 BANDWAGON

The ARRL Letter reports that New Mexico and West Virginia have become the 14th and 15th states to adopt pro Amateur Radio antenna bills based on the limited

federal preemption known as PRB-1. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Jeff Clark, K8JAC, reports:

We have this report:

--
In New Mexico Governor Gary Johnson signed House Bill 314 on March 5th. This, after it easily passed both houses of the legislature last month with just two opposing votes during a short session that typically only deals with appropriations bills. Called New Mexico's "Emergency Communication Preservation Act" the measure was sponsored by State Representative Mimi Stewart and Senator Ramsay Gorham. It stipulates that municipal or county ordinances regulating Amateur Radio antennas cannot obstruct or preclude amateur radio service communications. Also, that such ordinances shall reasonably accommodate amateur radio service communications.

Here in West Virginia Governor Bob Wise signed House Bill 4335 into law on March 7th. The bill provides that antenna structures may be erected at heights and dimensions sufficient to accommodate amateur radio service communications but does not include a minimum regulatory height schedule. The measure also exempts Amateur Radio antenna towers constructed prior to the effective date from subsequent zoning regulation changes.

From Charleston West Virginia, I’m Jeff Clark, K8JAC.

--

In signing the West Virginia bill into law, Governor Wise, whose late father held the call sign W-A-8-A-Y-P, also proclaimed March 7 as Amateur Radio Operators Appreciation Day across the state. (ARRL)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the Northcoast Amateur Radio Club repeater serving Cleveland Ohio.

(5 sec pause here)

**

AMERICA AT WAR: NEW TERRORISM ALERT SYSTEM

The United States has a new color-coded terrorism warning system. It was revealed on Tuesday, March 12th by Homeland Security chief Tom Ridge.

The five-level system is a response to public complaints that broad terror alerts issued by the government since the Sept. 11 attacks raised alarm without providing useful guidance. The lowest-status warning is green, followed by blue, yellow, orange and red as the perceived dangers intensify.

As the terrorism warning system was unveiled, Ridge said that the nation is on yellow alert. This means that the United States is facing a significant risk

of danger but not the highest stage.

The alert system is in force immediately for federal agencies, and Ridge is urging state and local governments to adopt it, too. It will be subject to a 45-day comment period, after which it probably will be revised. It's not known what part if any Amateur Radio will play in the new enhanced terrorism alert scheme. (Published news reports)

**

ENFORCEMENT: TAKE THAT UNCOORDINATED REPEATER OFF THE AIR

The FCC has told the operator of an uncoordinated North Carolina repeater to stop interfering with a coordinated machine, even if it means immediately taking his system off the air. This is the edict handed down to the operators of the NY4X repeater by FCC Special Counsel for Amateur Radio Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH.

--
Hollingsworth: " We also notified Richard Howell, NY4X, of Greer South Carolina and John Parker, AG4AZ, of Brevard Norrth Carolina that upon reciept of the letter, the NY4X repeater that they operate had to either shut down, obtain coordination or submit a detailed plan to the Commission to prevent interference to the KU4OL [repeater]."

"Now this interference has been going on for quite some time. We notified Parker and Howell back in November that something had to be done. Nothing was accomplished in regard to coordination and nothing was done in regard to the interference."
--

Hollingsworth letter says that Howell and Parker had more than ample time to fulfill their obligation under Section 97.205 of the Commission's rules. And late word is that the repeater has been shut down. (FCC, RAIN)

**

ENFORCEMENT: TAKE THAT BROKEN REPEATER OFF THE AIR

The NY4X repeater is not the only machine currently under FCC scrutiny. Another one is in Northern California. This one is having technical problems and is causing interference to machines on adjacent channel pairs. Again, the FCC's Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH:

--
Hollingsworth: "We notified Wendall Peterson of Walnut Creek California, operator of the K6POU repeater that more than enough time has elapsed for him to correct the technical and control problems with the repeater. His earlier response to our inquiry showed that the bandwidth was indeed so wide that it caused problems to two other repeaters. We have gotten complaints about that. And the repeater system is just not operating in accordance with good Amateur practice."
--

Hollingsworth says that his office expects the problems with the repeater to be corrected or that the machine will be taken off the air. He also gave Peterson 20 days from the date of his letter to respond. (FCC, RAIN)

**

ENFORCEMENT: THE RESPONSIBILITY OF REPEATER OWNERS

The FCC enforcement involving the NY4X and K-6POU repeaters are just the latest in a series of actions aimed at cleaning up the problems that have been plaguing the F-M community. Whether it's an uncoordinated repeater causing havoc to a coordinated machine, or a long established system in need of maintenance, the FCC's Hollingsworth says responsibility comes with repeater ownership:

--
Hollingsworth: "We want to emphasize that repeaters are voluntary. Nobody has to put one up. But if you do put one up you have a responsibility to maintain it, to get coordination if that's necessary, and to operate in accordance with good Amateur practices, especially if other repeaters are being detrimentally affected."
--

In reality, the only things the FCC is asking of those who own and operate repeaters is to be good neighbors and to adhere to the proper technical standards. In this way, the repeaters themselves can better serve their service area and the ham radio community in it. (FCC, RAIN)

**

RESCUE RADIO: KNOWING WHERE YOU ARE IN THE MID WEST

If you drive the highways and by-ways of Kentucky, you need never worry again about where you are. And if you get in a bind, rescuers will be able to find you. That is, if you are a ham radio operator equipped with a mobile APRS station. Jack Parker, W8ISH, of Amateur News Weekly, says that in his part of the world it is a mode that is truly coming of age:

--
Good news from the Kentuckey Automatic Position Reporting Society" their network of APRS digipeters is growing like well bred Kentucky Race Horses.

According to Brian Walker, KC4FIE, several new sites will be coming on line very soon. New digi's are planned for Grand Rivers, Morgantown, Owensboro, Lawrenceburg, and Dry Ridge to name a few.

The Murry State University club has added a digipeter and two stations along the Kentuckey – Tennessee border have extended APRS coverage into that state. These efforts effective extend the Mid-West network of APRS digipeters established by the Tri-State Working Group in Ohio, Indiana and Illinois.

If you need more information on the Automatic Position Reporting System just check the APRS Working Group website at www.tawg.org.

Reporting for Amateur News Weekly, this is Jack Parker, W8ISH.

--

With interest in A-P-R-S growing and ham gear that includes the mode as a standard feature, look for a defacto nationwide network to be in place by the end of the decade. (ANW)

**

HAMVENTION 2002: HAM TESTS WILL BE AT THE HARA

The Dayton Hamvention has asked that we pass along a correction to some information in its recently mailed pre-show brochure. The pamphlet incorrectly lists Meadowdale High School as the venue for Amateur Radio license exams. This is incorrect. The Hamvention says that all license exams will be held at the HARA Arena Hamvention site. (Hamvention(r))

**

HAMVENTION 2002: QCWA BANQUET

And attention QCWA members. This years annual banquet in conjunction with the Dayton Hamvention will be hosted by the South West Ohio chapter and will be held on Friday, May 17th. The venue is Alex's Continental Restaurant near Miamisburg. Starting time is 7:30 P.M. and reservations are required.

This years speaker will be General Raymond Moorman. He will be talking about the United States Air Force Museum and plans for the upcoming Centennial of Flight celebration in 2003. For more information and to make reservations please contact Ed Sonnanstine by e-mail to EdSonny@aol.com (QCWA)

**

CONVENTIONS - UTAH: UTAH HAMFEST

The 2002 Rocky Mountain Division ARRL Convention and 2002 Utah Hamfest will be held July 12th to the 14th at Ruby's Inn at Bryce, Utah. The venue is near Bryce Canyon National Park. For more information please visit www.utahhamfest.org on the world wide web. (Utah Hamfest)

**

CONFERENCES: ARRL/TAPR DIGITAL COMMUNICATIONS CONFERENCE

Technical papers are being solicited for presentation at the 21st Annual ARRL and TAPR Digital Communications Conference. The event will be held this September in Denver, Colorado. Presentations will also be publicized in the Conference Proceedings. Submission of papers is due by August 5th and in-person presentation at the conference is not required for publication. Conference registration and additional details are available on the web at www.tapr.org/dcc (TAPR, ARRL)

**

BREAK 2

Here when you need us 52 weeks a year. We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, with links to the world from our only official website at www dot a r newsline dot

o-r-g.

(5 sec pause here)

**

NAMES IN THE NEWS: HELPING HAND NET

We want to take a moment to welcome a new and very interesting net to the Amateur Radio Newsline family. It is on the AD6XK repeater here in Los Angeles California on 145.440 MHz.

What makes this net very special is that its Control Operator Simon Rosconi, K6DXN, is visually impaired. According to Dave Estrada, KD6HDX, Rosconi lost his vision at age 6. Estrada says that even without sight, Rosconi works 40 hours a week, and still finds time to volunteer his time as control operator for the nets.

But Rosconi is not the only vision impaired ham involved. Estrada tells Amateur Radio Newsline that Brian Coponiti, KG6BVO, who is also partially blind, has also volunteered. Coponiti downloads and plays back Amateur Radio Newsline to the net.

Estrada adds that this particular repeater group also has two other operators that are visually impaired. They are Gary La Duke, WB6WJW and Ivan Simer, K6TTA. (KD6HDX)

**

NAMES IN THE NEWS: EDWARD T. CLEGG, W8LOY FAMILY CELEBRATION

A few weeks ago we told you about plans by the family of the late Edward T. Clegg, W8LOY, to celebrate the life of this ham radio pioneer. The gathering is being planned by Ed’s widow Martie, her daughter Linda and Linda’s husband Rob Mc Guffie, K2HZN. Recently, RAIN producer Hap Holly, KC9RP, had a chance to speak with Rob about the upcoming event:

--
NO TEXT AVAILABLE – AUDIO ONLY
--

Hap conducted an extensive interview with Rob Mc Guffie. It really tells the whole story of Ed Clegg and his famed Clegg Labs. Part 1 is online right now at www.rainreport.com or by telephone at 847-827-7246. (RAIN)

**

RADIO REGULATIONS: AVOIDING A PHONE NUMBER CRUNCH

The nation's supply of telephone phone numbers is depleting rapidly and the government is taking steps to make sure what is left lasts longer. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Henry Feinberg, K2SSQ, has more:

--
Over the past several years, area codes have multiplied to cope with the

explosion in technology. Regions have responded by splitting up area codes among geographic areas or laying another area code over an existing one.

But in 1996 the Federal Communications Commission banned such overlays dedicated to specific kinds of technology. The Commission enacted the ban because it considered separate area codes for cellular telephones phones and pagers unfair to wireless companies and their customers. This is because everyone would have to dial 10 digits instead of seven to reach wireless customers.

But states including California, Massachusetts and Ohio had been been asking for ways to prevent existing area codes from running out of phone numbers, the agency said. The FCC says that it will now hear proposals from states on how they intend to conserve area codes on a case-by-case basis, including plans to use technology-specific area codes.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Henry Feinberg, K2SSQ, in West Orange New Jersey.

--

The FCC, which is responsible for overseeing the supply of phone numbers, says that without action the number pool will run out in less than ten years. (FCC)

**

HAM RADIO BUSINESS: A NEW HOME FOR VERTEX STANDARD/YAESU

Vertex Standard USA, better known in ham radio circles as Yaesu, is moving to a huge, beautiful new facility. The new address is Vertex Standard U-S-A, 10900 Walker Street, Cypress, California, 90630. The new main phone number is area code 714-827-7600. All e-mail addresses will remain the same but telephone extensions will change. Vertex Standard makes the move -- no joke -- on Monday, April 1st. (Vertex-Standard)

**

INTERNATIONAL-CANADA: VE7BFK IS NEW RAC ARDF COORDINATOR

Radio Amateurs of Canada has named Gordon Young, VE7BFK as it's news R-A-C National Amateur Radio Direction Finding Coordinator. Young replaces Perry Creighton, VA7PC who held that appointment for the past several years. (RAC)

**

CONTESTS: SOUTH WEST OKLAHOMA SPRINTS

The first ever South West Oklahoma Spring Sprints sponsored by the Lawton VHF Contesting Club will take place in just a few weeks. Sprints are short period contests held primarily on a specific band or using a specific mode. The South West Oklahoma Spring Sprints are band exclusive. The 2 meter sprint is on April 1st from 7 pm to 11 p.m. Central U-S time. The 70 centimeter sprint is April 13th also from 7 to 11 Central. Both are open to all Oklahoma hams living south of Interstate highway 40 and West of Interstate 35. For more

information e-mail ne0p@arrl.net (VHF Reflector)

**

DX

In DX, K8PT and K3PLV are in the Channel Islands and operating as MJ slash K8PT and MJ slash K3PLV from Jersey through the 19th of March. The emphasis is on CW and RTTY in the WARC bands during daylight and 30, 40 and 80 meters during the evenings. Q-S-L as directed on the air. (RSGB)

Also word that Laurence Howell, GM4DMA, who is now resident in Anchorage, Alaska, will be travelling to warmer climates. This, as part of his work for the youth development charity Raleigh International. Howell say that he plans to be active as V51 slash G4DMA from Namibia from the 16th of March for two weeks. Look for him on 160 through 6 meters as his work schedule allows. (RSGB)

**
THAT FINAL ITEM: A WEDDING AT HAMVENTION 2002

And finally this week, get ready for a first. The first ever wedding to be held at the Dayton Hamvention.

No, we are not kidding. For the first time in Hamvention history, wedding vows will be exchanged at the show. This as Cyndi Krieger and Mark Elliot, N8WZW, will be married Saturday, May 18th at the HARA Arena during Hamvention 2002.

Mark and Cyndi met about thirteen years ago through a mutual friend. On their first date Mark and Cyndi went out for dinner and a movie. According to Hamvention sources, they have been an "item" ever since.

Mark introduced Cyndi to amateur radio by going to a hamfest. Cyndi had no idea what a hamfest was, but it sounded interesting. It was and she was hooked! Cyndi is now studying for her license and may test for it before Hamvention weekend.

Why get married at Hamvention? Mark and Cyndi couldn't think of a better place to share their love for each other and for amateur radio than by getting married at the world's largest amateur radio trade show. The ceremony takes place at 3 PM in Forum Room 3 immediately following the Amateur Radio Newsline produced Ham Radio Town Meeting. (Hamvention (r))

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the Dayton Hamvention, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline@arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937,

Arcadia, California 91066.

Before we go, a reminder that the nominating period for the 2002 amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year is now open. No significant changes from last year. Nominees must be 18 or younger. Full rules and an application is on our website at www.arnewsline.org.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Don Wilbanks, KC5MFA saying 73, and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2002. All rights reserved.

2144. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations/problem Hams vs Good Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 11:48:11 UTC
From: RussellTodd@istoreplus.net
Message-ID: <217b8ae4.0203210348.298e21d0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 38189

Thanks for all the good advice. And by the way, the ONLY way I could end up in court in a lawsuit is if this were not true. Anyone familiar with KE4ENX knows its not only true, its just the tip of the iceburg.

73's all!

2145. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 14:48:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C99F2A2.C36FF08D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38191

Valentine Germann wrote:
> Fascinating. This means, to me, that the skids were
> greased well in advance, and far behind the scenes,
> such as seems to be happening in Europe.

There is obviously a world wide conspiracy. Keep your
telescope active looking for those black helicopters.
Or, more likely, you are simply a part of a small
minority whose heads are buried in the sands of time.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2146. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 14:51:32 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9jrqb7d2pm5c8@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38190

Bill Sohl wrote, concerning a retention of a decent code speed for the Extra class:

>Perhaps you should read the NPRM R&O. You'll find not
>one argument that sustained your viewpoint for any
>requirement based on "ancient custom" or for any other
>reason.

Fascinating. This means, to me, that the skids were greased well in advance, and far behind the scenes, such as seems to be happening in Europe. Once the future is decided a poll is taken . . . and what has already been done is announced, no matter what the results of the poll. Kinda like Zimbabwe!

Val

2147. HF after Code Testing Ends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 15:24:13 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9jtnhaflj614d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38192

Hello, all!

So, by sometime in 2004 (?) code testing here in the USA
will be at an end, for any class of license.

1) Are there any estimates of how many Technicians
will effectively upgrade, and in what time frame? That
is, passing the General test doesn't get you a radio, or
a station, or an antenna system. All of that takes money
and space, covenants or no. I wonder how many of
today's Technicians are in a position to EFFECTIVELY
get on HF when the rules change in '03 or '04 or '05,
whenever. In any event, consideration of this problem
perhaps explains the strength of the hand-wringing over
covenants in the March QST!

Val

2148. Remotely Controlled HF for New Upgrades?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 15:35:39 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9jud3cngh145@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38193

Hello, all!

No doubt this has been done since there are
very few truly new ideas under the sun. Anyway,
it seems possible to overcome some of the
problems the new upgrading Technicians are
going to have, with their move to HF, through the
use of what amounts to a community antenna.
Once code is dropped there will be a relative
flood of such people, will there not?

The local club (of which I am a new member)
has a serious HF station in a good location here
in town. Why not operate that station remotely,
using a computer? That is, through the InterNet,
amateur astronomers can get time on mountain
top telescopes and operate them from home,
making observations that are simply not possible
for them any other way.

In similiar fashion, a brand new General, with
only VHF equipment and InterNet access,
might turn on his club HF station, aim the beam,
and begin operations, using a virtual radio on
his computer that would be repeated at the
club station. Has this been done? Surely it
has been. It sounds like a natural to me, in
some ways.

Val

2149. Re: Death to Ham Radio at the hands of it's own operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 16:22:41 UTC
From: phineas@engineer.com
Message-ID: <a031bae8.0203210822.75286479@posting.google.com>
Source record: 38194
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.amateur,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I agree. There is an extreme rightwing element in HAM radio, and alot of these extremeist own repeater equipment, etc.... Also, they exist on every band. There are some of those types here in this area where I live. The best way to handle it is to get your own group of locals together, and use another repeater, or better yet there is always simplex. When people/clubs setup a repeater or repeater system, it acts as a status symbol. You know "We are cool cause we got our own repeater" type thing. I say let them keep their coolness and steer clear. If you just have to communicate on that frequency, just go Simplex on the output. That way you are not using their equipment, and you are not causing interference either.

Too many people out there who want to make contact with you to have to deal with afew snobby knuckle-heads.

As far as death to the hobby, that is in the hands of marketing. All you have to do is make it the cool thing and people will get in it again. Come out with some Tom Cruize movie about "Modern Radio" I will bet every kid will be in a Tech class.(Just like Kung Fu, Golf, computer hacking, saggy painters pants, and Tony Bennett). Who would have ever thought that it would be cool to walkaround in sagging pants? If marketing can do that, it can be done with radio also. Problem is, some of them old foggies and elitists out there dont want a lot of people in the hobby. Not enough money in it for it to make the investment to market it. So here we sit.

Phineas
KC0LSC

2150. Re: NCI/ARRL memership (was Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 17:33:31 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c9a1b98_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38195

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C916F7A.C259AA11@worldnet.att.net...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > While I somehow doubt that Len's answer is going to be
> > a resounding "Yes!" I feel compelled to point out that NCI
> > has NO problems with its members being ARRL members.
> > I am
>
> And I wonder if anyone reading here besides me recalls why it was
you said you
> joined-
>
> "To keep an eye on those 'illegitimate children'.

Dick,

That was NOT why I joined some 25 years ago ... keeping
an eye on what they were up to code-wise was a part of
why I maintained membership during many years when
their position on code was directly opposite to my position.
However, they have also always done good things ... that
I have never disupted ... my main dispute with ARRL in the
past was on the code issue and believing that they were
not proactively encouraging technical progress and advancement
in the ARS ... they seem to have improved on both counts
and I'm more pleased with ARRL now than I was for many
years of my membership.

Times change ... but that seems to be a difficult concept
for you to accept.

Carl - wa6vse

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPJoZZJe+N6+q84HiEQInlwCgtb7teHf4/BGfsKLSt1dox/DZVm0AoN8d
5Sm880sM7mbw07FDZ6XcwOSW
=2Ddg
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

2151. Re: Remotely Controlled HF for New Upgrades?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 18:29:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9A269E.96F9742@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38196

Valentine Germann wrote:
> The local club (of which I am a new member)
> has a serious HF station in a good location here
> in town. Why not operate that station remotely,
> using a computer?

This type of operation is pretty common. It usually consists
of a remote base controlled through a 70cm transceiver link.
Some type of controller interface must exist between the remote
70cm transceiver and the remote HF base station but it doesn't
have to be very sophisticated. A microcontroller is a logical
choice for the controller but I have seen it done with a few
discrete IC's.

When I lived in AZ, I could do HF QSO's through my home base
station using the 70cm transceiver in my truck. Sure beat a
75m Hamstick.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2152. Re: HF after Code Testing Ends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 18:32:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020321133230.26982.00000052@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38197

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>In any event, consideration of this problem
>perhaps explains the strength of the hand-wringing over
>covenants in the March QST!

No need to look to future hams for the reason for the hand wringing, Val. There are more than enough problems right now to cause ARRL to take action. Over the years, it has tried, without success, to get the FCC to add CC&Rs to its limited pre-emption of zoning regs. The last go around, the Commission was clear that it was not going to do so unless required by Congress. What you are seeing is the latest move to resond to that.

I believe that Phil Kane has some direct involvement in ARRL's strategy, so he can speak to this a bit more accurately.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2153. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 18:35:12 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020321133512.26982.00000053@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38198

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>> Now, ask yourself which is more likely -- the ARRL wanting to cook the
>books or
>> the ARRL not being very good at writing surveys. :-)
>
>I sure am glad to see that smiley face emoticon after that
>rhetoric!

Why, thank you, Clay. I am curious, though; do you think that ARRL was cooking the books or that they were not very good at writing surveys? I have seen you offer both theories.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2154. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 18:51:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020321135157.14579.00003175@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 38200

>Subject: Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test
>From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>Date: 03/20/02 20:43 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <a7be55$sv9$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>

>All of that will tune you in to those that are vocal and involved...to wit,
>the
>small percentage of movers and shakers...not necessarily any true
>majority. Nothing wrong with that, but it sure ain't "representative".

If there are those who desire to ignore the opportunity to participate in
their government (organization, club, association, etc etc etc) then that is
thier option.

My experience is that when things start going contrary to the general core
values of the community, more become vocal.

>>Feigned ignorance does not suit you, Bill.
>
>I have no clue what your comment is intended to convey.

Perhaps not as "feigned" as I thought, which is disappointing.

>> I asked for some sort of specific, Bill. Are you unable to produce
>even
>> one? Not ONE single elected office that cannot be recalled by popular or
>> Congressional vote?
>
>I already said there are some. Which ones, who cares?

I care. YOU said there were cases in which recall was not possible. In
order to make that statement, I would assume (yes...I KNOW what happens when
you "assume") that you had some knowledge of at least ONE example. Obviously
you don't, ergo I have to assume it was not your mouth you were speaking
from.....

>> If the President of the United States can be recalled or impeached,
>what
>> lesser office could be impervious to the whims of the electorate?
>
>The president can't be "recalled". Impeached - Yes, recalled No.
>There is a difference.

Yes, there IS a difference...Yet I have used both to point out that any
elected office is tentative upon the ONGOING consent of the electorate.

>>Just one, Bill. Please.
>
> I already said there are some. Which ones, who cares?

As I said, >I< care. YOU said there were examples. I have asked you for one. I have to assume (again) you were simply being argumentative.

>>But not by recent events, it's not.
>
>Even by recent events it is rare. One such incident does not
>make it commonplace.

I would hope that it was even more rare, but that it has happened at least twice that I can recall in the last year or so shows that the ARRL >IS< proactive in assuring that "elected" officials do what it is they were elected to do...Not simply bask in the glory of having won the election.

>> There have been several premature
>> changes in ARRL field leadership in RECENT years that were precipitated by
>> "cause", rather than by resignation for personal reasons or death of the
>office
>> holder.
>
>I'm only aware of one.

I am sure we could dig through QST and come up with the answers...Or simply write them and ask them. One, I believe was one of the New England sections, the other was down Dixie way.

>> >Situation normal.
>>
>> Apathy fits you even less than feigned ignorance, Bill.
>
>Who said I was apathetic. I merely pointed out that MOST folks
>just go with the flow. Reality...deal with it.

I AM dealing with your apathy, Bill....Also your predisposition to make assertions that you cannot validate.

>But ONCE elected, the indivdiual makes his/her own judgements
>on how to vote. Piss off enough constituents and s/he won't get reelected.

Isn't that what I have said? FAIL to represent the people to THIER satisfaction, and get "fired". Fail to do it on an important issue, and get "fired" sooner than later.

>>That obscure part that says "We, The People".
>
>That's great philosophy, but it isn't "The law". No one
>has ever been impeached for breaking "we the people" concepts.

No...he just got ran out of office BEFORE they could impeach him...

>Your point?

My "point" is that there are a great many things that occur in American law that are not spelled out word-for-word, yet we take them for granted as "givens". One of them being the concept that people elected to public office shall meet the expectations of the people who voted for them.

>Like I said, reality.

Ohhhhhhhh kay.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2155. Re: Death to Ham Radio at the hands of it's own operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 18:53:08 UTC
From: randy_NO_SPAM_PLEASE_@frs-usa.com
Message-ID: <b03b87e2.0203211053.33703295@posting.google.com>
Source record: 38101
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.amateur,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

JJ <radiojim0@hotmail.net> wrote in message >
> That is why your equipment has the ability to change frequencies
> or turn it off. If you are bored with the conversation then do one
> or the other.
> No one should have to limit their conversation just to please you.

When using SOMEONE ELSES repeater, you should use COMMON COURTESY to share the stage, so to speak and not get into confrontational conversations. If you want to utilize your soapbox, go to a simplex frequency and have at it! Repeaters are for sharing, not preaching.

Randy
KD4OWL

2156. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 18:59:38 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C9A2D99.794DF847@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 38102

Larry Roll KILT wrote:

> In article <u9darbppq9om73@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
> <vgermann@socket.net> writes:
>
> >Well, I ** did ** pass the Technician test this evening,
> >with 100 percent.
>
> Val:
>
> Congratulations on the remarkable achievement of passing a test
> that can be passed by any reasonably intelligent 2nd-grader with
> a copy of "Now You're Talking!" Now, to get your General, you've
> got to somehow beat that nasty 'ole 5 WPM Morse hazing ritual.

Might as well study for and do the extra. CW ain't that bad,
maybe you'll get into it and have daily skeds with Larry while
he's driving his bus. The test is done Farnsworth style, that
is, 13 or so wpm characters with 5wpm spacing. Idea is that
you will get faster quicker than with code sent with characters
sent at 5wpm.

2157. Re: Remotely Controlled HF for New Upgrades?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 19:02:49 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9kahfnsdeb211@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38199

CAM wrote, to my question about remote club
station operation by computer:

>This type of operation is pretty common. It usually consists
>of a remote base controlled through a 70cm transceiver link.
>Some type of controller interface must exist between the remote
>70cm transceiver and the remote HF base station but it doesn't
>have to be very sophisticated. A microcontroller is a logical
>choice for the controller but I have seen it done with a few
>discrete IC's.

I don't think this is the thing I'm asking about. The system
under consideration would use the InterNet and a computer
to put a remote operator in control of a station. That control
would extend to antenna rotation, the works, if possible.

>When I lived in AZ, I could do HF QSO's through my home
>base station using the 70cm transceiver in my truck. Sure
>beat a 75m Hamstick.

Once again, I'm looking for remote control -- by computer!

Val

2158. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 19:11:10 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C9A304E.68B45DF1@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 38103

CAM wrote:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > And when faced with typical liberal
> > thought-Nazi's, who demand absolute agreement, then I take
> > the gloves off and start letting the good times roll.
>
> "liberal Nazis"?????

Well, in this context, "nazi" is anyone who rejects any other
position as being flat out wrong and must be repressed.
I remember in Catholic grammar school one of the male nuns
berating our class because we were not starving kids in some
third world toilet. Like that was our fault somehow.....

2159. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 19:14:39 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C9A311F.553D5302@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 38104

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <wJGl8.61$aF.5185@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "Richard
> McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >Dick Nï¿½BK, from Nebraska -- World's ugliest license plates.
>
> You've obviously never seen Delaware's standard-issue plates.

I hear that Delaware doesn't have a state capital, they borrow Maryland's.

:-)

2160. Re: Remotely Controlled HF for New Upgrades?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 20:09:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020321150957.21361.00002536@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 38105

Hi, Val,

I will do a bit of top posting here.

Go to:

http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/internet.html
http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/linkremote.html

and download the articles and follow the links. If your ARRL membership is not active yet and you want some of the members-only articles, email me at w1rfi@arrl.org and I will send you the .pdfs.

That should get you started.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2161. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 20:12:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020321151256.21361.00002537@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 38106

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>"liberal Nazis"?????

When Larry types the words "politically correct," you can be sure that what
follows will be a near-random string of buzzwords. "Liberal" and "Nazi" are
both intended to evoke a response, so it is not surprising that he strung them
together.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2162. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 20:16:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020321151657.21361.00002538@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 38107

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Valentine Germann wrote:

>> Fascinating. This means, to me, that the skids were
>> greased well in advance, and far behind the scenes,
>> such as seems to be happening in Europe.

>There is obviously a world wide conspiracy. Keep your
>telescope active looking for those black helicopters.
>Or, more likely, you are simply a part of a small
>minority whose heads are buried in the sands of time.

I didn't read that into Val's post at all, Cecil. Do you believe that the FCC didn't have any vision at all about what changes they wanted to make in the Amateur Radio Service before the initiated the NOIs and NPRMs?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2163. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 21:23:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9A4F6D.64C2350E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38108

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> >> Fascinating. This means, to me, that the skids were
> >> greased well in advance, and far behind the scenes,
> >> such as seems to be happening in Europe.
>
> >There is obviously a world wide conspiracy. Keep your
> >telescope active looking for those black helicopters.
> >Or, more likely, you are simply a part of a small
> >minority whose heads are buried in the sands of time.
>
> I didn't read that into Val's post at all, Cecil. Do you believe that the FCC
> didn't have any vision at all about what changes they wanted to make in the
> Amateur Radio Service before the initiated the NOIs and NPRMs?

"skids were greased well in advance, and far behind the scenes",
sounds like a conspiracy to me, Ed. Do you think the FCC had its
collective mind made up before the NOIs and NPRMs? From the looks
of their first attempts, it seemed to me that they had given it
absolutely no thought at all.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2164. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 21:32:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C92CEDC.AA40434@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38109

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > What other possibility is there besides the ham population declining
> > > or not declining? I can't think of any.
> >
> > Uh- how about remaining static?
>
> Uhhhhhhh Dick, remaining static is not declining.

And what about *not* declining? Is that static, too?

>

>
>
> > Wrong, the same equipment *was* being used, on each of the several
> > stations.
>
> That's a falsehood, Dick. You were using a computer for PSK31 but not
> for the CW I

Noooooo, I was attempting to use one, and it didn't work.

2165. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 21:32:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C92D34C.F939FA78@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38110

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >The value of CW has nothing to do with, and they have no idea of its value,
> >that
> >only comes from learning and using it. Without the incentive of the license
> >few can
> >be expected to do it.
> > And I say again, that says nothing whatever about its value.
>
> Then why don't you say that CW Morse has value and is worth learning even if
> one is not tested for it?

When will you finally discuss what I actually say, instead of what you wish I had said? I said long ago that so few will be inclined to actually learn Morse code without a test that it will inevitably fade out as a viable communications mode.

> When you say that it has value but that no one will
> learn it unless they are required to do so by the circumstance of the test you
> are sending a very confused message.
>
> You choose the latter every time, and argue with me when I say the former. What
> conclusion do you expect people to draw from that, Dick?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

2166. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 21:32:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C92D7F2.7A6D44D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38111

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >For all 8 or 10 of those stations to wind up with the
> >same situation, no copy of the PSK but easy copy of the CW, indicated
> >something unusual was happening, probably polar phase shift.
>
> So it would have been much more informative to say that CW provides better copy
> than phase-shift keying when unusual propagation contains rapid phase shifts.
>
> That would be a bit more informative to newcomers than "Shannon was wrong."

Sure would! I'm sure glad I didn't say that!

2167. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 21:32:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C92DC07.1DE8E735@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38112

CAM wrote:

> K7JEB wrote:
> >
> > Valentine Germann, (callsign on its way!) wrote, in part:
> > > That is, from my reading and talking to other hams, it seems
> > > that very few of the "all-in-one" rigs that have ever been made
> > > can do a truly top-notch job with CW.
> >
> > I don't know who you've been talking to about "all-in-one" rigs,
> > Val, but every HF transceiver I've had a look at has been soooo
> > much better at CW operation than any of the 'legacy' rigs from
> > the 'golden age' of amateur radio.
>
> Hi Jim, methinks Val is being coached by Dick, W0EX.

Then you don't read what is before you. I have stated numerous times that virtually every HF rig built incorporated CW mode and that advances in technology are beneficial to CW just as to other modes. I have no interest in coaching, but if you want to annoy yourself with the thought, feel free.

> Methinks it
> is time to fire the coach. :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2168. Re: Conditions, Covenants and Cue-Ess-Tee!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 21:32:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C92DD92.1E21AA9@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38113

Valentine Germann wrote:

> CAM wrote
>
> >How many actual CW QSO's have you had, Val? Why should
> >anyone listen to what you have to say about CW since you've
> >never used the mode? You cannot have it both ways. You cannot
> >be a brand new ham and also be an expert on CW QSO's or
> >QSO's of any kind for that matter.
>
> Well, maybe not. But I know about neighbors and how they
> react when somebody starts doing strange things in high-
> end subdivisions! And I've been hanging around my near
> neighbor for several years, off and on, and watching and
> listening while he commuicates with folks all over the place,
> with equipment that can hardly be seen from the road. I
> don't know, I just thought it was relevant. But then, for you,
> maybe you'd just rather lash out . . . since my argument
> makes a little sense. But that couldn't be true, could it?

Yep, that's his usual game. Don't like the message, discredit the
messenger.

2169. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 22:18:53 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9km139623qd81@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38114

Robert Casey wrote:

>Might as well study for and do the extra. CW ain't that bad,
>maybe you'll get into it and have daily skeds with Larry while
>he's driving his bus. The test is done Farnsworth style, that
>is, 13 or so wpm characters with 5wpm spacing. Idea is that
>you will get faster quicker than with code sent with characters
>sent at 5wpm.

That's what my neighbor wants me to do, and since he's
willing to put me through my paces, well, that's what I'm going
to do -- I hope!

Val

2170. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 22:23:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9A5D60.44162D46@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38117

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > What other possibility is there besides the ham population declining
> > > > or not declining? I can't think of any.
> > >
> > > Uh- how about remaining static?
> >
> > Uhhhhhhh Dick, remaining static is not declining.
>
> And what about *not* declining? Is that static, too?

The population could be exploding and it wouldn't be declining
or static. If it increased by only one person, it wouldn't be
static. It would be an extremely low probability event if the
amateur radio population ever remained static (unchanging).

> > That's a falsehood, Dick. You were using a computer for PSK31 but not
> > for the CW I
>
> Noooooo, I was attempting to use one, and it didn't work.

You were attempting to use a computer, apparently rather poorly,
in order to copy PSK31. You were NOT attempting to use a computer
to copy the Morse code. You were NOT using the same hardware
or software - apples and oranges.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2171. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 22:24:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020321172408.21361.00002544@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 38116

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>W5YI, the leader of that other great Hamdom enterprise,
>claims it was He who led the council of volunteer examiners
>in an 11th hour appeal, and used their powers of persuasion
>to tilt the FCC to drop code testing. He said the waiver
>problem had a big effect. Does the poster dispute his
>claims?

I am not sure what claims you want me to dispute. Fred's statements to the FCC are hanging out there for all to see. I agree that the waiver problem had a big effect; the FCC more than likely got quite tired of the angry complaints about abuses.

>> The code test speed to obtain an Extra is the same as that required to
>obtain a
>> Tech plus.

>Which does not make alot of sense. Aprox. half of the
>QSO's on HF are OOK CW Morse. Probably 1% of QSO's on

>VHF/UHF (the traditional tech homeland) are OOK CW Morse.

There is a code test for HF access; none for VHF+ access. That seems to track the numbers you cited.

ARRL wanted to see multiple code-speed tests; their comments to the FCC asked for 5 wpm for Tech+, 5 wpm for General and 12 wpm for Extra.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2172. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 22:25:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9A5DEB.143661FC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38118

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I said long ago that so few will be inclined to actually learn Morse code
> without a test that it will inevitably fade out as a viable communications mode.

That's what we thought you said. Now you must attempt to talk as many
newcomers out of learning Morse code as possible in order for your
prediction to be correct.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2173. Re: Conditions, Covenants and Cue-Ess-Tee!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 22:26:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020321172659.21361.00002545@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 38119

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Valentine Germann wrote:

>> Is it really true that "reliable international communi-
>> cations" require all that hardware? Well, no, it does
>> not, if you're using CW.

>How many actual CW QSO's have you had, Val? Why should anyone
>listen to what you have to say about CW since you've never
>used the mode? You cannot have it both ways. You cannot be a
>brand new ham and also be an expert on CW QSO's or QSO's of
>any kind for that matter.

Maybe he is just taking your word for it that CW is a valuable mode for amateur radio and that it works well under marginal conditions.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2174. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 22:28:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9A5E92.322F87A8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38120

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > That would be a bit more informative to newcomers than "Shannon was wrong."
>
> Sure would! I'm sure glad I didn't say that!

You implied Shannon might be wrong when you asked if it were possible that
CW fell through a crack in Shannon's Theorem. Shannon's Theorem has no
known cracks. If you could prove the theorem wrong, you would be famous.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2175. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 22:29:30 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9kmku7i7e40da@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38115

W1RFI wrote:

>I didn't read that into Val's post at all, Cecil. Do you
>believe that the FCC didn't have any vision at all about
>what changes they wanted to make in the Amateur
>Radio Service before the initiated the NOIs and NPRMs?

Yes, it seems as though the FCC, and a concensus
of others with influence, have known where they have
wanted to go for some time. Hey, it's the way the
world works, through the interaction of various groups
and, er, factions. Always has; always will, I think.

So, now, looking down the road again, do you see
coming any pressure for the elimination of the CW-only
parts of the various bands? I mean serious pressure,
the kind of pressure that has done away with the testing.

For whatever reason, no group with true influence
stood up for code testing, anywhere, here or in Europe,
apparently, which all but guaranteed its demise. Will
we see this scenario repeated with the band plans
or has the intended effect been attained?

Val

2176. Re: Conditions, Covenants and Cue-Ess-Tee!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 22:32:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9A5F98.C38AE171@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38121

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Yep, that's his usual game. Don't like the message, discredit the
> messenger.

Wow! Talk about the pot calling the kettle black. Time was when
you wouldn't listen to a nocode tech because you thought they
had nothing useful to say. Now you are defending one. Will wonders
never cease?
--
cheers,

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2177. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 22:42:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9A61C9.3F11791F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38123

Valentine Germann wrote:
> Yes, it seems as though the FCC, and a concensus
> of others with influence, have known where they have
> wanted to go for some time.

From my reading of that first restructuring publication from the FCC, they didn't have a clue. I can't remember if it was an NOI or NPRM but that first draft was absolutely pitiful. It appeared to have been written by someone without a clue and without any knowledge of ham radio.

> So, now, looking down the road again, do you see
> coming any pressure for the elimination of the CW-only
> parts of the various bands?

There are no CW-only parts of ham bands except on VHF. CW is allowed on all HF ham frequencies (except for a strange exception in Alaska). I don't expect to see the CW-anywhere-and-everywhere rule changed.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2178. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 22:47:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9A6301.57279ACC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38125

W1RFI wrote:
> I agree that the waiver problem had a
> big effect; the FCC more than likely got quite tired of the angry complaints
> about abuses.

Some of the PCTA folk wished to do away with code waivers and
their wish was granted. Moral: Be careful what you wish for.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2179. Re: HF after Code Testing Ends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 22:56:33 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9ko7t7istmp97@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38122

W1RFI wrote, about the CC&R problems:

>No need to look to future hams for the reason for the hand
>wringing, Val. There are more than enough problems right
>now to cause ARRL to take action. Over the years, it has tried,
>without success, to get the FCC to add CC&Rs to its limited
>pre-emption of zoning regs. The last go around, the Commission
>was clear that it was not going to do so unless required by
>Congress. What you are seeing is the latest move to resond
>to that. I believe that Phil Kane has some direct involvement
>in ARRL's strategy, so he can speak to this a bit more accurately.

This is a mighty tall hill that the FCC has asked the ARRL
to climb, isn't it?. In looking at the article on page 15, in the
March QST, it seems obvious from the chronology there
that something of a wall has been hit. Statements like, "the
FCC has suggested that ARRL take a major and complex
issue to Congress for a decision" . . . and . . . "exactly
how the Congress should fit such a "statutory directive" into
the end-of-session, pre-election frenzy of activity remains
unknown," are not encouraging. Also, the fact that Republican
administrations, for the last 20 years, have been getting the
Federal Government OUT of local land-use planning, does not
bode well for moving anti-covenant plans along, in my view.
Finally, how does the ARRL's 501c status influence this whole
business? That is, I didn't think 501c organizations could, by
law, lobby Congess?

What a sticky wicket, indeed.

Val

2180. FCC Straw in the Regulatory Wind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-21 23:06:47 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9kor2s6qua22d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38124

Hello, all!

From another newsgroup, the good news of
an interfering CB operator getting the kabosh.
This is NOT helping amateur radio at all, with
people concerned about residential antennas.
And Ham Radio is exempt under the authority
granted state and local entities. The knife cuts
so MANY ways!

Val

(AR Newsline, Mar 15)

RADIO LAW: FCC REFUSES TO SIDE WITH
CBER IN LOCAL CITATION CASE

The FCC has refused to hear an appeal by an Illinois C-B operator
who was onvicted of Disorderly Conduct for using an 11 meter
Class D Citizens Band Radio.

Gary D. White is among the first C-B operators dinged under a new
authority granted by the Federal Government to states and municipal
law enforcement agencies. Authority to control interference caused
by operators of Class D 11Meter C-B radio sets.

White was convicted on a state Disorderly Conduct charge of
operating his C-B equipment in an unreasonably loud, offensive,
harassing or threatening manner. He was not convicted of violating
any FCC rules. White believed that the citation was based on
interference to a neighbors telephone and television receiver. This
in itself is not a violation of FCC Part 95 rules. And because
of this he also believed that local authorities had no justification to
sanction him. So he appealed the conviction to the FCC.

But the FCC says that the proof of guilt on the Disorderly conduct
allegation is not in its purview to consider. This is because no FCC
rules were violated. Also, under a law enacted by Congress in
November of 2000, state and local governments are free to enact
laws to enforce existing Part 95 Citizens Radio Service rules.

Bottom line. The FCC will not interfere in the case and White will
have to find other avenues if he wishes to continue his appeals.

--
Congress enacted the law to give state and local authorities enforcement
authority over 11 meter C-B operators due to the rising tide of unnecessary

and harmful interference to other people using radio devices in near-by spectrum. This includes corded and wireless telephones, television receivers, stereo Hi-Fi sets and other consumer electronic gear. Ham radio is specificallyexempted from the law and any ordinance it may be used to create.
--
**

2181. Re: Remotely Controlled HF for New Upgrades?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 00:37:58 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gtcdsx7.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 38126

On Thu, 21 Mar 2002 13:02:49 -0600, Valentine Germann wrote:

>I don't think this is the thing I'm asking about. The system
>under consideration would use the InterNet and a computer
>to put a remote operator in control of a station. That control
>would extend to antenna rotation, the works, if possible.

It's being done by a friend of mine with the HF rig at a former VOA transmitter site using a "retired" USAF SSB remote-controlled base transceiver.

It's limited to CW at the present time - he's the former manager of a now-closed Marine Coast Station, and he moved the rig from that station to the present site when the station closed several years ago.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2182. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 01:09:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020321200958.21361.00002581@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 38130

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>So, now, looking down the road again, do you see
>coming any pressure for the elimination of the CW-only
>parts of the various bands? I mean serious pressure,
>the kind of pressure that has done away with the testing.

The only two bands that are CW only are 50.0-50.1 and 144.0-144.1 MHz. And, interestingly, no-code Technician's can operate there. :-)

Virtually every other amateur frequency can be used for OOK CW.

If you are asking if I think the FCC might want to prohibit CW in the bands where it is now permitted, I don't see that in the cards. If you are asking if the FCC would eliminate mode sub-bands, I don't think they will; there is nothing in it for the FCC, and they might actually benefit from keeping digital/CW and phone/image separate. Imagine the QRM complaints they would receive if mode sub-bands were eliminated altogether.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2183. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 01:13:11 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020321201311.21361.00002583@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 38131

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>In addition, they seem to want out of as much as they can
>get out of, including enforcement, apparently. Of course,
>I could be wrong in this. It simply seems this way, to me.

Actually, Val, over the past 3 years, enforcement has taken a very positive turn. Riley came to ARRL HQ and told us that the FCC was back in the enforcement business for the long run. So far, that has proved to hold.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2184. Re: Remotely Controlled HF for New Upgrades?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 01:13:39 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9l08qkiejkm61@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38127

W1RFI wrote in message <20020321150957.21361.00002536@mb-cv.aol.com>...
>Hi, Val,
>
>I will do a bit of top posting here.
>
>Go to:
>
>http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/internet.html
>http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/linkremote.html
>
>and download the articles and follow the links. If your ARRL membership is
not
>active yet and you want some of the members-only articles, email me at
>w1rfi@arrl.org and I will send you the .pdfs.
>
>That should get you started.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Hello, Mr. Hare!

Thanks, this is a help!

Val

2185. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 01:15:26 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020321201526.21361.00002584@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 38132

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>>The code test speed to obtain an Extra is the same as
>>that required to obtain a Tech plus.
>
>Yes, and THIS is something that really is a bit strange.
>OK, so code is a problem for some, so the new Technician
>class is installed. And, hey, I can't really gripe. And perhaps
>any level of code is sufficient for a General license. But
>surely a case can be made for reserving a small slice of
>ancient custom for the Extra, the ne plus ultra of Hamdom?

>Surely that is not unreasonable?

ARRL thought so. When the restructuring NPRM was on the plate, they asked for a 5 wpm General and a 12 wpm Extra.

At the time, my personal views were that amateur radio should have a 20 wpm Extra that gained only the lower 25 kHz of 80, 40, 20, 15 and 10 meters. I would have gone to 5 wpm for the General.

Of course, I didn't get to make the decision. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2186. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 01:22:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020321202203.21361.00002586@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 38133

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>I had said? I said long ago that so few will be inclined to actually learn
Morse
>code without a test that it will inevitably fade out as a viable
communications
>mode.

Then you don't believe that CW has enough value that people will learn it
without a test.

What you say will, IMHO, discourage hams from learning it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2187. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 01:23:59 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9l0s5t0mbo56f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38128

CAM wrote:

>There are no CW-only parts of ham bands except on
>VHF. CW is allowed on all HF ham frequencies
>(except for a strange exception in Alaska). I don't
>expect to see the CW-anywhere-and-everywhere
>rule changed.

Well, ah, isn't it true that there are parts of various
bands where, er, ah, phone isn't supposed to be used
and, ah, CW more or less is free to roam unopposed,
except for FSK? Let's not mince words. Will NCI, and
the factions they perhaps speak for, now shift gears and
push to allow as much phone space as they can get?

Val

2188. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 01:25:32 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020321202532.21361.00002587@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 38134

From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net

>No.... they only speak for their membership. They are not obligated to the
>other 3/4 of the ham population.

Maybe. When ARRL filed its Reply Comments wrt the 70 cm RFID petition on the plate, do you believe they represented the interests of most amateurs? When they worked with HomePlug, Home Phone Networking and the VDSL standards committees to help persuade them to include spectral notches in the ham bands, do you believe they represented the interests of most amateurs?

These are just a couple of examples from my own work. I believe these actions represented nearly every ham. I think that other other 3/4 of the ham population is obligated to the 1/4 that helped pay for it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2189. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 01:26:43 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9l11cidhdpp0c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38129

W1RFI wrote:

>ARRL wanted to see multiple code-speed tests; their comments
>to the FCC asked for 5 wpm for Tech+, 5 wpm for General and
>12 wpm for Extra.

Well, that was very fair. It's a shame this wasn't adopted.

Of course, if the whole thing was going away anyway, and they
knew it . . .

Val

2190. Re: Ending Code Requirement at International Level

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 01:28:29 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020321202829.21361.00002588@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 38135

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> It shows up in posts where some advocated of
>advancement in communications arts denigrate CW in terms we know so well. You
>know
>the drill. Why don't you use some of the energy you waste on me in
>challenging
>those posters? Do *you* not believe that CW is worth defending? Sure seems
>like it.

Um, Dick... ask Carl if he has ever felt challenged by the things I have said
to him.

I am beginning to think you don't actually read every post I make! :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2191. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 02:24:41 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7e4p9ili1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38137

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9jrqb7d2pm5c8@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Bill Sohl wrote, concerning a retention of a decent code
> speed for the Extra class:
>
> >Perhaps you should read the NPRM R&O. You'll find not
> >one argument that sustained your viewpoint for any
> >requirement based on "ancient custom" or for any other
> >reason.
>
> Fascinating. This means, to me, that the skids were
> greased well in advance, and far behind the scenes,
> such as seems to be happening in Europe.

The skids needed no grease. The procode test advocates
had full recourse to comment and provide every "pro-code
test" argument they could. Each and every such argument
failed...and they were all reported in the R&O.

As for Europe...what's happening there?

> Once the
> future is decided a poll is taken . . . and what has
> already been done is announced, no matter what the
> results of the poll. Kinda like Zimbabwe!

Why can't people just make clear statements instead of
expecteng everyone to be knowledgeable about
everything going on in the world?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2192. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 02:26:33 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <tDwm8.4742$Jc5.395448@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38136

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C9A311F.553D5302@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> > In article <wJGl8.61$aF.5185@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard
> > McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
> >
> > >Dick N�BK, from Nebraska -- World's ugliest license plates.
> >
> > You've obviously never seen Delaware's standard-issue plates.
>
> I hear that Delaware doesn't have a state capital, they borrow
Maryland's.
>

WTH the difference. No matter where you are you can't get to either one.

2193. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 02:29:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7e52bsed1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38138

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9kmku7i7e40da@corp.supernews.com...
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> >I didn't read that into Val's post at all, Cecil. Do you
> >believe that the FCC didn't have any vision at all about
> >what changes they wanted to make in the Amateur
> >Radio Service before the initiated the NOIs and NPRMs?
>
> Yes, it seems as though the FCC, and a concensus
> of others with influence, have known where they have
> wanted to go for some time. Hey, it's the way the
> world works, through the interaction of various groups
> and, er, factions. Always has; always will, I think.
>
> So, now, looking down the road again, do you see
> coming any pressure for the elimination of the CW-only
> parts of the various bands?

What CW only portions of the bands?
There are ONLY two CW only band segments and
they are both VHF (i.e. 50.0-50.1 and 144.0-144.1)

> I mean serious pressure,
> the kind of pressure that has done away with the testing.

Conspiracy theory again?

> For whatever reason, no group with true influence
> stood up for code testing, anywhere, here or in Europe,
> apparently, which all but guaranteed its demise.

That's because no group could "justify" the need
for continued code testing based on clear, rational
and compelling arguments.

> Will we see this scenario repeated with the band plans
> or has the intended effect been attained?

Depends on how much you believe in conspiracy
theories.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2194. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 02:34:40 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7e5c0okj1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38139

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9l0s5t0mbo56f@corp.supernews.com...
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> >There are no CW-only parts of ham bands except on
> >VHF. CW is allowed on all HF ham frequencies
> >(except for a strange exception in Alaska). I don't
> >expect to see the CW-anywhere-and-everywhere
> >rule changed.
>
> Well, ah, isn't it true that there are parts of various
> bands where, er, ah, phone isn't supposed to be used
> and, ah, CW more or less is free to roam unopposed,
> except for FSK? Let's not mince words.

Then be accurate in your statements.

> Will NCI, and
> the factions they perhaps speak for, now shift gears and
> push to allow as much phone space as they can get?

I can't speak for "the factions" and can say this for the moment
regarding NCI's positions. NCI has no current intent
to push to allow as much phone space as can be had.
If NCI board voted to do so, I'd oppose it.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

>
>
>

2195. Re: HF after Code Testing Ends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 02:47:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7e63f$7ah$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38140

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9ko7t7istmp97@corp.supernews.com...
>
> W1RFI wrote, about the CC&R problems:
>
> >No need to look to future hams for the reason for the hand
> >wringing, Val. There are more than enough problems right
> >now to cause ARRL to take action. Over the years, it has tried,
> >without success, to get the FCC to add CC&Rs to its limited
> >pre-emption of zoning regs. The last go around, the Commission
> >was clear that it was not going to do so unless required by
> >Congress. What you are seeing is the latest move to resond
> >to that. I believe that Phil Kane has some direct involvement
> >in ARRL's strategy, so he can speak to this a bit more accurately.
>
> This is a mighty tall hill that the FCC has asked the ARRL
> to climb, isn't it?. In looking at the article on page 15, in the
> March QST, it seems obvious from the chronology there
> that something of a wall has been hit. Statements like, "the
> FCC has suggested that ARRL take a major and complex
> issue to Congress for a decision" . . . and . . . "exactly
> how the Congress should fit such a "statutory directive" into
> the end-of-session, pre-election frenzy of activity remains
> unknown," are not encouraging. Also, the fact that Republican
> administrations, for the last 20 years, have been getting the
> Federal Government OUT of local land-use planning, does not
> bode well for moving anti-covenant plans along, in my view.
> Finally, how does the ARRL's 501c status influence this whole
> business? That is, I didn't think 501c organizations could, by
> law, lobby Congess?

Which is why ARRL raises funding specifically for lobbying
outside the 501c activities. That's the same as unions, etc
raising PAC money.

> What a sticky wicket, indeed.

Are you expecting miracles?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2196. Re: Remotely Controlled HF for New Upgrades?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 02:52:11 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7e6cq$e$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38141

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9jud3cngh145@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all!
>
> No doubt this has been done since there are
> very few truly new ideas under the sun. Anyway,
> it seems possible to overcome some of the
> problems the new upgrading Technicians are
> going to have, with their move to HF, through the
> use of what amounts to a community antenna.

Assuming one can erect a community antenna.

> Once code is dropped there will be a relative
> flood of such people, will there not?

I doubt that the flood will result in any great problems.

> The local club (of which I am a new member)
> has a serious HF station in a good location here
> in town. Why not operate that station remotely,
> using a computer?

It's being done already by some.

> That is, through the InterNet,

It's probably been done already too.

> amateur astronomers can get time on mountain
> top telescopes and operate them from home,
> making observations that are simply not possible
> for them any other way.
>
> In similiar fashion, a brand new General, with
> only VHF equipment and InterNet access,
> might turn on his club HF station, aim the beam,
> and begin operations, using a virtual radio on
> his computer that would be repeated at the
> club station. Has this been done? Surely it
> has been. It sounds like a natural to me, in
> some ways.

It should be.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2197. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 03:42:13 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <pKxm8.95403$q2.10263@sccrnsc01>
Source record: 38142

>
> These are just a couple of examples from my own work. I believe these
actions
> represented nearly every ham. I think that other other 3/4 of the ham
> population is obligated to the 1/4 that helped pay for it.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Hello there Ed ... Well I certainly agree with the above statement. I can't understand the logic in ARRL bashing if you are NOT a member. I have not been in agreement with every league action but I do see where positive things have been done over the years. I would equate the situation with voting ... no vote ergo no right to complain.

73 Tom KI3R

2198. IN LOVING MEMORY OF A SILENTKEY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 04:11:05 UTC
From: rsdalton1 <rsdalton1@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <t9ym8.2894$Tk.157916@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38143

TO R.Dalton kb5veo:
It will be 5 yr.s this April since we lost you.You were more than my older brother,more than my Elmer,
you were my bestfriend,and you are missed terribly.
R.Dalton kc5gjy

2199. Re: Remotely Controlled HF for New Upgrades?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 11:20:00 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020322062000.26979.00000123@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38144

>From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>Assuming one can erect a community antenna.

In the zoning cases I have been involved with, opponents of the ham antenna have suggested that the ham should put up an antenna in a local business area, where antennas would be permitted.

Unfortunately, the state of amateur practice with remote control makes it an expensive proposition with limited application.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2200. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 11:22:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020322062240.26979.00000124@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38145

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>>ARRL wanted to see multiple code-speed tests; their comments
>>to the FCC asked for 5 wpm for Tech+, 5 wpm for General and
>>12 wpm for Extra.

>Well, that was very fair. It's a shame this wasn't adopted.

ARRL was criticized in both directions for that position.

>Of course, if the whole thing was going away anyway, and they
>knew it . . .

The League put a lot more effort into defending that position that "decorum" required. It stopped short of a Petition for Reconsideration on that aspect of the rules change because it could really not offer the Commission any additional argument than it had already made.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2201. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 11:26:51 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020322062651.26979.00000125@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38146

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>Will NCI, and
>the factions they perhaps speak for, now shift gears and
>push to allow as much phone space as they can get?

They say that they will not; their sole goal is the elimination of the code tests. NCI's Executive Director is personally opposed to seeing an expansion of the phone bands and has said so publically. NCI did not lynch him.

I can't promise that no one will seek an expansion of the phone/image mode sub-bands, but I don't believe it will come from NCI.

ARRL has a Novice-band refarming proposal that it has floated to its membership seeking to divvy up the Novice bands, with some expansion of phone.

Listen on 75 meters tonight and compare the occupancyof the phone part of the band to the CW part of the band and tell me which mode is getting the short end of the stick.

As a CW op, I think that all I have a right to expect is that my access to the band is fair. If the CW bands go unused, we cannot expect the mode allocations would not be adjusted to account for that.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2202. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 11:29:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020322062959.26979.00000126@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38147

From: "garigue" garigue@attbi.com

>Hello there Ed ... Well I certainly agree with the above statement. I can't
>understand the logic in ARRL bashing if you are NOT a member. I have not
>been in agreement with every league action but I do see where positive
>things have been done over the years. I would equate the situation with
>voting ... no vote ergo no right to complain.

I am not a member of any extremist group, but I very much disapprove of and
criticize their actions.

The right to "bashing" is a very fundamental one, guaranteed to us in the US by
our constitution.

What non-members cannot expect is that their views will carry as much weight
with the ARRL Board of Directors as the views of members.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2203. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 12:06:06 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c9b21fd_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38203

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020321172408.21361.00002544@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net
>
> >W5YI, the leader of that other great Hamdom enterprise,
> >claims it was He who led the council of volunteer examiners
> >in an 11th hour appeal, and used their powers of persuasion
> >to tilt the FCC to drop code testing. He said the waiver
> >problem had a big effect. Does the poster dispute his
> >claims?
>
> I am not sure what claims you want me to dispute. Fred's statements to
the FCC
> are hanging out there for all to see. I agree that the waiver problem had
a
> big effect; the FCC more than likely got quite tired of the angry
complaints
> about abuses.
>
> >> The code test speed to obtain an Extra is the same as that required to
> >obtain a
> >> Tech plus.
>
> >Which does not make alot of sense. Aprox. half of the
> >QSO's on HF are OOK CW Morse. Probably 1% of QSO's on
>
> >VHF/UHF (the traditional tech homeland) are OOK CW Morse.
>
> There is a code test for HF access; none for VHF+ access. That seems to
track
> the numbers you cited.
>
> ARRL wanted to see multiple code-speed tests; their comments to the FCC
asked
> for 5 wpm for Tech+, 5 wpm for General and 12 wpm for Extra.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

2204. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 12:11:03 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c9b2350_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38204

> From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net
>
> Aprox. half of theQSO's on HF are OOK CW Morse.

On what planet??? Even the ARRL's surveys show that
Morse usage is in a minority.

Carl - wa6vse

2205. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 12:11:03 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c9b2724_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38205

> From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net
>
> Aprox. half of theQSO's on HF are OOK CW Morse.

On what planet??? Even the ARRL's surveys show that
Morse usage is in a minority.

Carl - wa6vse

2206. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 12:11:03 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c9b26ad_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38206

> From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net
>
> Aprox. half of theQSO's on HF are OOK CW Morse.

On what planet??? Even the ARRL's surveys show that
Morse usage is in a minority.

Carl - wa6vse

2207. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 12:11:03 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c9b2ce4_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38207

> From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net
>
> Aprox. half of theQSO's on HF are OOK CW Morse.

On what planet??? Even the ARRL's surveys show that
Morse usage is in a minority.

Carl - wa6vse

2208. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 12:11:03 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c9b33a0_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38210

> From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net
>
> Aprox. half of theQSO's on HF are OOK CW Morse.

On what planet??? Even the ARRL's surveys show that
Morse usage is in a minority.

Carl - wa6vse

2209. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 12:11:03 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c9b39f1_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38213

> From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net
>
> Aprox. half of theQSO's on HF are OOK CW Morse.

On what planet??? Even the ARRL's surveys show that
Morse usage is in a minority.

Carl - wa6vse

2210. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 12:11:03 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c9b6532_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38216

> From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net
>
> Aprox. half of theQSO's on HF are OOK CW Morse.

On what planet??? Even the ARRL's surveys show that
Morse usage is in a minority.

Carl - wa6vse

2211. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 12:15:41 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c9b2ec5_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38208

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a7e5c0okj1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> news:u9l0s5t0mbo56f@corp.supernews.com...
>
> > Will NCI, and
> > the factions they perhaps speak for, now shift gears and
> > push to allow as much phone space as they can get?
>
> I can't speak for "the factions" and can say this for the moment
> regarding NCI's positions. NCI has no current intent
> to push to allow as much phone space as can be had.
> If NCI board voted to do so, I'd oppose it.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Bill is correct in his statement of NCI policy ... in fact,
it would be correct to drop the word "current" from his
statement above.

If you search the archives (or just take my word for it),
I have also stated that I would oppose any move to
expand the phone bands ... because I don't believe
that it's necessary and I don't believe we should compromise
the future growth of narrowband digital modes.

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast.net> [personal and NCI-related mail]
<mailto:wa6vse-shack@fast.net> [sked, QSO/QSL, and usenet related
messages ONLY, please]
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPJsgYJe+N6+q84HiEQJRmACbBC0VZY1shSff8Zl8B9afjyvedtIAn3ru
0v8vVtg3hrXbm6esTvuiPtJx
=lMbE
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2212. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 12:15:41 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c9b34d3_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38211

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a7e5c0$okj$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> news:u9l0s5t0mbo56f@corp.supernews.com...
>
> > Will NCI, and
> > the factions they perhaps speak for, now shift gears and
> > push to allow as much phone space as they can get?
>
> I can't speak for "the factions" and can say this for the moment
> regarding NCI's positions. NCI has no current intent
> to push to allow as much phone space as can be had.
> If NCI board voted to do so, I'd oppose it.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Bill is correct in his statement of NCI policy ... in fact,
it would be correct to drop the word "current" from his
statement above.

If you search the archives (or just take my word for it),
I have also stated that I would oppose any move to
expand the phone bands ... because I don't believe
that it's necessary and I don't believe we should compromise
the future growth of narrowband digital modes.

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast.net> [personal and NCI-related mail]
<mailto:wa6vse-shack@fast.net> [sked, QSO/QSL, and usenet related
messages ONLY, please]
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- -----------------------------------------------------
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- -----------------------------------------------------
```

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPJsgYJe+N6+q84HiEQJRmACbBC0VZY1shSff8Zl8B9afjyvedtIAn3ru
0v8vVtg3hrXbm6esTvuiPtJx
=lMbE
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2213. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 12:15:41 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c9b3b28_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38214

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a7e5c0okj1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> news:u9l0s5t0mbo56f@corp.supernews.com...
>
> > Will NCI, and
> > the factions they perhaps speak for, now shift gears and
> > push to allow as much phone space as they can get?
>
> I can't speak for "the factions" and can say this for the moment
> regarding NCI's positions. NCI has no current intent
> to push to allow as much phone space as can be had.
> If NCI board voted to do so, I'd oppose it.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Bill is correct in his statement of NCI policy ... in fact,
it would be correct to drop the word "current" from his
statement above.

If you search the archives (or just take my word for it),
I have also stated that I would oppose any move to
expand the phone bands ... because I don't believe
that it's necessary and I don't believe we should compromise
the future growth of narrowband digital modes.

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast.net> [personal and NCI-related mail]
<mailto:wa6vse-shack@fast.net> [sked, QSO/QSL, and usenet related
messages ONLY, please]
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPJsgYJe+N6+q84HiEQJRmACbBC0VZY1shSff8Zl8B9afjyvedtIAn3ru
0v8vVtg3hrXbm6esTvuiPtJx
=lMbE
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2214. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 12:15:41 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c9b66e0_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38217

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a7e5c0$okj$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> news:u9l0s5t0mbo56f@corp.supernews.com...
>
> > Will NCI, and
> > the factions they perhaps speak for, now shift gears and
> > push to allow as much phone space as they can get?
>
> I can't speak for "the factions" and can say this for the moment
> regarding NCI's positions. NCI has no current intent
> to push to allow as much phone space as can be had.
> If NCI board voted to do so, I'd oppose it.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Bill is correct in his statement of NCI policy ... in fact,
it would be correct to drop the word "current" from his
statement above.

If you search the archives (or just take my word for it),
I have also stated that I would oppose any move to
expand the phone bands ... because I don't believe
that it's necessary and I don't believe we should compromise
the future growth of narrowband digital modes.

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast.net> [personal and NCI-related mail]
<mailto:wa6vse-shack@fast.net> [sked, QSO/QSL, and usenet related
messages ONLY, please]
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- -----------------------------------------------------
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- -----------------------------------------------------
```

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPJsgYJe+N6+q84HiEQJRmACbBC0VZY1shSff8Zl8B9afjyvedtIAn3ru
0v8vVtg3hrXbm6esTvuiPtJx
=lMbE
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2215. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 12:15:41 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c9b9905_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38219

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a7e5c0$okj$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> news:u9l0s5t0mbo56f@corp.supernews.com...
>
> > Will NCI, and
> > the factions they perhaps speak for, now shift gears and
> > push to allow as much phone space as they can get?
>
> I can't speak for "the factions" and can say this for the moment
> regarding NCI's positions. NCI has no current intent
> to push to allow as much phone space as can be had.
> If NCI board voted to do so, I'd oppose it.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Bill is correct in his statement of NCI policy ... in fact,
it would be correct to drop the word "current" from his
statement above.

If you search the archives (or just take my word for it),
I have also stated that I would oppose any move to
expand the phone bands ... because I don't believe
that it's necessary and I don't believe we should compromise
the future growth of narrowband digital modes.

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast.net> [personal and NCI-related mail]
<mailto:wa6vse-shack@fast.net> [sked, QSO/QSL, and usenet related
messages ONLY, please]
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- ------------------------------------------------------
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- ------------------------------------------------------
```

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPJsgYJe+N6+q84HiEQJRmACbBC0VZY1shSff8Zl8B9afjyvedtIAn3ru
0v8vVtg3hrXbm6esTvuiPtJx
=lMbE
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

2216. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 12:25:37 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c9b2ff4_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38209

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020321200958.21361.00002581@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
> >So, now, looking down the road again, do you see
> >coming any pressure for the elimination of the CW-only
> >parts of the various bands? I mean serious pressure,
> >the kind of pressure that has done away with the testing.
>
> The only two bands that are CW only are 50.0-50.1 and 144.0-144.1 MHz.
And,
> interestingly, no-code Technician's can operate there. :-)
>
> Virtually every other amateur frequency can be used for OOK CW.

Ed is correct ... of course :-)

As far as your question regarding "pressure" ... let's expand
the context from what, as Ed points out are VERY limited
CW-only bands to "the frequencies where CW is currently
allowed." Will NCI seek to ban or restrict CW usage? NO.
That has been categorically stated here so many times that
I'm frankly getting tired of having to repeat it ...

> If you are asking if I think the FCC might want to prohibit CW in the
bands
> where it is now permitted, I don't see that in the cards. If you are
asking if
> the FCC would eliminate mode sub-bands, I don't think they will; there is
> nothing in it for the FCC, and they might actually benefit from keeping
> digital/CW and phone/image separate. Imagine the QRM complaints they would
> receive if mode sub-bands were eliminated altogether.

While in most of the world, there are no such sub-band-by-mode
restrictions, and it doesn't seem to have caused huge problems
prompting those other administrations to enact any, I agree with
Ed that the FCC will probalbly keep some separation ...though it
may be modified a bit, as someone else (Richard?) suggested to
"narrowband in the lower part (i.e., CW and current digital)" and
"widerband" in the upper part (i.e. SSB, SSTV, digital voice, and
digital data, where the data rates are higher and the bandwidth is
wider than allowed in the lower parts ... keep in mind that digital
voice is legal now, provided that the bandwidth limitations are met,
and since "bits is bits" in a digital system, it seems not to make a
lot of sense to limit digital to "voice only").

Carl - wa6vse
in the

2217. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 12:25:37 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c9b365c_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38212

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020321200958.21361.00002581@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
> >So, now, looking down the road again, do you see
> >coming any pressure for the elimination of the CW-only
> >parts of the various bands? I mean serious pressure,
> >the kind of pressure that has done away with the testing.
>
> The only two bands that are CW only are 50.0-50.1 and 144.0-144.1 MHz.
And,
> interestingly, no-code Technician's can operate there. :-)
>
> Virtually every other amateur frequency can be used for OOK CW.

Ed is correct ... of course :-)

As far as your question regarding "pressure" ... let's expand
the context from what, as Ed points out are VERY limited
CW-only bands to "the frequencies where CW is currently
allowed." Will NCI seek to ban or restrict CW usage? NO.
That has been categorically stated here so many times that
I'm frankly getting tired of having to repeat it ...

> If you are asking if I think the FCC might want to prohibit CW in the
bands
> where it is now permitted, I don't see that in the cards. If you are
asking if
> the FCC would eliminate mode sub-bands, I don't think they will; there is
> nothing in it for the FCC, and they might actually benefit from keeping
> digital/CW and phone/image separate. Imagine the QRM complaints they would
> receive if mode sub-bands were eliminated altogether.

While in most of the world, there are no such sub-band-by-mode
restrictions, and it doesn't seem to have caused huge problems
prompting those other administrations to enact any, I agree with
Ed that the FCC will probalbly keep some separation ...though it
may be modified a bit, as someone else (Richard?) suggested to
"narrowband in the lower part (i.e., CW and current digital)" and
"widerband" in the upper part (i.e. SSB, SSTV, digital voice, and
digital data, where the data rates are higher and the bandwidth is
wider than allowed in the lower parts ... keep in mind that digital
voice is legal now, provided that the bandwidth limitations are met,
and since "bits is bits" in a digital system, it seems not to make a
lot of sense to limit digital to "voice only").

Carl - wa6vse
in the

2218. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 12:25:37 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c9b3c60_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38215

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020321200958.21361.00002581@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
> >So, now, looking down the road again, do you see
> >coming any pressure for the elimination of the CW-only
> >parts of the various bands? I mean serious pressure,
> >the kind of pressure that has done away with the testing.
>
> The only two bands that are CW only are 50.0-50.1 and 144.0-144.1 MHz.
And,
> interestingly, no-code Technician's can operate there. :-)
>
> Virtually every other amateur frequency can be used for OOK CW.

Ed is correct ... of course :-)

As far as your question regarding "pressure" ... let's expand
the context from what, as Ed points out are VERY limited
CW-only bands to "the frequencies where CW is currently
allowed." Will NCI seek to ban or restrict CW usage? NO.
That has been categorically stated here so many times that
I'm frankly getting tired of having to repeat it ...

> If you are asking if I think the FCC might want to prohibit CW in the
bands
> where it is now permitted, I don't see that in the cards. If you are
asking if
> the FCC would eliminate mode sub-bands, I don't think they will; there is
> nothing in it for the FCC, and they might actually benefit from keeping
> digital/CW and phone/image separate. Imagine the QRM complaints they would
> receive if mode sub-bands were eliminated altogether.

While in most of the world, there are no such sub-band-by-mode
restrictions, and it doesn't seem to have caused huge problems
prompting those other administrations to enact any, I agree with
Ed that the FCC will probalbly keep some separation ...though it
may be modified a bit, as someone else (Richard?) suggested to
"narrowband in the lower part (i.e., CW and current digital)" and
"widerband" in the upper part (i.e. SSB, SSTV, digital voice, and
digital data, where the data rates are higher and the bandwidth is
wider than allowed in the lower parts ... keep in mind that digital
voice is legal now, provided that the bandwidth limitations are met,
and since "bits is bits" in a digital system, it seems not to make a
lot of sense to limit digital to "voice only").

Carl - wa6vse
in the

2219. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 12:25:37 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c9b67b1_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38218

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020321200958.21361.00002581@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
> >So, now, looking down the road again, do you see
> >coming any pressure for the elimination of the CW-only
> >parts of the various bands? I mean serious pressure,
> >the kind of pressure that has done away with the testing.
>
> The only two bands that are CW only are 50.0-50.1 and 144.0-144.1 MHz.
And,
> interestingly, no-code Technician's can operate there. :-)
>
> Virtually every other amateur frequency can be used for OOK CW.

Ed is correct ... of course :-)

As far as your question regarding "pressure" ... let's expand
the context from what, as Ed points out are VERY limited
CW-only bands to "the frequencies where CW is currently
allowed." Will NCI seek to ban or restrict CW usage? NO.
That has been categorically stated here so many times that
I'm frankly getting tired of having to repeat it ...

> If you are asking if I think the FCC might want to prohibit CW in the
bands
> where it is now permitted, I don't see that in the cards. If you are
asking if
> the FCC would eliminate mode sub-bands, I don't think they will; there is
> nothing in it for the FCC, and they might actually benefit from keeping
> digital/CW and phone/image separate. Imagine the QRM complaints they would
> receive if mode sub-bands were eliminated altogether.

While in most of the world, there are no such sub-band-by-mode
restrictions, and it doesn't seem to have caused huge problems
prompting those other administrations to enact any, I agree with
Ed that the FCC will probalbly keep some separation ...though it
may be modified a bit, as someone else (Richard?) suggested to
"narrowband in the lower part (i.e., CW and current digital)" and
"widerband" in the upper part (i.e. SSB, SSTV, digital voice, and
digital data, where the data rates are higher and the bandwidth is
wider than allowed in the lower parts ... keep in mind that digital
voice is legal now, provided that the bandwidth limitations are met,
and since "bits is bits" in a digital system, it seems not to make a
lot of sense to limit digital to "voice only").

Carl - wa6vse
in the

2220. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 12:25:37 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c9b9907_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38220

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020321200958.21361.00002581@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
> >So, now, looking down the road again, do you see
> >coming any pressure for the elimination of the CW-only
> >parts of the various bands? I mean serious pressure,
> >the kind of pressure that has done away with the testing.
>
> The only two bands that are CW only are 50.0-50.1 and 144.0-144.1 MHz.
And,
> interestingly, no-code Technician's can operate there. :-)
>
> Virtually every other amateur frequency can be used for OOK CW.

Ed is correct ... of course :-)

As far as your question regarding "pressure" ... let's expand
the context from what, as Ed points out are VERY limited
CW-only bands to "the frequencies where CW is currently
allowed." Will NCI seek to ban or restrict CW usage? NO.
That has been categorically stated here so many times that
I'm frankly getting tired of having to repeat it ...

> If you are asking if I think the FCC might want to prohibit CW in the
bands
> where it is now permitted, I don't see that in the cards. If you are
asking if
> the FCC would eliminate mode sub-bands, I don't think they will; there is
> nothing in it for the FCC, and they might actually benefit from keeping
> digital/CW and phone/image separate. Imagine the QRM complaints they would
> receive if mode sub-bands were eliminated altogether.

While in most of the world, there are no such sub-band-by-mode
restrictions, and it doesn't seem to have caused huge problems
prompting those other administrations to enact any, I agree with
Ed that the FCC will probalbly keep some separation ...though it
may be modified a bit, as someone else (Richard?) suggested to
"narrowband in the lower part (i.e., CW and current digital)" and
"widerband" in the upper part (i.e. SSB, SSTV, digital voice, and
digital data, where the data rates are higher and the bandwidth is
wider than allowed in the lower parts ... keep in mind that digital
voice is legal now, provided that the bandwidth limitations are met,
and since "bits is bits" in a digital system, it seems not to make a
lot of sense to limit digital to "voice only").

Carl - wa6vse
in the

2221. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 14:29:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9B3FAD.9D795842@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38148

Valentine Germann wrote:
> Well, ah, isn't it true that there are parts of various
> bands where, er, ah, phone isn't supposed to be used
> and, ah, CW more or less is free to roam unopposed,
> except for FSK?

The bands are essentially divided between narrow band modes
and broad band modes but CW is allowed virtually everywhere.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2222. Re: IN LOVING MEMORY OF A SILENTKEY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 15:15:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020322101558.14045.00002357@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 38149

>Subject: IN LOVING MEMORY OF A SILENTKEY
>From: "rsdalton1" rsdalton1@earthlink.net
>Date: 03/21/02 23:11 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <t9ym8.2894$Tk.157916@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
>
>TO R.Dalton kb5veo:
>It will be 5 yr.s this April since we lost you.You were more than my older
>brother,more than my Elmer,
>you were my bestfriend,and you are missed terribly.
>R.Dalton kc5gjy

May he have ever resting Peace....Via con Dios

73

Steve

2223. Re: IN LOVING MEMORY OF A SILENTKEY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 16:06:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9B569C.2365F774@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38150

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> May he have ever resting Peace....Via con Dios

Please add my SK friend, W7FEZ, to that list. And I think
the expression is, "Go with God" which in Spanish is
something like, "Vaya con Dios", an imperative form of
"ir" (to go).
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2224. Re: Death to Ham Radio at the hands of it's own operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 19:38:12 UTC
From: "Phillip A Manning (KC8TAU)" <kc8tau@fuse.net>
Message-ID: <iedk9u4krgij4gq73v55mu7aesj050kju9@4ax.com>
Source record: 38201
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.amateur,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 21 Mar 2002 00:33:40 -0500, Steve Lewis N8TFD <n8tfd@one.net>
wrote:

>Certainly.

>Where in my comments did I advocate that he had to limit his conversation?

" I can say that I would tire of listening to even my closest amateur
radio friends for a long period of time."
Here is the answer to your question. It sounded to me as it seems it
did to others that if you are tired of the conversation that it should
end.

>The problem with UseNet is that people just don't read.

>I think I'll resume ignoring UseNet ham radio groups and return to paying
>attention to ham radio itself!

Here, my fellow hams, is exactly the problem I am talking about. If
you happen to have something to say that is not to there likening they
just ignore you both here, in type, and on the radio in hopes that you
will just go away.

Here is a little something I found on a web page don't ask me what
page because it was like 3am and I had one foot in the bed when I
e-mail it to my self. Someone else that has my opinion and seems like
he knows the area very well.

To the author of this I hope that you do not mind me using your words
for my point and if you do see this here please e-mail me I would love
to talk to you a little more in depth.

"Ham radio can be an exciting hobby. Being able to join different
groups that are involved in emergency communications and Red Cross
activities, and a chance to meet new people. What happened in
Cincinnati? The local Tri-State area has quite a different twist on
ham radio. First off, the 2M band is filled with mostly jammers, lids
and other clueless people. The 1.25M band is basically empty. The 70Cm
band is filled with mostly clueless "EMERGENCY SERVICE" operators that
down grade the hobby more than support it. This town has many open
repeaters on the air but a few short conversations will tell you that
they are mostly ego driven, self centered operators who only care
about sounding and looking good for whomever they are trying to
impress. I have monitored many so called EMERGENCY SERVICE nets,
including the local "SKYWARN" group only to hear fancy attitudes, over
structured management and "window dressing" like no other town or city

I have ever seen or heard. These operators, in the name of "AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE" have no regard for public service that I or others have observed but rather use their position for press exposure and ego stroking. The NWS in the local area seems to be just about as clueless with the issuance of timely watch and /or warning statements. How sad that all the time, money and equipment in the Tri-State Area is WASTED for a bunch of self serving groups who's only goal seems to be frequency spectrum domination and fame. My heart goes out to all those who live in this area and I can only hope that one day, perhaps, regular communications with regular operators can once again be monitored in the Amateur Radio Service. Until that time I guess the Cincinnati Area will remain a "RADIO WASTELAND"."

By: Charles Verrick

2225. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 19:39:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020322143958.02963.00000205@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 38202

In article <3C9A61C9.3F11791F@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> So, now, looking down the road again, do you see
>> coming any pressure for the elimination of the CW-only
>> parts of the various bands?
>
>There are no CW-only parts of ham bands except on VHF.
>CW is allowed on all HF ham frequencies (except for a
>strange exception in Alaska). I don't expect to see the
>CW-anywhere-and-everywhere rule changed.

The two CW-only ham bands are 50.0 to 50.1 MHz and
144.0 to 144.1 MHz but there are three more CW-only bands
which apply ONLY to Novice and Technician Plus classes:
3675 to 3725 KHz, 7100 to 7150 KHz, and 21.1 to 21.2 KHz.
[source: ARRL on-line "US Amateur Bands" image (copyright
2000 ARRL) dated April 15, 2000.

In addition the two VHF CW-only bands don't apply to Novices
so one can't say those two VHF sub-bands are really and
truly "CW-only" because of that Novice restriction. :-)

While no new Novice or Technician Plus license classes are
granted, those that still exist are good until their expiration.
So, it becomes a problem of definition. Since the 6 and 2 m
sub-bands are all okay for any class BUT Novices, are they
"really" CW-only? Those sub-bands are okay for Technician
Plus but not for Novice. Down in the three HF sub-bands, those
frequencies for CW-only apply just to Novice and Tech Plus...
BUT General, Advanced, and Extra can all work CW, RTTY,
and Data in them. All of the sub-bands mentioned are AND
aren't "CW-only" depending on other qualifiers. :-) :-) :-)

Okay, now which is what? :-)

2226. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 22:08:15 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020322170815.27054.00000226@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38221

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>... keep in mind that digital
>voice is legal now, provided that the bandwidth limitations are met,
>and since "bits is bits" in a digital system, it seems not to make a
>lot of sense to limit digital to "voice only").

A point I have made to my ARRL Director.

Unfortunately, I waited until the last possible minute to give Tom my member input that I felt htat the Novice refarming open that spectrum to all modes, with any bandwidth up to 50 kHz, just to see how sub-band with no mode restrictions would work in the US.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2227. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 22:10:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020322171027.27054.00000230@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38222

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>> Aprox. half of theQSO's on HF are OOK CW Morse.

>On what planet??? Even the ARRL's surveys show that
>Morse usage is in a minority.

Yeah, but a very vocal minority. I bet that if you count QSOs tonight on 20 meters, you would find approximately the same number of CW QSOs as SSB. Do count the weak ones; the Morse guys are digging them out of the mud! :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2228. ARRL Novice Refarming Petition

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-22 22:25:44 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020322172544.27060.00000312@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38223

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2002/03/22/4/?nc=1

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2229. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 00:39:34 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <a9Qm8.93546$af7.54268@rwcrnsc53>
Source record: 38224

> I am not a member of any extremist group, but I very much disapprove of
and
> criticize their actions.
>
> The right to "bashing" is a very fundamental one, guaranteed to us in the
US by
> our constitution.
Agreed Ed .....
> What non-members cannot expect is that their views will carry as much
weight
> with the ARRL Board of Directors as the views of members.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

OK Ed ...fill me in on some history. I remember that there was a poll taken some years ago regarding the use of mail forwarding by "automatic" stations on HF. I also remember, I think, that there was a resounding negative for this. However again as I recall, there was a lot of noise made by non-members regarding getting this agenda through. Didn't the league "cave" or do I have it wrong. It seems that the poll was deferred in some manner. Correct me if I am wrong as this was a while back and I am not sure of the details. 73 Tom KI3R

2230. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 01:56:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020322205645.27626.00000562@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 38227

In article <3C9A2D99.794DF847@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>> Congratulations on the remarkable achievement of passing a test
>> that can be passed by any reasonably intelligent 2nd-grader with
>> a copy of "Now You're Talking!" Now, to get your General, you've
>> got to somehow beat that nasty 'ole 5 WPM Morse hazing ritual.
>
>Might as well study for and do the extra. CW ain't that bad,
>maybe you'll get into it and have daily skeds with Larry while
>he's driving his bus. The test is done Farnsworth style, that
>is, 13 or so wpm characters with 5wpm spacing. Idea is that
>you will get faster quicker than with code sent with characters
>sent at 5wpm.

Bob:

Sorry, but I don't have no steenkeengk HF on my bus. I'm limited
to the 800-MHz company radios (one voice, one for our CAD/AVL
system), and my dual-band HT.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2231. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 01:56:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020322205646.27626.00000563@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 38225

In article <3C9A311F.553D5302@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>> In article <wJGl8.61$aF.5185@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "Richard
>> McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>>
>> >Dick Nï¿½BK, from Nebraska -- World's ugliest license plates.
>>
>> You've obviously never seen Delaware's standard-issue plates.
>
>I hear that Delaware doesn't have a state capital, they borrow Maryland's.
>
>
>
>
>:-)

Bob:

I sure hope not! Maryland is such a Socialist State, that I wouldn't be
surprised to find a red flag with a sickle and hammer flying over the
state legislature in Annapolis! In Delaware we enjoy a much higher
level of freedom, even though Gov. Minner is doing her best to change
that! BTW, I live in Dover, which is the capital of Delaware.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2232. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 01:56:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020322205646.27626.00000564@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 38228

In article <u9km139623qd81@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>Robert Casey wrote:
>
>>Might as well study for and do the extra. CW ain't that bad,
>>maybe you'll get into it and have daily skeds with Larry while
>>he's driving his bus. The test is done Farnsworth style, that
>>is, 13 or so wpm characters with 5wpm spacing. Idea is that
>>you will get faster quicker than with code sent with characters
>>sent at 5wpm.
>
>That's what my neighbor wants me to do, and since he's
>willing to put me through my paces, well, that's what I'm going
>to do -- I hope!
>
>Val

My advice is to NEVER listen to Morse characters sent slower than
the Farnsworth 16 WPM speed. Even at 13 WPM, you can still
count "dots and dashes," and are not hearing each character as a
complete, distinctive sound. When you hear the letter "C," you should
hear and react to the sound "dadidadit" -- and not be hearing "dah dit
dah dit." You don't get the "sound" of the character until the
sending speed is at LEAST 16 WPM. 20 WPM would be better,
25 WPM would be ideal. Once you can recognize and react to all
the characters sent at those higher speeds, all you need to do is
develop the ability to write them down fast enough to "copy" at that
speed. A lot of people prefer "cursive" writing, however, I find printing
in lower-case letters is just as fast, and a lot more legible. Printing in
block-capital letters will limit your copying speed to no more than
15 WPM or so.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2233. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 01:56:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020322205647.27626.00000565@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 38226

In article <tDwm8.4742$Jc5.395448@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>
>> > In article <wJGl8.61$aF.5185@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
>"Richard
>> > McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>> >
>> > >Dick Ni¿½BK, from Nebraska -- World's ugliest license plates.
>> >
>> > You've obviously never seen Delaware's standard-issue plates.
>>
>> I hear that Delaware doesn't have a state capital, they borrow
>Maryland's.
>>
>
>WTH the difference. No matter where you are you can't get to either one.

Dick:

I wish I could figure out what you mean by that. I've heard lots of people say that Delaware is inaccessible, but it really isn't. The tricky part is finding the right exit off of I-95, or the right "back road" off of US 50/302 if coming from the West. Dover is the state capital; I live 2 miles from Legislative Hall and about an equal distance from the Governor's mansion. The capital of Maryland is Annapolis, easily accessible from US 50, about 45 miles East of Washington, DC. If you plan on a visit and need specific directions, let me know.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2234. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 02:40:13 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c9d3cdb$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38314

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020320230126.02713.00000429@mb-cu.aol.com...
> In article <3c97fe38$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
> <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> Val:
> >>
> >> Congratulations on the remarkable achievement of passing a test
> >> that can be passed by any reasonably intelligent 2nd-grader with
> >> a copy of "Now You're Talking!" Now, to get your General, you've
> >> got to somehow beat that nasty 'ole 5 WPM Morse hazing ritual.
> >> Good luck -- you're gonna need it
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >Val, meet the very dark side of amateur radio. Then promptly ignore it,
as
> >most of us do.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Val:
>
> I couldn't have said it better myself. Kim has officially been declared
> by a high-ranking FCC enforcement official as taking the ARS "One
> Step Closer To Extinction." Therefore, she is, truly, the very
> personification of amateur radio's "dark side." As she says, feel free
> to ignore her. Most of us do.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

As you can see Val, Larry's quite the follower. Never had an original idea
on his own--never achieved the things he wanted either. He's been "making
the rest of the world suffer" ever since...'cept his issues are so
unimportant to anyone but him that there's barely anyone even
listening...er, but him. heh heh

Kim W5TIT

2235. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 02:44:45 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c9d3de8_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38316

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020320230127.02713.00000430@mb-cu.aol.com...
>
> Ed:
>
> If the "social rules" you refer to are the rules of mush-minded,
> mealy-mouthed Political Correctness, then no, I don't believe they
> apply here. Of course, I don't believe they apply anywhere else,
> either. I am a person who speaks his mind,
>

You haven't had an original thought since I've begun scanning this
newsgroup, Larry. You have "everyone" else's mind but your own.

>
> doesn't pull his
> punches, and takes the heat that follows. I don't take popular
> positions merely for the sake of getting along with whatever
> majority I am facing at the time.
>

Your positions aren't popular, Larry. You aren't either.

>
> If I disagree, then I let my
> disagreement be known.
>

No, if you disagree you submit things that others have said in disagreement.
You're nothing but a mime, Larry, a mouthpiece.

>
> And when faced with typical liberal
> thought-Nazi's, who demand absolute agreement, then I take
> the gloves off and start letting the good times roll.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

And, what would you say is so *not* thought-Nazi/ish and undemanding of
absolute agreement that you find in my callsign?

Try to make your answer original. I am yawning over your whining.

Kim W5TIT

2236. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 02:46:41 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <l0Sm8.1190$se.98802@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38229

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020322205647.27626.00000565@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article <tDwm8.4742$Jc5.395448@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard
> McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >>
> >> > In article <wJGl8.61$aF.5185@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> >"Richard
> >> > McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
> >> >
> >> > >Dick N�BK, from Nebraska -- World's ugliest license plates.
> >> >
> >> > You've obviously never seen Delaware's standard-issue plates.
> >>
> >> I hear that Delaware doesn't have a state capital, they borrow
> >Maryland's.
> >>
> >>
> >WTH the difference. No matter where you are you can't get to either
one.
>
> Dick:
>
> I wish I could figure out what you mean by that. I've heard lots of
> people say that Delaware is inaccessible, but it really isn't. The
> tricky part is finding the right exit off of I-95, or the right "back
road"
> off of US 50/302 if coming from the West. Dover is the state
> capital; I live 2 miles from Legislative Hall and about an equal
> distance from the Governor's mansion. The capital of Maryland is
> Annapolis, easily accessible from US 50, about 45 miles East of
> Washington, DC. If you plan on a visit and need specific directions,
> let me know.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Try to get to Dover on an airplane, or Annapolis, when your main aim in life is taking the Insurance Commish to lunch and assuring him that albeit small, Delaware ranks uppermost in your mind and heart. It has, BTW, the only real no-fault law in the US as well as some really good places for an expense account lunch.

2237. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 03:11:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C93CABE.4986E41A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38230

CAM wrote:

> "skids were greased well in advance, and far behind the scenes",
> sounds like a conspiracy to me, Ed. Do you think the FCC had its
> collective mind made up before the NOIs and NPRMs?

When you gonna learn?? FCC itself knows next to nothing about the ARS, and relies entirely on a couple of (ostensibly) knowledgeable staffers, whose output is rubberstamped once it has been run past the legal eagles to make sure nothing too embarrassing in the way of legal ramifications is likely to ensue as a result.

> From the looks
> of their first attempts, it seemed to me that they had given it
> absolutely no thought at all.

Nothing obscure about that, either. Obviously you aren't that familiar with bureaucracies. The original write was done by the low guy on the totem, hired last week right out of college. What he knew was so little that he made most of it up. The revision was done by or at the dictation of his supervisor, who knew a little more.

2238. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 03:11:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C93CD38.A58A8E03@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38231

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >The value of CW has nothing to do with, and they have no idea of its value,
> >that
> >only comes from learning and using it. Without the incentive of the license
> >few can
> >be expected to do it.
> > And I say again, that says nothing whatever about its value.
>
> Then why don't you say that CW Morse has value and is worth learning even if
> one is not tested for it? When you say that it has value but that no one will
> learn it unless they are required to do so by the circumstance of the test you
> are sending a very confused message.

Might be confusing to you but the people who won't learn it sure understand! The
newcomers who do learn it will, too.

>
>
> You choose the latter every time, and argue with me when I say the former. What
> conclusion do you expect people to draw from that, Dick?

Not the one you do.

2239. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 03:11:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C93CD79.63C14152@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38232

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > What is strange is the necessary breadth of knowledge a rank newcomer has
> > > developed in order to conclude that "The whole thing is very strange".
> >
> > Because he had no license -he just passed his first exam- you automatically
> > categorize him a "rank newcomer"? How do you know what he knows about the
> > ARS, after all he has said he is fulfilling a longtime dream, to become a
> > ham. Maybe he has kept up with the ARS, and he has stated he has read this NG
> > for a year.
>
> Or maybe he's being "helped" in his postings by someone like you.
> He simply cannot posture himself as both a newcomer and a long time
> authority. To do so simply stinks to high heaven.

Maybe the moon is made of green cheese, too. Your ego just can't stand it that
there are a lot of hams who agree with me instead of you.

2240. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 03:11:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C93CE3D.4CB6A9CB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38234

Valentine Germann wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote, in reply to a comment that this poster,
> a brand new ham, is talking out of school:
>
> >Because he had no license - he just passed his first exam - you
> >automatically categorize him a "rank newcomer"? How do you
> >know what he knows about the ARS, after all he has said he is
> >fulfilling a longtime dream, to become a ham. Maybe he has kept
> >up with the ARS, and he has stated he has read this NG
> >for a year. That alone pretty well qualifies him as knowledgeable
> >on many of the issues.
>
> Mr. Carroll is right! I have in my hand the notebook I started
> FOUR years ago, and it begins with a clip from QST, April '98,
> entitled "The Joy of Morse." Then I have clipped an article
> from CQ VHF called: "Are You a REAL Ham?" Then there's
> a long article that I have marked up, from the April '98 issue
> of CQ, called "Restructuring in the Amateur Service." Then
> I have a bunch of downloads from the NCI site, and then a
> long message from N2EY, from this newsgroup, dated
> 07May98 and entited, "Give Me A Good Reason to Learn
> Code." And then he DOES!
>
> I have over one hundred pages in this notebook, including
> many messages from Mr. Heil, Jon Bloom, Mr. Roll, CAM,
> and others. I have done some homework on this subject
> and would have been a ham in 1997 or 1998 if my wife had
> not laid down the law about the number of things I was doing.
> I've had to basically abandon motorcycling to do radio, in
> a sad testimony to the shortness of life and time.

Val, you have to overlook CAM, he has lots of problems with
mosquitos there in South Texas, and often confuses the lil' black
things with micro-helicopters.

2241. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 03:11:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C93CEF2.CA3CD74D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38233

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > What is strange is the necessary breadth of knowledge a rank newcomer has
> > > developed in order to conclude that "The whole thing is very strange".
> >
> > Because he had no license -he just passed his first exam- you automatically
> > categorize him a "rank newcomer"? How do you know what he knows about the
> > ARS, after all he has said he is fulfilling a longtime dream, to become a
> > ham. Maybe he has kept up with the ARS, and he has stated he has read this NG
> > for a year.
>
> Or maybe he's being "helped" in his postings by someone like you.
> He simply cannot posture himself as both a newcomer and a long time
> authority. To do so simply stinks to high heaven.

We can't help it if your pet skunk like to cuddle up close, Cec. Val is not so unusual, in fact far more people in their 40's and early 50's are getting into ham radio after years of kibitzing these days than there are kids.

2242. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 03:11:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C93D5DA.4627CDA2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38235

Valentine Germann wrote:

> Bill Sohl wrote, concerning a retention of a decent code
> speed for the Extra class:
>
> >Perhaps you should read the NPRM R&O. You'll find not
> >one argument that sustained your viewpoint for any
> >requirement based on "ancient custom" or for any other
> >reason.
>
> Fascinating. This means, to me, that the skids were
> greased well in advance, and far behind the scenes

If CW was nothing more than a novelty or an "ancient custom" there would indeed be no point in anything more than novelty status, and no reason whatever for anyone to be even encouraged to learn it. Since it is a very viable, useful and efficient mode of radiocommunications, that is not the case. Seems only reasonable that anyone who ascribes to be a ham radio operator would be more than agreeable to learn the most basic of radio communications modes. To skip the basics, missing out on the mode most easily implemented, save the effort required to become a user, seems to make a very negative statement about those who advocate it being dropped.

2243. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 03:11:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C944694.15BC233F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38236

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I said long ago that so few will be inclined to actually learn Morse code
> > without a test that it will inevitably fade out as a viable communications mode.
>
> That's what we thought you said. Now you must attempt to talk as many
> newcomers out of learning Morse code as possible in order for your
> prediction to be correct.

Well, it's easy to see where you come from. You actually believe, against all evidence, that I want CW to go away. That's your line, and that of NCI. A few of you guys are masters at obfuscation.

2244. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 03:11:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C944708.1DFF7948@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38237

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > That would be a bit more informative to newcomers than "Shannon was wrong."
> >
> > Sure would! I'm sure glad I didn't say that!
>
> You implied Shannon might be wrong when you asked if it were possible that
> CW fell through a crack in Shannon's Theorem. Shannon's Theorem has no
> known cracks. If you could prove the theorem wrong, you would be famous.

What I implied is that there is more to the story that theory, and clearly there is.

2245. Re: Conditions, Covenants and Cue-Ess-Tee!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 03:11:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C944789.452F29BA@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38238

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Yep, that's his usual game. Don't like the message, discredit the
> > messenger.
>
> Wow! Talk about the pot calling the kettle black. Time was when
> you wouldn't listen to a nocode tech because you thought they
> had nothing useful to say.

On the subject of CW, that would be correct. On other subjects, it has always been on a individual basis.

> Now you are defending one.

One finally came along who understands CW!

2246. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 03:11:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C9448DA.50017F0E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38239

CAM wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:
> > I agree that the waiver problem had a
> > big effect; the FCC more than likely got quite tired of the angry complaints
> > about abuses.
>
> Some of the PCTA folk wished to do away with code waivers and
> their wish was granted. Moral: Be careful what you wish for.

Be careful what you say for you may be termed a liar. The existance of waivers was not the problem, their misuse was. Far too many MD's would write out a waiver slip on request with no justification.

2247. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 03:31:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9BF6F8.BAEAADFC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38240

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > You implied Shannon might be wrong when you asked if it were possible that
> > CW fell through a crack in Shannon's Theorem. Shannon's Theorem has no
> > known cracks. If you could prove the theorem wrong, you would be famous.
>
> What I implied is that there is more to the story than theory, and clearly there
> is.

Why not become famous by telling the world exactly what is wrong with the theory?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2248. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 03:33:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9BF78A.682ED2AB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38241

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > I said long ago that so few will be inclined to actually learn Morse code
> > > without a test that it will inevitably fade out as a viable communications mode.
> > >
> > That's what we thought you said. Now you must attempt to talk as many
> > newcomers out of learning Morse code as possible in order for your
> > prediction to be correct.
>
> Well, it's easy to see where you come from. You actually believe, against all
> evidence, that I want CW to go away.

If CW doesn't go away, you will have been proven wrong. Do you enjoy
being proved wrong or do you try not to be wrong? If you do not like
to be wrong then you will necessarily want CW to go away.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2249. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 03:34:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9BF7D9.9ECF9841@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38242

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > Then why don't you say that CW Morse has value and is worth learning even if
> > one is not tested for it? When you say that it has value but that no one will
> > learn it unless they are required to do so by the circumstance of the test you
> > are sending a very confused message.
>
> Might be confusing to you but the people who won't learn it sure understand! The
> newcomers who do learn it will, too.

Why on earth would any newcomer choose to learn Morse code after listening
to what you have to say about it?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2250. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 03:35:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9BF81B.1B65DB73@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38243

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Or maybe he's being "helped" in his postings by someone like you.
> > He simply cannot posture himself as both a newcomer and a long time
> > authority. To do so simply stinks to high heaven.
>
> Maybe the moon is made of green cheese, too. Your ego just can't stand it that
> there are a lot of hams who agree with me instead of you.

Yeah, it really gets to me that all both of you think the same way.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2251. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 03:42:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9BF993.EC821394@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38244

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Seems only reasonable that anyone who ascribes
> to be a ham radio operator would be more than agreeable to
> learn the most basic of radio communications modes.

Not after being told by you that he/she won't choose to learn
Morse code after the code requirement if dropped.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2252. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 03:46:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9BFAAF.6B6EA621@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38245

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Some of the PCTA folk wished to do away with code waivers and
> > their wish was granted. Moral: Be careful what you wish for.
>
> Be careful what you say for you may be termed a liar. The existance of waivers was
> not the problem, their misuse was.

Many of the PCTA folk believed that virtually all code waivers were suspect.
Remember the statement, "Anyone can learn Morse code."?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2253. Re: Conditions, Covenants and Cue-Ess-Tee!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 03:49:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9BFB5B.ABCF3A27@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38246

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Wow! Talk about the pot calling the kettle black. Time was when
> > you wouldn't listen to a nocode tech because you thought they
> > had nothing useful to say.
>
> On the subject of CW, that would be correct.

Val hasn't passed a Morse code exam yet.

> > Now you are defending one.
>
> One finally came along who understands CW!

You once said that someone who doesn't know Morse code cannot
possibly understand CW and therefore can have nothing valid to
say about the mode. Have you changed your mind?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2254. Monthly Pointer To Twistedhed FAQ

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 09:20:31 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0203230120.4e2d509@posting.google.com>
Source record: 38247
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

http://www.geocities.com/keyclownslappa/twistworld.jpg

http://www.geocities.com/keyclownslappa/twistworld.jpg

http://www.geocities.com/keyclownslappa/twistworld.jpg

http://www.geocities.com/keyclownslappa/twistworld.jpg

2255. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 11:21:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020323062137.21366.00003162@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 38248

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>> What I implied is that there is more to the story than theory, and clearly
>there
>> is.
>
>Why not become famous by telling the world exactly what is wrong with the
>theory?

If he can, I bet that would be an earth-shaking story in one of the IEEE
proceedings.

Dick, what would help here is an example of that "more to the story," showing
how a human is able to decode OOK CW below Shannon's limit. That is, I assume,
what you mean by "more to the story." If I am mistaken, please do explain what
that "more to the story" is.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2256. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 11:23:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020323062340.21366.00003163@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 38249

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>Seems only reasonable that anyone who ascribes
>to be a ham radio operator would be more than agreeable to
>learn the most basic of radio communications modes.

Now you're starting to come around, Dick. >To skip
>the basics, missing out on the mode most easily implemented,
>save the effort required to become a user, seems to make a
>very negative statement about those who advocate it being
>dropped.

I don't think I have ever seen a post advocating that learning and using CW be prohibited in the Amateur Radio Service.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2257. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 11:26:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020323062617.21366.00003164@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 38250

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> When you gonna learn?? FCC itself knows next to nothing about the ARS, and
>relies entirely on a couple of (ostensibly) knowledgeable staffers...

At least one of those FCC staffers is a pretty active ham. I think he is at
least as knowledgeable about ham radio as you and me. I think we can also
safely conclude that he knows more about spectrum allocation that you and me,
considering that he does it for a living.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2258. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 11:27:24 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020323062724.21366.00003166@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 38251

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>Val, you have to overlook CAM, he has lots of problems with
>mosquitos there in South Texas, and often confuses the lil' black
>things with micro-helicopters.

You mean like thinking that there is an anti-Amateur-Radio conspriracy at the
FCC? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2259. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 11:31:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020323063135.21366.00003167@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 38252

From: "garigue" garigue@attbi.com

>OK Ed ...fill me in on some history. I remember that there was a poll
>taken some years ago regarding the use of mail forwarding by "automatic"
>stations on HF. I also remember, I think, that there was a resounding
>negative for this. However again as I recall, there was a lot of noise made
>by non-members regarding getting this agenda through. Didn't the league
>"cave" or do I have it wrong. It seems that the poll was deferred in some
>manner. Correct me if I am wrong as this was a while back and I am not sure
>of the details. 73 Tom KI3R

Hi, Tom,

I really didnt' follow that one very closely. I wouldn't say that non-members have zero influence over ARRL policy, just that non-members cannot expect that they will carry as much weight with the Board as do members.

I know that there were certainly people who wanted to see automated digital operation be permitted on HF. I didn't see any indication, however, as to whether those people were ARRL members or not. I am curious, on what basis do you believe they were not ARRL members?

I think the matter was pretty well reported in QST. A search of the index should produce a few articles and news items.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2260. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 11:35:34 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020323063534.21366.00003168@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 38253

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> When you say that it has value but that no one will
>> learn it unless they are required to do so by the circumstance of the test
>>you are sending a very confused message.

>Might be confusing to you but the people who won't learn it sure understand!

My point exactly. Those who read your message will infer that something that an old time CW op tells them that most people will not learn unless they have to learn it to pass a test is not worth learning. I believe that you are wrong and that CW has enough value that people should learn and use it even if they are not tested for it.

>> You choose the latter every time, and argue with me when I say the former.
>What
>> conclusion do you expect people to draw from that, Dick?

>Not the one you do.

Okay, but what do you think that new or hams who have no knowledge of CW and its values will think of the mode after they read an experienced old timer saying that no new hams will learn CW unless it is on the test?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2261. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 11:37:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020323063727.21366.00003169@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 38254

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>You actually believe, against all
>evidence, that I want CW to go away.

I don't believe that you want CW to go away, Dick. I believe that the things you are saying, in your belief that saying them will somehow save the test, are going to talk new hams out of learning CW.

If the test is dropped, will you still tell new hams that most people will not bother learning CW because it is not tested, or will you be saying different things to try to explain the value of the mode?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2262. Re: Conditions, Covenants and Cue-Ess-Tee!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 11:39:32 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020323063932.21366.00003170@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 38255

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> One finally came along who understands CW!

In spite of your saying that CW is not worth learning unless it is tested!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2263. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 13:29:20 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7i03h$or3$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38256

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C944694.15BC233F@worldnet.att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > I said long ago that so few will be inclined to actually learn Morse
code
> > > without a test that it will inevitably fade out as a viable
communications mode.
> >
> > That's what we thought you said. Now you must attempt to talk as many
> > newcomers out of learning Morse code as possible in order for your
> > prediction to be correct.
>
> Well, it's easy to see where you come from. You actually believe, against
all
> evidence, that I want CW to go away. That's your line, and that of NCI. A
few of you
> guys are masters at obfuscation.

The reason Cecil and others believe you don't seriously
want CW to continue is because your comments here simply
do NOT convey any great dedication to the mode. It
is as if you want CW to die out so you can then say..."See,
I told you so." Your mileage may vary...but that IS
the perception YOU have created for yourself.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2264. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 13:36:22 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7i0gn$7oh$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38257

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020323063534.21366.00003168@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> When you say that it has value but that no one will
> >> learn it unless they are required to do so by the circumstance of the
test
> >>you are sending a very confused message.
>
> >Might be confusing to you but the people who won't learn it sure
understand!
>
> My point exactly. Those who read your message will infer that something
that
> an old time CW op tells them that most people will not learn unless they
have
> to learn it to pass a test is not worth learning. I believe that you are
wrong
> and that CW has enough value that people should learn and use it even if
they
> are not tested for it.

As an NCI director, let me state the following...I encourage every new
ham to look into ALL the options they have in terms of modes,
technical areas of interest, etc...that would also include morse code.
I do NOT discourage anyone from pursuiing morse or any other
aspect of ham radio.

> >> You choose the latter every time, and argue with me when I say the
former.
> >> What conclusion do you expect people to draw from that, Dick?
>
> >Not the one you do.
>
> Okay, but what do you think that new or hams who have no knowledge of CW
and
> its values will think of the mode after they read an experienced old timer
> saying that no new hams will learn CW unless it is on the test?

2265. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 13:41:13 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7i0pp$6t3$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38258

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C944708.1DFF7948@worldnet.att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > W1RFI wrote:
> > > > That would be a bit more informative to newcomers than "Shannon was
wrong."
> > >
> > > Sure would! I'm sure glad I didn't say that!
> >
> > You implied Shannon might be wrong when you asked if it were possible
that
> > CW fell through a crack in Shannon's Theorem. Shannon's Theorem has no
> > known cracks. If you could prove the theorem wrong, you would be famous.
>
> What I implied is that there is more to the story than theory,
> and clearly there is.

What you implied is that there may be some "unknown" reason
that morse might not be subject to the Shannon's Theorem limits.
What else can your "fell through the crack in Shannon's
Theorem" statement mean? Shannon's Theorem has NO
known cracks and if you can demonstrate in any way that morse
code use in any actual situation defies Shannon's Theorem, then...
as Cecil stated...you would be famous.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2266. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 13:46:07 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7i1cvsnk1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38259

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C93CEF2.CA3CD74D@worldnet.att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > What is strange is the necessary breadth of knowledge a rank
newcomer has
> > > > developed in order to conclude that "The whole thing is very
strange".
> > >
> > > Because he had no license -he just passed his first exam- you
automatically
> > > categorize him a "rank newcomer"? How do you know what he knows about
the
> > > ARS, after all he has said he is fulfilling a longtime dream, to
become a
> > > ham. Maybe he has kept up with the ARS, and he has stated he has read
this NG
> > > for a year.
> >
> > Or maybe he's being "helped" in his postings by someone like you.
> > He simply cannot posture himself as both a newcomer and a long time
> > authority. To do so simply stinks to high heaven.
>
> We can't help it if your pet skunk like to cuddle up close, Cec. Val is
not so
> unusual, in fact far more people in their 40's and early 50's are getting
into ham
> radio after years of kibitzing these days than there are kids.

That's a common thing in many hobbys. Once the kids are grown and gone,
and typically, the career path has lead many people to higher income
positions (as opposed to starting salary ranges when first employed), people
have more money to pursue hobbys that cost money. Additionally,
the empty (or emtying) nest situation usual results in more free time.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2267. Re: DARC didn't fly with Germany's administration

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 13:51:22 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7i1d0snk2@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38260

I'm amazed...posted this two days ago and not one comment
from Dick, Larry, et al;

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a7bir4$80d$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
> ---
> A G Z - P r e s s R e l e a s e
> ---
> WRC-03: "National Group" confirms NO to CW exams
> ---
> Bonn, March 18th, 2002.
>
> On March 18th 2002 the National Group preparing Germany's position
> for WRC-03 met in Bonn again at the Federal Ministry of Economics.
> AGZ e.V. and No Code International (NCI) were represented by Dr.
> Ralph P. Schorn, DC5JQ.
>
> Again the Group discussed the expected alteration of RR-article
> S25.5. Already at their September 2001 meeting, the Group's members
> decided to advise the Minister to vote against compulsory Morse
> telegraphy exams.
>
> In this context the National Group took note of an opinion poll
> that Germay's largest amateur radio club performed among their
> members. 52 percent voted in favour of keeping compulsory Morse
> exams for shortwave access. The Group, however, expressed no
> necessity to change the position defined in September 2001, as
> already then a 50:50 situation was assumed among radio amateurs
> in Germany. The National Group regards the outcome of the opinion
> poll as a confirmation of their September decision against CW
> exams.
>
> The National Group supported the position of CEPT's Conference
> Preparatory Group (CPG), that on it's Oslo meeting in February
> 2002 decided on a new text for Article S25.5 being the
> preliminary European position:
>
> > Administrations shall determine whether or not a person
> > seeking a license to operate an amateur station shall
> > prove that he is able to send and receive correctly texts
> > in Morse code signals.
>
> Only a single member of the National Group (i.e. DARC) voted against
> this position.

>
> According to this, the decision to ask for a Morse exam would be
> up to each individual administration. A frequency barrier, being at
> 30 MHz today, is not desired any more. Representatives of the
> Federal Ministry of Economics pointed out, however, that Germany
> would not continue Morse telegraphy exams after a change of S25.5
> and that Germany will not create any national regulation that
> deviates from a common European CEPT position.
> --------end of AGZ Press Release-------------
>
>
>

2268. Re: DARC didn't fly with Germany's administration

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 14:35:05 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <to0n8.8181$Tk.462344@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38261

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

> I'm amazed...posted this two days ago and not one comment
> from Dick, Larry, et al;

In other words, you were trolling?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2269. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 14:49:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9C95E4.D1C2DC3D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38262

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> > One finally came along who understands CW!
>
> In spite of your saying that CW is not worth learning unless it is tested!

Val, here's a question for you. Is Dick correct in his opinion that
you would not learn Morse code if it was not required?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2270. Re: Death to Ham Radio at the hands of it's own operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 14:49:58 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <qC0n8.1023$Fp7.75534533@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38263
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.amateur,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Phillip A Manning (KC8TAU)" <kc8tau@fuse.net> wrote in message
news:0fff9uke3qjcqqnc8oi1v8ubr8t5166af6@4ax.com...

> So you may ask, what can be done about such atrocities?

> Phil Manning
> KC8TAU
> kc8tau@fuse.net

Phil, overwhelmingly, when a ham is sitting at an HF radio, he will talk to the strangest of strangers. Whe he is sitting at a VHF radio, he wants only to talk to his closest ham friends. Extremely cliquish.

Go to meetings and meet the people. Then they may be more apt to talk to you on their repeaters (be sure to join and pay their ransom). Or go to simplex. You might have better luck there. A 160W amp in the trunk doesn't hurt.

Whatever you do, don't try to put up another %$&*@ vhf repeater. You won't get anyone to talk to you there either.

Brian/N0iMD

2271. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 15:04:41 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <dQ0n8.1026$dE7.76025119@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38264

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C89E448.4DFE1512@worldnet.att.net...

> After 51 years you, particularly, don't know the CW abbreviations. Most CW
ops of long
> tenure do. Many of them don't use many of them so as not to confuse the
newer ops. I
> think they should, as a training thing.

Yeh, just like your "banana boat swing" dribble, and not knowing which way
to lie next. So which is it?

a. Use the Banana Boat Swing to confuse the newbies?
b. Don't use abbreviations so as not to confuse newbies?

BTW, you'd enjoy a letter to the editor in the April QST, "CW, a Digital
Protocol." I can't decide if its one of their April Fools jokes or if its
serious.

Brian

2272. Re: DARC didn't fly with Germany's administration

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 15:05:46 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7i5og$213$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38265

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:to0n8.8181$Tk.462344@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
> > I'm amazed...posted this two days ago and not one comment
> > from Dick, Larry, et al;
>
> In other words, you were trolling?
> With all kind wishes,
> de Hans, K0HB

If posting a factual report and expecting some
commentary from Dick and Larry is trolling...
then so be it.

Indeed, if such is trolling, then just about everything any
of us posts can be so designated...else why do we post
if not to engage in dialog/discussion/debate or otherwise
expect responses?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2273. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 15:14:41 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <BZ0n8.1028$Bw7.75761923@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38267

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020319002214.16994.00000309@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <qhxl8.7786$Z7.1514670349@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> Bill:
> >>
> >> If DARC wants to keep code testing, I'm sure the Deutsche Bundespost
> >> will vote that way at whatever WRC gets to decide the issue. You see,
> >> unlike the U.S. FCC, the Bundespost has no problem with the
bureaucratic
> >> burden of code testing prospective radio amateurs.
> > >
> > >What? No favorite German on the bus? How bout a good "knuckle dragging
> > >lowlander" joke? You must be running out of material.
> > >
> > >And Germans (like
> >> myself) aren't a bunch of lazy whiners. They get the job done.
> > >
> > >Til the 'Mericans showed up. Whose Air Force were you in? Oh, that's
> > >right, you are a blue-helmutted "citizen of the world."
>
> Brian:
>
> They got Mexicans in Germany? They must have got their wet backs
> from swimming across the Atlantic, then. Of course, someone has
> to harvest all those cabbages and potatoes, and pick those grapes
> in the vinyards. Axeually, I think Mexicans serve a very useful
> purpose. Someone has to do the menial, back-breaking manual
> tasks of the world. I say they are perfectly welcome here in the U.S.,
> as long as they are legally emigrated, card-carrying, and learn to
> read and speak enough American English to get along. In fact, if
> they ever figured out that by using their human intelligence, initiative,
> and ingenuity -- and got a good education, learned to speak English,
> and dropped their goal of living off of the American Welfare State,
> they could be a very powerful force in this country in a generation
> or two. However, if they had what it took to get that kind of power,
> they would have their own paradise down in Mexico, and wouldn't
> need to come up here, would they?
>
> If Bush signs this Amnesty legislation for the illegal XE's, he will have
> lost my vote in '04 -- war or no war.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

???

Larrah, Aye sed Mericans, not Mexicans. So whose your favorite Mexican on the bus?

2274. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 15:20:49 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <l31n8.1029$WE7.76042332@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38268

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020321202532.21361.00002587@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net
>
> >No.... they only speak for their membership. They are not obligated to
the
> >other 3/4 of the ham population.
>
> Maybe. When ARRL filed its Reply Comments wrt the 70 cm RFID petition on
the
> plate, do you believe they represented the interests of most amateurs?
When
> they worked with HomePlug, Home Phone Networking and the VDSL standards
> committees to help persuade them to include spectral notches in the ham
bands,
> do you believe they represented the interests of most amateurs?
>
> These are just a couple of examples from my own work. I believe these
actions
> represented nearly every ham. I think that other other 3/4 of the ham
> population is obligated to the 1/4 that helped pay for it.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

When they represented me during the restructuring period, I would have
preferred they didn't.

Too many license classes, too much code. Luckily the FCC didn't want more
of the same either.

Brian

2275. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 15:24:13 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <x61n8.1030$nO7.76327202@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38269

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020323063135.21366.00003167@mb-cv.aol.com...
> Hi, Tom,
>
> I really didnt' follow that one very closely. I wouldn't say that
non-members
> have zero influence over ARRL policy, just that non-members cannot expect
that
> they will carry as much weight with the Board as do members.

Holy Guacamole, Batman! Then if I weren't a member, I would have negative
weight.

Brian

2276. Re: Conditions, Covenants and Cue-Ess-Tee!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 15:28:48 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u9p6o21cjgs765@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38266

W1RFI wrote, about Mr. Carrol's comment that I was a new Tech
who understood CW :

>In spite of your saying that CW is not worth learning unless it is tested!

Two things were working for CW with me. First, from way-back-when
CW was seen by me to be an integral part of the avocation. Secondly,
getting the chance to watch it in action, used by a neighbor, sealed the
deal. So, I'm kind of a special case.

It's spring break here at the University of Missouri and the family and I
are going on a "mini-vacation" by car over the next few days. My ARRL
code tapes are in my camera case, along with a small tape player and
a set of headphones. I've been studying the General material seriously
for several days now and so, with any luck, I can take and pass those
two elements in April. We'll see.

Val

2277. Re: Death to Ham Radio at the hands of it's own operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 15:29:25 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <pb1n8.1032$EB7.75934954@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38270
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.amateur,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:qC0n8.1023$Fp7.75534533@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Phillip A Manning (KC8TAU)" <kc8tau@fuse.net> wrote in message
> news:0fff9uke3qjcqqnc8oi1v8ubr8t5166af6@4ax.com...
>
> > So you may ask, what can be done about such atrocities?
>
> > Phil Manning
> > KC8TAU
> > kc8tau@fuse.net
>
> Phil, overwhelmingly, when a ham is sitting at an HF radio, he will talk
to
> the strangest of strangers. Whe he is sitting at a VHF radio, he wants
only
> to talk to his closest ham friends. Extremely cliquish.
>
> Go to meetings and meet the people. Then they may be more apt to talk to
> you on their repeaters (be sure to join and pay their ransom).

Err, I meant repeater costs.

Or go to
> simplex. You might have better luck there. A 160W amp in the trunk
doesn't
> hurt.
>
> Whatever you do, don't try to put up another %$&*@ vhf repeater. You
won't
> get anyone to talk to you there either.
>
> Brian/N0iMD
>
>

2278. Re: DARC didn't fly with Germany's administration

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 16:21:46 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020323112146.09775.00000627@mb-mt.news.cs.com>
Source record: 38271

>I'm amazed...posted this two days ago and not one comment
>from Dick, Larry, et al;

Well, I'll oblige you Bill.

>> In this context the National Group took note of an opinion poll
>> that Germay's largest amateur radio club performed among their
>> members. 52 percent voted in favour of keeping compulsory Morse
>> exams for shortwave access. The Group, however, expressed no
>> necessity to change the position defined in September 2001, as
>> already then a 50:50 situation was assumed among radio amateurs
>> in Germany. The National Group regards the outcome of the opinion
>> poll as a confirmation of their September decision against CW
>> exams.

Must be the "new" math? 55:48=50:50, glad our gov't. (on the whole) doesn't work like this. Sure would like to see the issue put to a vote anyway. Despite some claims that the expressed wants of the majority of the affected contsituency don't mean a hill of beans to those empowered (by said constituency, BTW) to regulate the hobby/service in question.

>A frequency barrier

<ggg>

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

2279. Re: Straight Dope on CW's Future?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 16:45:18 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <yi2n8.8410$Tk.482758@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38272

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote

> But what about the public policy aspects. Is there a band plan
> for bow and arrow?

Yes, in point of fact there is. In my state special hunting seasons
are set aside for archers, and archers are allowed to hunt in some
areas that are closed to firearms.

> Is there any FCC involvement in that sport?

Why in the world would the FCC be involved in archery?
Talk about strained analogies!

> Are there organized groups out there sharpening their knives
> to do away with ranges for bow and arrow?

Nope. Neither is anyone sharpening their knives to
do away with CW "ranges". CW is in fact the most favored
mode in ham radio, in that it allowed on virtually all of
our assigned spectrum, and I have seen NO effort to
diminish that generous allocation.

> No, sorry, your analogy is, as usual, off the point.

To the contrary, Cecil's analogy was precisely on point.

> Yes, sirree, it's all about HAVING FUN! And gee, I thought
> we boomers were the FUN generation! Little did I know that
> REAL GEEZERS were all about FUN!

But Cecil didn't say "it's all about having fun". In fact he
attached PRIMARY importance to emergency communications.
Your distortion of his position is dishonest at best!

> Turn out the lights, folks, its all over.

That's what the curmudgeons were saying 40+ years ago when
I qualified for my first license, but ham radio just keeps getting
better and better.

With all kinds wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
Grand Exhalted Liberator of the Electric Smoke

2280. People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 17:01:12 UTC
From: Jester <maverick@topgun.comSPAM>
Message-ID: <sx2n8.216922$uv5.18731391@bin6.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
Source record: 38273

Are the majority of people who want to see the code requirement lifted, are they those that have not put the time forth to learn the code?
Here is the point at least learning the code takes a sort of discipline and an effort to show you are serious or dedicated to amatuer radio, if not I am afriad it will turn into 11 meter free for all. You want to remove the code and what leave the question pool as it is ? Christ they already give yo the answers, all you need to do is memorize the answers and not know anything about radio. Imagine if they got rid of the road test when you took your drivers license, and they gave you all the answers to the written test. Think we would have safer roads?

2281. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 17:01:21 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Bx2n8.1967$Eb5.188293@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38274

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:l31n8.1029$WE7.76042332@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
>
> When they represented me during the restructuring period, I would have
> preferred they didn't.
>
> Too many license classes, too much code. Luckily the FCC didn't want
more
> of the same either.
>
> Brian

What in hell was the diff, Brian? You wouldn't have responded to either
plan and haven't.

Between screen bouts, download Morse Academy from http://ah0a.org and use
the time playing a new form of Nintendo for a month or so. Or is actually
Doing Anything beyond you?

Telephone Sanitizers of the World Unite!

Dick, NBK

2282. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 17:40:58 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020323124058.11046.00004090@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 38275

>Christ they already give yo the
>answers, all you need to do is memorize the answers and not know anything
>about radio.

Your Exactly right, but now all the "New CB Hams" will tell you that you cant memorize all those Questions.

2283. Re: DARC didn't fly with Germany's administration

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 17:47:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3C9CBFCD.1D98F7BB@adelphia.net>
Source record: 38276

Isn't that the basis of this group?

- Mike -

K0HB wrote:

> In other words, you were trolling?

2284. Re: Conditions, Covenants and Cue-Ess-Tee!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 18:47:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9CCDB6.69464EFE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38277

Valentine Germann wrote:
> I've been studying the General material seriously
> for several days now and so, with any luck, I can take and pass those
> two elements in April. We'll see.

Val, would you learn Morse code if you didn't have to?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2285. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 18:49:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9CCE34.C91853D3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38278

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >Christ they already give yo the
> >answers, all you need to do is memorize the answers and not know anything
> >about radio.
>
> Your Exactly right, but now all the "New CB Hams" will tell you that you cant
> memorize all those Questions.

They are probably right. It was much easier to memorize the material
when there was less material back in the early 1950's.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2286. OT - Plug Needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 20:58:13 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gtfttr1.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 38279

Does anyone have a source for the male cable plug that would mate
with a 7-pin miniature tube socket?

I don't think that Amphenol even makes such a critter any more.

Policy Reference - it's a good policy to use the proper plug for the
socket rather than poke wires into the holes.......

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane <k2asp @ arrl.net>

2287. 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 22:52:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9D0725.785096D5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38280

No matter how hard I try or how many hours I practice, I just can't seem to get past 15wpm hard copy. I cannot seem to buffer more than four characters so any word longer than four characters becomes a random stream of characters. If the actual words are the expected words, I can copy 20+ wpm. But if the actual words deviate from the expected words, I am lucky to copy 10wpm. For instance:

If I am copying f-u-t-u-r- and the next character is "e", I am perfectly OK. If the next character is "i", my entire copy of that word is blown. The unexpected character causes a different subroutine to be executed in my head and it takes a couple of seconds to recover. In the meantime, I have missed one or more words.

Is this an unusual problem? Are there any solutions?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2288. Re: Remotely Controlled HF for New Upgrades?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 23:23:49 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <988n8.9239$Tk.548962@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38281

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote

> Anyway, it seems possible to overcome some
> of the problems the new upgrading Technicians are
> going to have, with their move to HF, through the
> use of what amounts to a community antenna.
> Once code is dropped there will be a relative
> flood of such people, will there not?

It is my considered opinion that everyone who wants
to be on HF is already there, and that the awaited drop
of Morse testing will result in only a modest trickle of
new HF operators.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2289. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 23:31:41 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <xf8n8.5$LJ2.2968@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38282

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

> Is this an unusual problem? Are there any solutions?

It's a common problem. When training Navy radio ops it was called "word anticipation", and we solved it by training the ops with completely random "nonsense" practice tapes. The character sequences ("words") were of random length and contained no recognizable words. Hard copy thus became a completely automaton-ic connection between the eardrums and the fingertips, with no intervening conscious mental processing of any kind.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2290. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 23:40:16 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <An8n8.1142$8J4.89383123@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38283

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C9D0725.785096D5@IEEE.org...
> No matter how hard I try or how many hours I practice, I just can't
> seem to get past 15wpm hard copy. I cannot seem to buffer more than
> four characters so any word longer than four characters becomes a
> random stream of characters. If the actual words are the expected
> words, I can copy 20+ wpm. But if the actual words deviate from
> the expected words, I am lucky to copy 10wpm. For instance:
>
> If I am copying f-u-t-u-r- and the next character is "e", I am
> perfectly OK. If the next character is "i", my entire copy of
> that word is blown. The unexpected character causes a different
> subroutine to be executed in my head and it takes a couple of
> seconds to recover. In the meantime, I have missed one or more
> words.
>
> Is this an unusual problem? Are there any solutions?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Yes, speaking from years of experience, and I love CW, you just need to get on the rrap net with Dixie and Jim and let them push you a little harder. You'll only improve if you're challenged.

Brian

2291. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 23:46:51 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Lt8n8.1144$jk5.90518716@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38284

"Jester" <maverick@topgun.comSPAM> wrote in message
news:sx2n8.216922$uv5.18731391@bin6.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com...
> Are the majority of people who want to see the code requirement lifted,
are
> they those that have not put the time forth to learn the code?
> Here is the point at least learning the code takes a sort of discipline
and
> an effort to show you are serious or dedicated to amatuer radio,

Yes, Part 97 allows only serious and dedicated applicants to enter the
service. Thats why we stopped the draft.

if not I am
> afriad it will turn into 11 meter free for all.

That's why we have Riley. We don't need a code test to make people behave.
Look at WA8ULX - he passed a code test.

You want to remove the code
> and what leave the question pool as it is ? Christ they already give yo
the
> answers, all you need to do is memorize the answers and not know anything
> about radio.

If you say so. Someone drop a current test on this guy.

>Imagine if they got rid of the road test when you took your
> drivers license, and they gave you all the answers to the written test.
> Think we would have safer roads?

Jester Maverick (CB names?), we went down this path about 5 years ago. Try
somthing new.

Brian

2292. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 23:47:36 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <su8n8.2375$Eb5.238327@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38285

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C9D0725.785096D5@IEEE.org...
> No matter how hard I try or how many hours I practice, I just can't
> seem to get past 15wpm hard copy. I cannot seem to buffer more than
> four characters so any word longer than four characters becomes a
> random stream of characters. If the actual words are the expected
> words, I can copy 20+ wpm. But if the actual words deviate from
> the expected words, I am lucky to copy 10wpm. For instance:
>
> If I am copying f-u-t-u-r- and the next character is "e", I am
> perfectly OK. If the next character is "i", my entire copy of
> that word is blown. The unexpected character causes a different
> subroutine to be executed in my head and it takes a couple of
> seconds to recover. In the meantime, I have missed one or more
> words.
>
> Is this an unusual problem? Are there any solutions?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Not at all, Cecil, you are perfectly normal - for this purpose at least
:-)

Morse is a language like any other and is learned in somewhat the same
way, immersion generally if one is really going to be any good at it, but
that is hard to do anymore. So like someone learning Spanish it helps to
have some background in the structure of the language so he is not totally
faked out when Revolutionary Armed Forces of Columbia comes out as FARC
and realizes that English puts the modifiers out front and need buffering
where in Spanish you are told what is being modified first, or that German
separable verbs can leave you in buffer mode for quite a while before
telling you what is really happening geworden sein. So back up and
contemplate what is reasonable to expect.

Most decent methods of learning Morse will deliver you to about 16 wpm or
a good Journeyman level varying only in the number of bad habits you have
to unlearn. I have had people make it to this level from 'gentlemen, this
is a dit' in 32 days best and 40-45 commonly. This is why, BTW, a number
of us are not totally convinced that 5wpm is not more deadly to the mode
than no test at all. Your brain apparently is still fully engaged and
this is why you are not copying more. Being the competative soul that you
are you want to measure progress and you have spent a lifetime using the
grey cells so you are running in a mode comfortable and habitual to you
that unfortunately limits your copy.

My suggestion would be a good random character generator set to about 25 wpm. Set yourself up with a group of 5 or so letters you are going to pick out of the mess (I always started with A, W, J, 1, and AR AS prosigns followed next by N, K, C, Y, 6 and worked from there with similar-sounding characters to cure anticipation) and throw your brain a bit of a curve. You are at a point where you are going to need a whack on the head and copying 5 letter groups at 25 will get the brain disconnected in a hell of a hurry. Try Morse Academy at http://ah0a.org for a fully adjustable generator. Use it's features as you will, you are an adult but I would both use groups to bore your brain stiff and make enough of a jump to require sweaty palms.

In my case, running a kw on 20 CW overnite for Field Day blew me out of the rut. When the birds and the crickets at 5AM as I was filling the generator told me I was 5-9 in South Jersey a whole new world opened up. I passed the Extra about 10 days later and the FCC lady did not even react to being given the first 375 characters in five-letter groups; she counted 100 and moved on.

Ultimately you are going to have to do it with guys that have been at it a really long time. Immersion is ultimately the way to learn but a bit of classroom takes the tension out of it. You just need a real challenge instead of more of the same.

Dick N BK

2293. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 23:48:17 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <5v8n8.1145$Jj5.90492171@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38286

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020323124058.11046.00004090@mb-cu.aol.com...
> >Christ they already give yo the
> >answers, all you need to do is memorize the answers and not know anything
> >about radio.
>
> Your Exactly right, but now all the "New CB Hams" will tell you that you
cant
> memorize all those Questions.

I'm certain you couldn't. I'd put a $20 on it.

2294. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 23:49:17 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <1w8n8.1146$Ph5.90422295@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38287

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C9CCE34.C91853D3@IEEE.org...
> WA8ULX wrote:
> >
> > >Christ they already give yo the
> > >answers, all you need to do is memorize the answers and not know
anything
> > >about radio.
> >
> > Your Exactly right, but now all the "New CB Hams" will tell you that you
cant
> > memorize all those Questions.
>
> They are probably right. It was much easier to memorize the material
> when there was less material back in the early 1950's.

I'm certain that's how Bruse did it. I'd put a $20 on it.

2295. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 23:59:49 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7j51o$1i4$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38289

"Jester" <maverick@topgun.comSPAM> wrote in message
news:sx2n8.216922$uv5.18731391@bin6.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com...
> Are the majority of people who want to see the code requirement lifted,
are
> they those that have not put the time forth to learn the code?

The majority of those on the No Code (test) Int'l have, indeed, passed
a code test. Most, in fact, passed code tests at 13 or 20 wpm.

> Here is the point at least learning the code takes a sort of discipline
and
> an effort to show you are serious or dedicated to amatuer radio, if not I
am
> afriad it will turn into 11 meter free for all.

PLEASE.....tell us all where the rules and regulations in Part 97
make any statement that even remotely suggests any need to
"test" for someone's dedication to amateur radio or to test how
serious they are about amateur radio.

> You want to remove the code
> and what leave the question pool as it is ? Christ they already give yo
the
> answers, all you need to do is memorize the answers and not know anything
> about radio.

Same old arguments. Ineffective today as they were on
the FCC during the NPRM comment period.

> Imagine if they got rid of the road test when you took your
> drivers license,

You get a driver's license to DRIVE...the road test is 100%
related to the licensing. Passing a CW test doesn't ensure safer
or better airwaves. Never taking a CW test creates no
"danger" to anyone.

> no a
and they gave you all the answers to the written test.
> Think we would have safer roads?

The anlogy has no basis in relation to code testing.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2296. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-23 23:59:51 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <XF8n8.1147$Wr5.90728678@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38288

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C978C86.9BF63AB9@IEEE.org...
> I would like to see a new "novice"
> license, akin to a learning permit, with reasonable privileges,
> that expires on a youngster's 18th birthday.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

No kidding. The Tech exam, which was the General exam in 1986, has become the entry level exam after folding the Novice exam into it and 16 years of beefing up the content. Since it conveys no HF priveleges, why fold the Novice in to it? Who thinks this crap up?

One amateur license with all priveleges, we'll call it "Amateur," and one entry license with limited priveleges, good for a couple of years or age 18, whichever comes last. We'll call that one "limited."

2297. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 00:01:40 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7j5a6$h3t$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38290

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020323124058.11046.00004090@mb-cu.aol.com...
> >Christ they already give yo the
> >answers, all you need to do is memorize the answers and not know anything
> >about radio.
>
> Your Exactly right, but now all the "New CB Hams" will tell you that you
cant
> memorize all those Questions.

Sure they can...just as Cecil and I memorized all we
needed to memorize to pass the written General over
40 years ago. 16 pages of pretty easy to memorize
stuff...including 14 schematics.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2298. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 00:08:24 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <YN8n8.1151$Aw5.90869978@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38291

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gt8od10.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Tue, 19 Mar 2002 16:41:37 -0600, CAM wrote:
>
> >Highly technical people, on the average, are not interested
> >in efficient international communications.
>
> How do they expect their precious Internet and cell-phone systems to
> exisy without same?
>
> Can't compare Morse with either......

Phil, ever wonder why a 20meg hard drive won't even hold Windows 2000
Professional?

We're not interested in efficiency or we'd still be using DOS 3.32 with 512k
of ram.

2299. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 00:10:36 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <0Q8n8.1152$kf5.90345574@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38292

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a7981n$t6a$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote in message
> news:a793e7$11nr$1@heap.juniper.net...
> > Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote:
> > >On Tue, 19 Mar 2002 16:41:37 -0600, CAM wrote:
> > >>Highly technical people, on the average, are not interested
> > >>in efficient international communications.
> > >
> > > How do they expect their precious Internet and cell-phone systems to
> > > exisy without same?
> >
> > Not to mention wired phones. Someone being interviewed on NPR this
> > morning said that the number of overseas telephone calls made from the
> > US had increased from 200 million in 1990 to 5.2 billion last year.
>
> Probably true. Calling overseas today is just about as
> easy as calling long distance (i.e. 1+10 digit dialing)
> and the costs of a call have been driven down to
> the point that an international call isn't all that more
> expensive than domestic.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Yep, when "help desk" calls get kicked over to India and a guy named "Sam"
answers with a bit of an accent...

2300. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 00:12:34 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <RR8n8.1153$af5.90339445@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38293

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9hi4l70v4gd8e@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >Calling overseas today is just about as
> >easy as calling long distance (i.e. 1+10 digit dialing)
> >and the costs of a call have been driven down to
> >the point that an international call isn't all that more
> >expensive than domestic.
>
> So, there we go, another reason for the existence
> of Ham Radio . . . nearly eliminated.
>
> What's left, if it's "mode function" we're all worried
> about? I don't know.
>
> Val

Val, few other hobbies are as they were in 1921. Why is the amateur service
any different? Brian

2301. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 00:16:44 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7j61e$e0l$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38294

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:YN8n8.1151$Aw5.90869978@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.gt8od10.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> > On Tue, 19 Mar 2002 16:41:37 -0600, CAM wrote:
> >
> > >Highly technical people, on the average, are not interested
> > >in efficient international communications.
> >
> > How do they expect their precious Internet and cell-phone systems to
> > exisy without same?
> >
> > Can't compare Morse with either......
>
> Phil, ever wonder why a 20meg hard drive won't even hold Windows 2000
> Professional?
>
> We're not interested in efficiency or we'd still be using DOS 3.32 with
512k
> of ram.

15-20 years ago, efficiency in software (i.e. lines of
code, hard storage, RAM, etc.) were prime considerations
in telecommunications equipment. Megbytes of memory
were expensive. Today, storage, RAM and processing
is dirt cheap...hence, not a significant concern. The place
that does get expensive is route miles. Efficiencies in
passing voice/data down the lightwave communications
paths are where significant cost savings are being worked
on. Several companies make fibre transport equipment that
carries over 1 Terrabit of digital bandwidth. At that, the
"across the pond" routes are not easily upgraded to such
new higher speed technologies and, therefore, efficiencies
in voice bandwidth (compression algorithims) to reduce
channel occupance of 64Kb per voice call to as low as
8Kb per call are also being developed and improved.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2302. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 00:31:42 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020323193142.07185.00002628@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 38295

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>When they represented me during the restructuring period, I would have
>preferred they didn't.

From what I have seen of your views on restructuring, ARRL did not represent you in the restructuring matter. The League very much realized that there was a wide range of opinion on the subject. They put forth articles (QST and web) on various strawman proposals and articles on their position wrt the restructing rulemaking. Those articles very clearly encouraged hams to file their own comments with the FCC.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2303. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 00:33:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020323193341.07185.00002629@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 38296

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>I encourage every new
>ham to look into ALL the options they have in terms of modes,
>technical areas of interest, etc...that would also include morse code.
>I do NOT discourage anyone from pursuiing morse or any other
>aspect of ham radio.

Wanna bet that sooner or later, someone will say that you want to eliminate
Morse code?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2304. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 00:45:14 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <uk9n8.1163$4P5.91424890@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38297

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9hnul4l0o16fe@corp.supernews.com...

> It's obvious that the FCC does not CARE one way or
> another. It's WE who care. Now, what I want to know,
> REALLY, is what your deal IS! Are you truly basing
> your position vis-a-vis code on "Libertarianism" and
> not on what's best, in the long run, for amateur radio?
> It sure seems that way since I find your position extreme,
> considering the other things you have said relative to
> code itself. But then, you know, I have read in the papers
> about people who are "pro life" -- but who shoot doctors
> in the head.

I think comparing Cecil to a murderer is extreme. You really shouldn't do
that.

So, I guess I shouldn't be surprised that
> you seem willing to execute the thing you use the most!
> Of course, you won't be around, most likely, when the
> hammer finally falls, will you? Apre mois, le deluge?

Decades of non-enforcement of CODE TESTED amateurs appears to be a bigger
problem. Riley is still working through that mess.

> >[Why should] CW be singled out and tested as a skill?
>
> Lots of reasons, especially to get on HF, especially as,
> say, an Extra.

Why? Because the Extra has to pass a RTTY operating exam? A SSTV operating
exam? PSK31 operating exam? There's absolutely no valid reason today that
any amateur needs to pass a Morse Code exam.

> >Why should Morse code skill, for testing purposes, be
> >considered as important as everything else in ham
> >radio combined?
>
> It is? I don't think that's true at all. I will be getting a
> Technician license soon (since I have passed the test)
> that will allow me to do all kinds of things, all kinds of
> high-tech things, and no code required at all. There's
> a whole WORLD of radio I will be able to do in a few
> days, and no code required at all. What in heaven's
> name are you talking about?

Fascinating. You have no experience with Morse Code, CW, or amateur radio at all, and you've got all these wonderful opinions already. Welcome to rrap. Your opinion counts as much as anyone elses here, in my opinion. Others on here won't give unlicensed opinions the time of day.

But I'm curious where you've developed such a deep seated need for code, having had no actual experience with it. How old is the literature you're studying or reading? Maybe I can point you to some fresher stuff.

> OK, now I know you're just making stuff up, like the engineer
> who tried low-power CW and found it "unreliable." Quit doing
> this; it doesn't look good . . . and it completely trivializes
> Ham Radio. Wow!

Hanging on to the code exam trivializes amateur radio. Knowledgeable people roll their eyes when they hear "amateur radio" and "high tech" in the same sentence. Find something relevant and examine that instead.

73, Brian

2305. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 00:47:29 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Bm9n8.1167$qO5.91402435@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38298

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020320170518.06011.00002164@mb-dd.aol.com...
> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
> >It's obvious that the FCC does not CARE one way or
> >another.
>
> It was the FCC that initiated the rulemaking that ultimately led to the
> restructuring of Amateur Radio. If they didn't care, the easiest path was
to
> leave well enough alone. They could have dealt with the waiver problem
with a
> lot less work.
>
> >>[Why should] CW be singled out and tested as a skill?
>
> >Lots of reasons, especially to get on HF, especially as,
> >say, an Extra.
>
> The code test speed to obtain an Extra is the same as that required to
obtain a
> Tech plus.

Which is now the same speed as the first code exam, back when code was a
vital mode of communicating.

Brian

2306. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 00:51:19 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <bq9n8.1168$9S5.91523139@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38299

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9i62odjtlo374@corp.supernews.com...
>
> W1RFI wrote, about the FCC and code, after I indicated
> that the FCC didn't really care about the code problem:
>
> >It was the FCC that initiated the rulemaking that ultimately
> >led to the restructuring of Amateur Radio. If they didn't care,
> >the easiest path was to leave well enough alone. They could
> >have dealt with the waiver problem with a lot less work.
>
> Well, yes. And it would be most interesting to be privy to
> exact sequence that led to that FCC "initiation." Let me
> rephrase: They don't seem to care as much as they used
> to, one way or another, and code to them surely is something
> they respond to with refererence to the Ham Community itself,
> and not because of any overriding government interest.
> In addition, they seem to want out of as much as they can
> get out of, including enforcement, apparently. Of course,
> I could be wrong in this. It simply seems this way, to me.

Val, we've had more enforcement in the last 3 years than we've had in the
last quarter century.

Brian

2307. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 00:53:41 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <ps9n8.1169$9T5.91547740@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38300

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C992A54.D6E33A1B@IEEE.org...
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > But
> > surely a case can be made for reserving a small slice of
> > ancient custom for the Extra, the ne plus ultra of Hamdom?
> >
> > Surely that is not unreasonable?
>
> The purpose of the federal government is NOT to preserve
> ancient customs. That is entirely up to groups of
> individual citizens.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Society for Creative Anachronism?

2308. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 00:55:59 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <zu9n8.1170$EP5.91449626@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38301

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9jrqb7d2pm5c8@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Bill Sohl wrote, concerning a retention of a decent code
> speed for the Extra class:
>
> >Perhaps you should read the NPRM R&O. You'll find not
> >one argument that sustained your viewpoint for any
> >requirement based on "ancient custom" or for any other
> >reason.
>
> Fascinating. This means, to me, that the skids were
> greased well in advance, and far behind the scenes,
> such as seems to be happening in Europe. Once the
> future is decided a poll is taken . . . and what has
> already been done is announced, no matter what the
> results of the poll. Kinda like Zimbabwe!
>
> Val

A conspiracy theorist? Now I get it. You sitting up late at night
listening to Art Bell? Try a good night's sleep and you'll think clearer.

2309. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 00:57:49 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <hw9n8.1171$DD5.91078781@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38302

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C99F2A2.C36FF08D@IEEE.org...
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > Fascinating. This means, to me, that the skids were
> > greased well in advance, and far behind the scenes,
> > such as seems to be happening in Europe.
>
> There is obviously a world wide conspiracy. Keep your
> telescope active looking for those black helicopters.

You might see Mike "Maddog" Deignan rapelling out of one.

> Or, more likely, you are simply a part of a small
> minority whose heads are buried in the sands of time.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

I only wonder where a newbie comes to this "Give me Morse or Give me Death"
attitudes?

2310. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 00:59:39 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <%x9n8.1174$gW5.91640099@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38303

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020321151657.21361.00002538@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> >> Fascinating. This means, to me, that the skids were
> >> greased well in advance, and far behind the scenes,
> >> such as seems to be happening in Europe.
>
> >There is obviously a world wide conspiracy. Keep your
> >telescope active looking for those black helicopters.
> >Or, more likely, you are simply a part of a small
> >minority whose heads are buried in the sands of time.
>
> I didn't read that into Val's post at all, Cecil. Do you believe that the
FCC
> didn't have any vision at all about what changes they wanted to make in
the
> Amateur Radio Service before the initiated the NOIs and NPRMs?

I know the ARRL didn't. That's why they were unprepared for the noi/nprm.
But we've gone over this again and again.

Brian

2311. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 01:05:13 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <dD9n8.1177$JT5.91564321@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38304

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9kmku7i7e40da@corp.supernews.com...
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> >I didn't read that into Val's post at all, Cecil. Do you
> >believe that the FCC didn't have any vision at all about
> >what changes they wanted to make in the Amateur
> >Radio Service before the initiated the NOIs and NPRMs?
>
> Yes, it seems as though the FCC, and a concensus
> of others with influence, have known where they have
> wanted to go for some time. Hey, it's the way the
> world works, through the interaction of various groups
> and, er, factions. Always has; always will, I think.

??

> So, now, looking down the road again, do you see
> coming any pressure for the elimination of the CW-only
> parts of the various bands? I mean serious pressure,
> the kind of pressure that has done away with the testing.

Who cares?

> For whatever reason, no group with true influence
> stood up for code testing, anywhere, here or in Europe,
> apparently, which all but guaranteed its demise. Will
> we see this scenario repeated with the band plans
> or has the intended effect been attained?

The ARRL has. Which almost drove me away as a member. Anyway, the sands of
time are scouring away the deep mental scarring of years of unnecessary
Morse exams. Why dredge it all up again?

Where's Aaron?

2312. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 01:09:20 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <4H9n8.1181$CZ5.91735163@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38305

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C9A61C9.3F11791F@IEEE.org...
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > Yes, it seems as though the FCC, and a concensus
> > of others with influence, have known where they have
> > wanted to go for some time.
>
> From my reading of that first restructuring publication from
> the FCC, they didn't have a clue. I can't remember if it was
> an NOI or NPRM but that first draft was absolutely pitiful.
> It appeared to have been written by someone without a clue
> and without any knowledge of ham radio.

It was an nprm, later called an noi. It was awful.

> > So, now, looking down the road again, do you see
> > coming any pressure for the elimination of the CW-only
> > parts of the various bands?
>
> There are no CW-only parts of ham bands except on VHF.
> CW is allowed on all HF ham frequencies (except for a
> strange exception in Alaska).

Alaska relies on 5 mHz SSB for statewide emergency comms. Hmmm?

I don't expect to see the
> CW-anywhere-and-everywhere rule changed.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

Me either. Brian

2313. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 01:13:40 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <8L9n8.2516$Eb5.248418@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38306

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:dD9n8.1177$JT5.91564321@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
>
> Anyway, the sands of
> time are scouring away the deep mental scarring of years of unnecessary
> Morse exams. Why dredge it all up again?

Spare us the victim thing, Brian. Tonite, 608 to 705. There went another perfectly good hour of code practice. About the only thing we are being convinced of is a really bad case of Peter Pan Syndrome.

Dick N�BK

2314. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 01:14:47 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <bM9n8.1183$o16.91833532@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38307

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9l0s5t0mbo56f@corp.supernews.com...
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> >There are no CW-only parts of ham bands except on
> >VHF. CW is allowed on all HF ham frequencies
> >(except for a strange exception in Alaska). I don't
> >expect to see the CW-anywhere-and-everywhere
> >rule changed.
>
> Well, ah, isn't it true that there are parts of various
> bands where, er, ah, phone isn't supposed to be used
> and, ah, CW more or less is free to roam unopposed,
> except for FSK? Let's not mince words. Will NCI, and
> the factions they perhaps speak for,

What factions? Another conspiracy?

now shift gears and
> push to allow as much phone space as they can get?

No, its the ARRL that's pushing for refarming the old Novice CW-only freqs.
Its a good idea only in that it will now allow Novices to initiate QSOs with
Generals rather than wait for Generals to drop down to the Novice ghettos
and pass out welfare QSOs. It's only about 25 years late.

> Val

Screw phone. How about automated, unmanned digital networks forwarding
and/or repeating traffic?

2315. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 01:22:56 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <QT9n8.1184$TV5.91626755@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38308

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9l11cidhdpp0c@corp.supernews.com...
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> >ARRL wanted to see multiple code-speed tests; their comments
> >to the FCC asked for 5 wpm for Tech+, 5 wpm for General and
> >12 wpm for Extra.
>
> Well, that was very fair. It's a shame this wasn't adopted.

Why? I thought you wanted a 20wpm Extra?

> Of course, if the whole thing was going away anyway, and they
> knew it . . .
>
> Val

Yes, isn't it awful.

Brian

2316. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 01:23:55 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <LU9n8.1185$LP5.91452513@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38309

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020322062240.26979.00000124@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
> >>ARRL wanted to see multiple code-speed tests; their comments
> >>to the FCC asked for 5 wpm for Tech+, 5 wpm for General and
> >>12 wpm for Extra.
>
> >Well, that was very fair. It's a shame this wasn't adopted.
>
> ARRL was criticized in both directions for that position.
>
> >Of course, if the whole thing was going away anyway, and they
> >knew it . . .
>
> The League put a lot more effort into defending that position that
"decorum"
> required. It stopped short of a Petition for Reconsideration on that
aspect of
> the rules change because it could really not offer the Commission any
> additional argument than it had already made.

You mean you guys didn't offer lobster dinners?

2317. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 01:29:40 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <8_9n8.1186$X86.92076252@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38311

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020322170815.27054.00000226@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >... keep in mind that digital
> >voice is legal now, provided that the bandwidth limitations are met,
> >and since "bits is bits" in a digital system, it seems not to make a
> >lot of sense to limit digital to "voice only").

If "bits is bits" in a digital system, then we should have no trouble
machine copying Dick's "Banana Boat Swing."

Was the "CW, a Digital Protocol" in the April issue an April Fools joke?

Brian

2318. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 01:29:57 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gtg6713.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 38310

[No readable article body recovered]

2319. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 01:34:26 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <C2an8.1188$e46.91908249@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38312

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020322171027.27054.00000230@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >> Aprox. half of theQSO's on HF are OOK CW Morse.
>
> >On what planet??? Even the ARRL's surveys show that
> >Morse usage is in a minority.
>
> Yeah, but a very vocal minority. I bet that if you count QSOs tonight on
20
> meters, you would find approximately the same number of CW QSOs as SSB.
Do
> count the weak ones; the Morse guys are digging them out of the mud! :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed, lets think about this. If you "hear" the same number on CW as on SSB, and if CW always gets through, then there are far more SSB signals out there. You just can't hear them all.

And what of the SSB Op who'se digging SSB signals out of the mud? Are their efforts somehow diminished because they're using the "wrong" mode?

Brian

2320. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 01:47:00 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <oean8.1190$yh6.92349590@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38313

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:8L9n8.2516$Eb5.248418@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> news:dD9n8.1177$JT5.91564321@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > Anyway, the sands of
> > time are scouring away the deep mental scarring of years of unnecessary
> > Morse exams. Why dredge it all up again?
>
> Spare us the victim thing, Brian.

Sorry, I listened to NPR yesterday on a drive through southern Ohio. 5
friggin hours of nonstop victimization. Its a wonder that I didn't slash my
wrists, that stuff is so depressing.

Brian

2321. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 02:53:56 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C9D3FAC.9736736D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38315

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
>
> Screw phone. How about automated, unmanned digital networks forwarding
> and/or repeating traffic?

Hear, Hear! I agree. Put all the automated, unmanned
digital networks forwarding and repeating traffic in the
phone bands!

73,
Clay N4AOX

2322. Re: A Look at Some Ham Populations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 04:41:58 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <qOcn8.3328$se.293747@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38317

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote

> Hello, all!

> In looking at the QRZ site I noted that California has just about
> 100,000 hams. So, in the interest of beginning some statstical
> analysis I assembled two other groups of about 100,000 to see
> how they broke out by license class.

> States Ex Ad Gen Pl Tch Nov
>
> CA 11,400 11,300 17,000 12,500 41,500 6,300
>
> NY
> OH 14,850 12,650 21,050 13,150 30,550 6,800
> PA
> MO
>
> FL
> TX 11,000 14,100 22,700 12,450 33,650 5,300
> NM
> AZ
>
> The last group of states above I'm calling my "retirement states"
> while the second group is my "working states." California is in
> a class by itself, obviously.
>
> The Tech class is a bigger deal out there, isn't it? Interesting!

Of course it is... it's a 'High-Tech' state.... very natural in my book...

Rich

2323. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 05:18:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9D61B9.9B3BA88C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38318

K0HB wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
> > Is this an unusual problem? Are there any solutions?
>
> It's a common problem. When training Navy radio ops it was called "word
> anticipation", and we solved it by training the ops with completely random
> "nonsense" practice tapes. The character sequences ("words") were of random
> length and contained no recognizable words. Hard copy thus became a
> completely automaton-ic connection between the eardrums and the fingertips,
> with no intervening conscious mental processing of any kind.

But I have been advised to practice head copy to increase my speed.
Head copy requires recognizing words.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2324. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 05:28:11 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Ltdn8.1229$LJ2.63997@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38319

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

> But I have been advised to practice head copy to increase my speed.
> Head copy requires recognizing words.

My mistake.

I thought you meant 'hard' copy which implies transcribed (not conversational) communications.

The truly fast Morse copiers do not copy in their head, but transcribe it as a string of characters without 'thinking about it'. In fact, until they read it off the paper they typically have no idea of the content of the message.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2325. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 06:07:55 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7jqk0gda1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38320

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020323193341.07185.00002629@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>
> >I encourage every new
> >ham to look into ALL the options they have in terms of modes,
> >technical areas of interest, etc...that would also include morse code.
> >I do NOT discourage anyone from pursuiing morse or any other
> >aspect of ham radio.
>
> Wanna bet that sooner or later, someone will say that you want to
eliminate
> Morse code?
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

I can't remember specifiics, but that charge has been
made already.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2326. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 06:16:45 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <0fen8.168163$Nn6.8724401@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 38321

I have mixed emotions. While I am certainly not the most learned ham around, I ran into a
situation that illustrates what I HAVE learned. Just the other day, we had quite a bit of rain.
I noticed that my performance on my screwdriver had deterioriated somewhat, and I somewhat sniffed the odor of rat. I tuned the radio down the band from 10 meters (but not
the antenna) and discovered I had a nice "match" in that I could run full power on 20 meters
with the antenna sitting on 10 meters! Now wait a minute--NO WAY! I took the antenna
and mount off to see what was the matter. It only took a few minutes to discover that just
enough moisture seeped down thru the quick connect for a "short". But it so happened that
it wasn't really a "short", but that the amount of moisture was juuuuuust enough to form a kind of "capacitor" at 50 ohms that let the radio load into the mount. Just like a dummy load. Nice for the finals, but no signal worth a damn.! I had been meaning to remove the antenna anyway and perform some regular maintenance, so I cleaned and dried up
everything, replaced a few little bolts, crimp connects, etc. and put it back together. Well,
whaddya know; the antenna goes back to it's narrow-banded self!

Now this little revelation is not earth-shaking at all, but not THAT many years ago, it would
have totally had me flummoxed. Then I really began to dig into antenna theory and circuitry,
etc. and found some interesting little tidbits about the relationship of RF to ground, impedance, and a few other little things that had, prior, been secret to me.

The information and knowledge is still out there for those who really want to know it, but I
do wonder, admittedly, if we aren't completely consumed by the I-want-it-right-now-and-
you-better-give it-to-me mentality. Sure, CW is not as important as it once was, but it was
an apple I had to peel to get at the meat. I am not saying that everybody should do it because I did it, just that conquering a token speed of 5 WPM (which is painfully slow, BTW) is a small signal that one is willing to crack the nut to get at the sweetmeats. I don't
know if the two issues are even related, but I do notice that folks tend to memorize the tests, plug in a radio, and never continue the study that will unlock a whole fascinating world

beyond just yakking on a radio. And when they run into a small problem, they haven't a clue. When they upgrade, they have NO idea how HF behaves, nor how to even install their own equipment ("Uh, what did you say? What is 'impedance'--never heard of it). They can't even figure the length of a halfwave dipole. No, I'm not making fun--I started right at the same place, and I STILL don't know it all; far from it. I am not afraid to ask a fellow ham how something works if it stumps me, but OTH, it is gratifying to have a problem like I mentioned and be able to recognize what is going on, then repair it and have
it WORK. All I am asking, will the ones who come along WANT to learn if there is no
apple to peel, no nut to crack to get at the meat?73

Jerry
K4KWH

Jester <maverick@topgun.comSPAM> wrote in message
news:sx2n8.216922$uv5.18731391@bin6.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com...
> Are the majority of people who want to see the code requirement lifted, are
> they those that have not put the time forth to learn the code?
> Here is the point at least learning the code takes a sort of discipline and
> an effort to show you are serious or dedicated to amatuer radio, if not I am
> afriad it will turn into 11 meter free for all. You want to remove the code
> and what leave the question pool as it is ? Christ they already give yo the
> answers, all you need to do is memorize the answers and not know anything
> about radio. Imagine if they got rid of the road test when you took your
> drivers license, and they gave you all the answers to the written test.
> Think we would have safer roads?
>
>
>

2327. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 12:01:48 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Mejn8.3611$se.334550@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38322

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:Ltdn8.1229$LJ2.63997@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
>
>
> > But I have been advised to practice head copy to increase my speed.
> > Head copy requires recognizing words.
>
> My mistake.
>
> I thought you meant 'hard' copy which implies transcribed (not
> conversational) communications.
>
> The truly fast Morse copiers do not copy in their head, but transcribe
it as
> a string of characters without 'thinking about it'. In fact, until they
> read it off the paper they typically have no idea of the content of the
> message.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

QSL Big Time. Having had the chance watch one of two old WW2 types go at it when the other one was the communication in his town for a few hours they don't have a clue what is coming thru. All you hear is an old Underwood being beaten to death under the impression it is a model 15 sometimes one-handed as he pours a coffee or dials a phone. My function was to supply paper and ultimately take over the phone. It is a truly astounding sight the first time you see two good ops go at it. And when it was all over you even had the written record with counts checked when the traffic deserved it.

At the same time, I would not want to go thru what he did to learn the skill. He will be 84 in October and it is apparent how much of his hearing he left in the Pacific. I learned from him and still prefer a good growl to the 750 Hz that most rigs force on you for a sidetone. The QSK rigs of the vintage were a tad slow on come up so I picked up that habit and have been accused of sending with a drawl but I don't even try a bug anymore. Electronic keyers are not a dead waste.

Dick NBK

2328. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 12:10:27 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Tmjn8.3621$se.337591@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38323

"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:0fen8.168163$Nn6.8724401@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
> I have mixed emotions. While I am certainly not the most learned ham
> around, I ran into a
> situation that illustrates what I HAVE learned. Just the other day, we
had
> quite a bit of rain.
> I noticed that my performance on my screwdriver had deterioriated
somewhat,
> and I somewhat sniffed the odor of rat. I tuned the radio down the band
> from 10 meters (but not
> the antenna) and discovered I had a nice "match" in that I could run
full
> power on 20 meters
> with the antenna sitting on 10 meters! Now wait a minute--NO WAY! I
took
> the antenna
> and mount off to see what was the matter. It only took a few minutes to
> discover that just
> enough moisture seeped down thru the quick connect for a "short". But
it so
> happened that
> it wasn't really a "short", but that the amount of moisture was
juuuuuust
> enough to form a kind of "capacitor" at 50 ohms that let the radio load
into
> the mount. Just like a dummy load. Nice for the finals, but no signal
> worth a damn.! I had been meaning to remove the antenna anyway and
perform
> some regular maintenance, so I cleaned and dried up
> everything, replaced a few little bolts, crimp connects, etc. and put it
> back together. Well,
> whaddya know; the antenna goes back to it's narrow-banded self!
>
> Now this little revelation is not earth-shaking at all, but not THAT
many
> years ago, it would
> have totally had me flummoxed. Then I really began to dig into antenna
> theory and circuitry,
> etc. and found some interesting little tidbits about the relationship of
RF
> to ground, impedance, and a few other little things that had, prior,
been
> secret to me.

> The information and knowledge is still out there for those who really
want
> to know it, but I
> do wonder, admittedly, if we aren't completely consumed by the
> I-want-it-right-now-and-
> you-better-give it-to-me mentality. Sure, CW is not as important as it
once
> was, but it was
> an apple I had to peel to get at the meat. I am not saying that
everybody
> should do it because I did it, just that conquering a token speed of 5
WPM
> (which is painfully slow, BTW) is a small signal that one is willing to
> crack the nut to get at the sweetmeats. I don't
> know if the two issues are even related, but I do notice that folks tend
to
> memorize the tests, plug in a radio, and never continue the study that
will
> unlock a whole fascinating world
> beyond just yakking on a radio. And when they run into a small problem,
> they haven't a clue. When they upgrade, they have NO idea how HF
behaves,
> nor how to even install their own equipment ("Uh, what did you say?
What is
> 'impedance'--never heard of it). They can't even figure the length of a
> halfwave dipole. No, I'm not making fun--I started right at the same
place,
> and I STILL don't know it all; far from it. I am not afraid to ask a
> fellow ham how something works if it stumps me, but OTH, it is
gratifying to
> have a problem like I mentioned and be able to recognize what is going
on,
> then repair it and have
> it WORK. All I am asking, will the ones who come along WANT to learn
if
> there is no
> apple to peel, no nut to crack to get at the meat?73
>
> Jerry
> K4KWH
>

Well said, Jerry. There is players and there is fans and both serve a purpose. Playing is more fun but now and again you have to get used to looking like a total nincompoop and depend on the mercy of other people who know what nincompoopery looks like.

We had a severed coax on one of our Sunday bus UHF rigs so I pulled back the shield about six inches and got her into the repeater for the run. Always fun to pull a MacIver and watch the heads shake.

Dick BK

2329. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 13:04:50 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <S9kn8.11948$_a4.2137452709@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38324

Val, Congratulations and Welcome!!!

Brian/N0iMD

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9darbppq9om73@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all!
>
> Well, I ** did ** pass the Technician test this evening,
> with 100 percent. I was in competition with another
> fellow (we're both long-time members of the local
> astronomy club) and he got 100 percent as well. If
> I had missed one, well, I never would have heard the
> end of it, just because . . .
>
> We both took the test seriously and studied hard.
>
> My neighbor down the street, the guy who started me
> down this road, took my dues for the local club last
> week and they voted me in a few days ago, on his
> word that I would pass. So, the heat was REALLY on!
>
> I'm very happy to at last be a ham and have already
> started on the General book and the CW. Also, the
> amateur satellite programs have a lot of interest for
> me, particularly because I give fifteen to twenty
> programs per year on astronomy, about half of them
> to schools. Now, I can have a radio component in
> those programs!
>
> Val Germann
> Columbia, Missouri
> (waiting for a call sign on the QRZ site!)
>
> **
>
>
>
>

2330. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 13:07:19 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <bckn8.11949$9a4.2137398422@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38326

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020319204808.27626.00000357@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article <u9darbppq9om73@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
> <vgermann@socket.net> writes:
>
> >Well, I ** did ** pass the Technician test this evening,
> >with 100 percent.
>
> Val:
>
> Congratulations on the remarkable achievement of passing a test
> that can be passed by any reasonably intelligent 2nd-grader with
> a copy of "Now You're Talking!" Now, to get your General, you've
> got to somehow beat that nasty 'ole 5 WPM Morse hazing ritual.
> Good luck -- you're gonna need it
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Val, Darth Vader had twin son's; one good and one evil. You saw the good
one in Star Wars.

Brian

2331. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 13:20:21 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <pokn8.11954$Jr4.2138529951@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38325

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9g63ra03gmk94@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> >Congratulations on the remarkable achievement of passing
> >a test that can be passed by any reasonably intelligent 2nd-
> >grader with a copy of "Now You're Talking!" Now, to get your
> >General, you've got to somehow beat that nasty 'ole 5 WPM
> >Morse hazing ritual. Good luck -- you're gonna need it
>
> As you know, it won't be a matter of luck at all. Application
> to the task at hand will get the job done. And I know from my
> long-suffering Ham neighbor that 5 wpm is nowhere with
> code and I'm going to have to about triple that . . . and that
> I ** WILL ** triple that if I stay with it, which I intend to do.

If you don't we won't hold it against you.

> I guess I've really been of two minds about this Technician test.
> That is, it turned out to be fun, mostly because of the QRZ site.
> I had read the "Now You're Talking" book thoroughly and had
> gone over the questions there but, well, using that site really
> put the icing on the cake. I took their sample tests several
> dozen times.
>
> So, in the end, some of the material I simply memorzed, like
> the frequency limits and things like that. Some material I just
> knew, such as electrical theory and components and whatnot.
> Much of the rest I locked in on after the reading and from that
> QRZ site, which is great.

Much like everyone else, even Dixie.

> Today, with the QRZ site able to put up sample tests of almost
> any kind, I think the pools could be done away with, or
> made larger, or whatever, thus making the tests "harder."

The QPs -are- larger. The exam you took is the old General and Novice
combined, and years of layering new stuff on top. It is far too difficult
an exam for youngsters. While Pepsi and Mitsubishi are killing themselves
trying to develop brand loyalty in the younger crowd, amateur radio bumbles
along...

We gotta make everything "harder" because code is being deemphasized. My
only question is "Why?"

73, Brian

2332. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 13:24:37 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <pskn8.11956$pl4.2138117318@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38327

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9hempmc8kq3e7@corp.supernews.com...
>
> CAM wrote
>
> >Hope you realize that Dick and Larry will view you forever
> >as a post restructuring dumbed-down amateur radio operator.
>
> Well, I'm not sure of that at all.

We are.

> However, a certain amount of
> uncomfortableness with the "new standard" is inevitable, in
> my view. We're all only human and therefore have weaknesses.

I have no reservations about the exam you took or your qualifications to be
an amateur radio operator.

Brian

2333. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 13:38:17 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <dFkn8.11957$6K4.2139700420@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38328

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020320230128.02713.00000432@mb-cu.aol.com...
> In article <u9hempmc8kq3e7@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
> <vgermann@socket.net> writes:
>
> >CAM wrote
> >
> >>Hope you realize that Dick and Larry will view you forever
> >>as a post restructuring dumbed-down amateur radio operator.
> >
> >Well, I'm not sure of that at all.
>
> Val:
>
> Well, now you can be sure of it. You are (through no fault of
> your own), a post-restructuring, dumbed-down amateur radio
> operator. Now, having said that, I'll also say that I don't hold
> this against you, personally.

Holy Cow!!! Larry appears to be backing away from his Black Heart view of
restructuring. Val is an adult, has been a member of an astronomy club for
2x something years, had the opportunity to become a ham under pre-1991
rules, had the opportunity to become a ham during the decade prior to the
latest restructuring, and now Larry declares "(through no fault of your
own)."

> >However, a certain amount of
> >uncomfortableness with the "new standard" is inevitable, in
> >my view.
>
> And that, IMHO, is a very healthy and mature point-of-view.
>
> >We're all only human and therefore have weaknesses.
>
> I agree, and the "weakness" of those who lobbied for, and
> received, reduced licensing standards have done nothing to
> further the cause of amateur radio.

Larry, they've done everything you've done, and more. They haven't ripped a
hole in every new ham they've come across.

Unfortunately, all they
> have done is to permanently install a "Balkanized" relationship
> between hams who are separated by a date on a timeline.

They haven't done this - YOU HAVE!

> One thing I know, and have said repeatedly is: Amateur Radio is what
> amateur radio operators make of it; and amateur radio operators
> are what they make of themselves. That was true in the past,
> and always will be true in the future.

With a little extra persecution thrown in by Larry, who knows what heap of failures amateur radio can produce.
Keep trying, Larry.

73, Brian

2334. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 13:41:23 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <7Ikn8.11959$HO4.2139983925@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38329

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C9A304E.68B45DF1@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > And when faced with typical liberal
> > > thought-Nazi's, who demand absolute agreement, then I take
> > > the gloves off and start letting the good times roll.
> >
> > "liberal Nazis"?????
>
> Well, in this context, "nazi" is anyone who rejects any other
> position as being flat out wrong and must be repressed.
> I remember in Catholic grammar school one of the male nuns
> berating our class because we were not starving kids in some
> third world toilet. Like that was our fault somehow.....

What's a male nun?

2335. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 13:46:32 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <YMkn8.11962$rV4.2140424331@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38330

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C9A2D99.794DF847@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> Larry Roll KILT wrote:
>
> > In article <u9darbppq9om73@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
> > <vgermann@socket.net> writes:
> >
> > >Well, I ** did ** pass the Technician test this evening,
> > >with 100 percent.
> >
> > Val:
> >
> > Congratulations on the remarkable achievement of passing a test
> > that can be passed by any reasonably intelligent 2nd-grader with
> > a copy of "Now You're Talking!" Now, to get your General, you've
> > got to somehow beat that nasty 'ole 5 WPM Morse hazing ritual.
>
> Might as well study for and do the extra. CW ain't that bad,
> maybe you'll get into it and have daily skeds with Larry while
> he's driving his bus. The test is done Farnsworth style, that
> is, 13 or so wpm characters with 5wpm spacing. Idea is that
> you will get faster quicker than with code sent with characters
> sent at 5wpm.

Why? No where in Part 97 is there a line expressing the government wants
faster code. The ARRL took it upon itself to force 13wpm code (disguised as
Farnsworth Code, not Morse Code) on unsuspecting newbies who don't know any
better. Now all the VEs are doing it.

2336. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 13:48:48 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <4Pkn8.11964$xU4.2140364868@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38331

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9km139623qd81@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Robert Casey wrote:
>
> >Might as well study for and do the extra. CW ain't that bad,
> >maybe you'll get into it and have daily skeds with Larry while
> >he's driving his bus. The test is done Farnsworth style, that
> >is, 13 or so wpm characters with 5wpm spacing. Idea is that
> >you will get faster quicker than with code sent with characters
> >sent at 5wpm.
>
> That's what my neighbor wants me to do, and since he's
> willing to put me through my paces, well, that's what I'm going
> to do -- I hope!
>
> Val

Aha, your neighbor! I've wondered where a newcomer gets such ideas and opinions. Well, at least he'll help you. Many of these guys simply demand that you do it.

Brian

2337. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 13:50:54 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <2Rkn8.11965$HW4.2140505210@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38332

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> Sorry, but I don't have no steenkeengk HF on my bus. I'm limited
> to the 800-MHz company radios (one voice, one for our CAD/AVL
> system), and my dual-band HT.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry, the ultimate "shack on his hip" ham. Can you post a photo?

Brian

2338. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 13:54:42 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <CUkn8.11966$q%4.2140799037@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38333

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u9iq2otos16s10@corp.supernews.com...

> As for the satellites, I hope to track them, listen to them,
> and photograph them -- at the same time. We'll see!
>
> Val

That would be worthy of an article in QST. The ARRL has been interested in
the marriage of technologies articles, with amateur radio as the tie-in.

Brian

2339. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 13:57:34 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <iXkn8.11973$S35.2141080695@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38334

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:l0Sm8.1190$se.98802@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...

> It has, BTW, the
> only real no-fault law in the US as well as some really good places for an
> expense account lunch.

Nothing to brag about. No fault laws are bad.

2340. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 14:09:08 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7kmq7kut1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38335

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:pokn8.11954$Jr4.2138529951@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> news:u9g63ra03gmk94@corp.supernews.com...
> > Today, with the QRZ site able to put up sample tests of almost
> > any kind, I think the pools could be done away with, or
> > made larger, or whatever, thus making the tests "harder."
>
> The QPs -are- larger (today).

The reality is that the QRZ site uses the actual question pools.
If published pools were done away with, anyone could
still get all the questions via the QRZ site. It'd only
take a day or so for all the questions to be published on
the internet. (please, no counter arguments about copyrights
since we all know how effective that approach is to
limiting anything via the internet...and the questions are not
copyrightable because they are products of/for federal
regulations)

Making the pools larger is one area I (as well as Ed Hare
and others) have suggested, especially regarding formula/equation
solving. There's no reason that the three varieties of ohms
law (given two of the three variables of E, I and R) solve for the
missing. If each variable had at least 10 values in the question pool
that would create at least 200 possible answers when solving for
the third. Not many people will just memorize that.

> The exam you took is the old General and Novice
> combined, and years of layering new stuff on top. It is far too difficult
> an exam for youngsters. While Pepsi and Mitsubishi are killing themselves
> trying to develop brand loyalty in the younger crowd, amateur radio
bumbles
> along...
> We gotta make everything "harder" because code is being deemphasized. My
> only question is "Why?"

Cause Larry, Dick and others want a "work ethic", a show
of dedication, a variation of the "I walked to school 3 miles
uphill both ways" mindset. AKA - The "I did it, so should you" crowd.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2341. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 14:19:09 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7kni0$dh2$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38336

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:YMkn8.11962$rV4.2140424331@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3C9A2D99.794DF847@ix.netcom.com...
> > Might as well study for and do the extra. CW ain't that bad,
> > maybe you'll get into it and have daily skeds with Larry while
> > he's driving his bus. The test is done Farnsworth style, that
> > is, 13 or so wpm characters with 5wpm spacing. Idea is that
> > you will get faster quicker than with code sent with characters
> > sent at 5wpm.
>
> Why? No where in Part 97 is there a line expressing the
> government wants faster code.
> The ARRL took it upon itself to force 13wpm code (disguised as
> Farnsworth Code, not Morse Code) on unsuspecting newbies
> who don't know any better. Now all the VEs are doing it.

Brian,
As you know, I am 100% against the code test.
BUT, the reality of learning morse code is that it
is better to learn to hear the characters
at 13 wpm with 5 wpm spacing.

In reality, that benefits the
test taker because it gives more "dead space" time to
process and identify what the character sent was. Use of
"Farnsworth" makes far more sense that sending characters
at 5 wpm.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2342. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 14:28:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7knve$cp2$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38337

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:CUkn8.11966$q%4.2140799037@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> news:u9iq2otos16s10@corp.supernews.com...
>
> > As for the satellites, I hope to track them, listen to them,
> > and photograph them -- at the same time. We'll see!
> >
> > Val
>
> That would be worthy of an article in QST. The ARRL has been interested
in
> the marriage of technologies articles, with amateur radio as the tie-in.

Interesting thoughts too.

If Val has the set-up to track the satellites...to which
he has slaved a telecope for photographing the
satellites, then that same "set-up" could drive a
small dish to really zero in on the satellite for
listening as well as transmitting to the satellite if
it has ham capabilities..

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2343. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 15:13:30 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c9ded2d_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38338

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020323193341.07185.00002629@mb-cr.aol.com...
>
> Wanna bet that sooner or later, someone will say that you want to
eliminate
> Morse code?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

I'm in for another lobster on that one ...

BTW, when are you coming down to buy it? :-)

(since that lie has been propagated many times over
the past number of years since NCI came into existence ...)

Carl - wa6vse

2344. Re: DARC didn't fly with Germany's administration

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 15:35:39 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c9df260_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38339

The interesting fact about the poll taken by DARC is
that only about 1/3 of DARC's members even cared
enough to vote ... thus, the result represents a 52%
"majority" amongst only 1/3 of the members ... and
I don't believe that membership in DARC is required
to hold a German license, so it's probably well below
52% of 1/3 of German-licensed hams ...

Carl - wa6vse

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a7i1d0snk2@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net...
> I'm amazed...posted this two days ago and not one comment
> from Dick, Larry, et al;
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:a7bir4$80d$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
> > --
> > A G Z - P r e s s R e l e a s e
> > --
> > WRC-03: "National Group" confirms NO to CW exams
> > --
> > Bonn, March 18th, 2002.
> >
> > On March 18th 2002 the National Group preparing Germany's position
> > for WRC-03 met in Bonn again at the Federal Ministry of Economics.
> > AGZ e.V. and No Code International (NCI) were represented by Dr.
> > Ralph P. Schorn, DC5JQ.
> >
> > Again the Group discussed the expected alteration of RR-article
> > S25.5. Already at their September 2001 meeting, the Group's members
> > decided to advise the Minister to vote against compulsory Morse
> > telegraphy exams.
> >
> > In this context the National Group took note of an opinion poll
> > that Germay's largest amateur radio club performed among their
> > members. 52 percent voted in favour of keeping compulsory Morse
> > exams for shortwave access. The Group, however, expressed no
> > necessity to change the position defined in September 2001, as
> > already then a 50:50 situation was assumed among radio amateurs
> > in Germany. The National Group regards the outcome of the opinion
> > poll as a confirmation of their September decision against CW
> > exams.
> >
> > The National Group supported the position of CEPT's Conference

> > Preparatory Group (CPG), that on it's Oslo meeting in February
> > 2002 decided on a new text for Article S25.5 being the
> > preliminary European position:
> >
> > > Administrations shall determine whether or not a person
> > > seeking a license to operate an amateur station shall
> > > prove that he is able to send and receive correctly texts
> > > in Morse code signals.
> >
> > Only a single member of the National Group (i.e. DARC) voted against
> > this position.
> >
> > According to this, the decision to ask for a Morse exam would be
> > up to each individual administration. A frequency barrier, being at
> > 30 MHz today, is not desired any more. Representatives of the
> > Federal Ministry of Economics pointed out, however, that Germany
> > would not continue Morse telegraphy exams after a change of S25.5
> > and that Germany will not create any national regulation that
> > deviates from a common European CEPT position.
> > --------end of AGZ Press Release-------------
> >
> >
> >
>
>

2345. Re: DARC didn't fly with Germany's administration

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 15:50:02 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c9df5bf_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38340

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:to0n8.8181$Tk.462344@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
> > I'm amazed...posted this two days ago and not one comment
> > from Dick, Larry, et al;
>
> In other words, you were trolling?
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Hans,

I don't see how it's fair to characterize the posting of a legitimate,
factual news article that's on-topic to this newsgroup as "trolling."

Carl - wa6vse

2346. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 18:02:50 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <FBon8.173919$Nn6.9417795@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 38341

W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3c7afa4f_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C7AA83C.B5200A0F@earthlink.net...
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > >
> > > From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> > >
> > > >W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > >
> > > >> There's no stretch at all, Dave. I don't like CW for me, it goes
no
> > > >farther
> > > >> than that. I draw the conclusion that it is not a reliable mode
for
> > > >> emergencies because of a lack of operators and/or its prior use in
> recent
> > > >> disasters.

Kim,

I am certainly not joining this thread to get into an argument with you--or
anyone for that
matter. But this discussion and your post above begs a question in my mind:
If you cannot
read Morse, well, don't use CW, how do you know whether there was CW traffic
WRT
the 9/11 incident? I am just asking, not trying to put you down.

Jerry
K4KWH

> > >
> > > >That's a rather juvenile conclusion to draw based on your dislike for
> > > >CW. You don't know morse well; don't use morse at all and thus know
> > > >little if anything about its use.
> > >
I'm still of the
> > opinion that her conclusions are those of someone hindered by lack of
> > information.
> >

>
> READ: I can't come up with a thing.
>
> Kim W5TIT

>
>

2347. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 18:12:24 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <zKon8.174025$Nn6.9424121@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 38342

LOL!

If one never continues to study and learn within the hobby, only content to work DX on
phone, and take the rig to the shop when it breaks, he/she will never know the gratifying
feeling of solving even the simplest little difficulties that are bound to cause one's hand to
aim for the back of the head for a scratch. And the thing is for me, even after years and
years (many of which were prior to ham radio), I have only begun the journey to find a
head that doesn't itch! Mine gets scratched on a regular basis! LOL!

73

Jerry
K4KWH

Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:Tmjn8.3621$se.337591@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:0fen8.168163$Nn6.8724401@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
> > I have mixed emotions. While I am certainly not the most learned ham
> > around, I ran into a
> > situation that illustrates what I HAVE learned. Just the other day, we
> had
> > quite a bit of rain.
> > I noticed that my performance on my screwdriver had deterioriated
> somewhat,
> > and I somewhat sniffed the odor of rat. I tuned the radio down the band
> > from 10 meters (but not
> > the antenna) and discovered I had a nice "match" in that I could run
> full
> > power on 20 meters
> > with the antenna sitting on 10 meters! Now wait a minute--NO WAY! I
> took
> > the antenna
> > and mount off to see what was the matter. It only took a few minutes to
> > discover that just
> > enough moisture seeped down thru the quick connect for a "short". But
> it so
> > happened that
> > it wasn't really a "short", but that the amount of moisture was

> juuuuuust
> > enough to form a kind of "capacitor" at 50 ohms that let the radio load
> into
> > the mount. Just like a dummy load. Nice for the finals, but no signal
> > worth a damn.! I had been meaning to remove the antenna anyway and
> perform
> > some regular maintenance, so I cleaned and dried up
> > everything, replaced a few little bolts, crimp connects, etc. and put it
> > back together. Well,
> > whaddya know; the antenna goes back to it's narrow-banded self!
> >
> > Now this little revelation is not earth-shaking at all, but not THAT
> many
> > years ago, it would
> > have totally had me flummoxed. Then I really began to dig into antenna
> > theory and circuitry,
> > etc. and found some interesting little tidbits about the relationship of
> RF
> > to ground, impedance, and a few other little things that had, prior,
> been
> > secret to me.
> >
> > The information and knowledge is still out there for those who really
> want
> > to know it, but I
> > do wonder, admittedly, if we aren't completely consumed by the
> > I-want-it-right-now-and-
> > you-better-give it-to-me mentality. Sure, CW is not as important as it
> once
> > was, but it was
> > an apple I had to peel to get at the meat. I am not saying that
> everybody
> > should do it because I did it, just that conquering a token speed of 5
> WPM
> > (which is painfully slow, BTW) is a small signal that one is willing to
> > crack the nut to get at the sweetmeats. I don't
> > know if the two issues are even related, but I do notice that folks tend
> to
> > memorize the tests, plug in a radio, and never continue the study that
> will
> > unlock a whole fascinating world
> > beyond just yakking on a radio. And when they run into a small problem,
> > they haven't a clue. When they upgrade, they have NO idea how HF
> behaves,
> > nor how to even install their own equipment ("Uh, what did you say?
> What is
> > 'impedance'--never heard of it). They can't even figure the length of a
> > halfwave dipole. No, I'm not making fun--I started right at the same
> place,
> > and I STILL don't know it all; far from it. I am not afraid to ask a

> > fellow ham how something works if it stumps me, but OTH, it is
> gratifying to
> > have a problem like I mentioned and be able to recognize what is going
> on,
> > then repair it and have
> > it WORK. All I am asking, will the ones who come along WANT to learn
> if
> > there is no
> > apple to peel, no nut to crack to get at the meat?73
> >
> > Jerry
> > K4KWH
> >
>
> Well said, Jerry. There is players and there is fans and both serve a
> purpose. Playing is more fun but now and again you have to get used to
> looking like a total nincompoop and depend on the mercy of other people
> who know what nincompoopery looks like.
>
> We had a severed coax on one of our Sunday bus UHF rigs so I pulled back
> the shield about six inches and got her into the repeater for the run.
> Always fun to pull a MacIver and watch the heads shake.
>
> Dick BK
>
>

2348. Re: Conditions, Covenants and Cue-Ess-Tee!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 18:27:59 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <bZon8.174159$Nn6.9430897@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 38343

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C990EA0.1EDEABDF@IEEE.org...
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > Is it really true that "reliable international communi-
> > cations" require all that hardware? Well, no, it does
> > not, if you're using CW.
>
> How many actual CW QSO's have you had, Val? Why should anyone
> listen to what you have to say about CW since you've never
> used the mode? You cannot have it both ways. You cannot be a
> brand new ham and also be an expert on CW QSO's or QSO's of
> any kind for that matter.

Cecil,

I have to agree with you. Moreover, I don't think I have ever been ambiguous about how I
feel about covenants and neighbors telling me what I can and can't have on my own property. As to being "Libertarian", I am probably as libertarian as they come when it comes to what I can do on my own yard. I am not unreasonable, but I have lived in a place
where I have not had any trouble with antennas or unhappy neighbors. I deliberately oper-
ate my ham station late at night so as not to bother anyone, with an occasional foray onto
40 and 20 meters during the day. But I don't stay on there ragchewing constantly because I
am mindful that I just might bother someone's soap opera. I don't know that I DO bother
anyone because no one's ever mentioned it to me.

But when I get some nosey, busybody old blue-haired lady lookin' at me over Ben Franklins and trying to scold me over something I "can't" have, then I will go to war, and she most likely won't like the verbal response she gets. Failing in any attempts to abate the
issue or win in court, then I will simply move out into the country where the neghbors are
at least 1/2 mile away. Unlike California, we still have some isolated areas around here that
don't have CC & R, and most cities and towns don't have antenna statutes, or scanner laws.
And the blue-haired old lady can promptly get in her Cadillac and go to hell via the shortest
route.

73

Jerry

> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2349. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 18:43:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9E1E39.162F0CB2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38344

Jerry Oxendine wrote:
> ... but I do notice that folks tend to
> memorize the tests, plug in a radio, and never continue the study that will
> unlock a whole fascinating world

I memorized the Q&A in junior high school and then got a EE degree.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2350. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 18:45:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9E1ECE.3DB1FCED@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38345

K0HB wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
>
> > But I have been advised to practice head copy to increase my speed.
> > Head copy requires recognizing words.
>
> My mistake.
>
> I thought you meant 'hard' copy which implies transcribed (not
> conversational) communications.
>
> The truly fast Morse copiers do not copy in their head, but transcribe it as
> a string of characters without 'thinking about it'. In fact, until they
> read it off the paper they typically have no idea of the content of the
> message.

That's the way I am now and I am limited by how fast I can print.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2351. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 19:39:56 UTC
From: Jester <maverick@topgun.comSPAM>
Message-ID: <gYpn8.147694$1g.12010339@bin3.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>
Source record: 38346

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C9D0725.785096D5@IEEE.org...

>
> Is this an unusual problem? Are there any solutions?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Cecil, Many would tell you to help abolish the code test CW is not needed
why waste your time studying. Thats just there opinion though is it yours
too?

2352. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 20:19:56 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Mxqn8.3622$Eb5.375618@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38347

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:iXkn8.11973$S35.2141080695@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:l0Sm8.1190$se.98802@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> > It has, BTW, the
> > only real no-fault law in the US as well as some really good places
for an
> > expense account lunch.
>
> Nothing to brag about. No fault laws are bad.
>
>

Not really compared to what they replace and the problem they are intended to solve. Florida did it mostly as a reaction to the uninsured and simply transferred the first $10k to the victim. New Jersey is the epitome of the Trial Lawyer Rape and Relief Act which solved the lawyer's problem of clients running out of money before trial.

Handling injuries at retail is expensive and the object of the exercise is to keep the expense level down, stop overcompensating children's head bumps, and make the payments more certain.

I do not know what Delaware's threshold is these days; I hope it is more than the original $10k but their approach was unique. Driving is inherently a dangerous activity so one must insure himself against the first $10 k or whatever which is deducted from any judgement. Say it is 10 and you have a 25k claim which in most cases requires about 45-50k to pay the expense. So the jury gives you 50, the judge deducts 10, the attorney gets the customary 40 percent of 40k or 16 and the plaintiff is where he belongs after all the wailing moaning and groaning but the lawyer gets less. Not a huge improvement if the threshold is 10k but now say it is 25k which happens to be the Financial Responsibility Limit in both NE and WI and for all the moaning the lawyer is cut in half and the plaintiff gets not a lot more than if he had simply gone back to work. I think the whole bill was on one page. It had a salutory effect on the plantiff's Bar.

A Tort System which is what most states are still on has several failings beyond expense.

1. You may be a decent driver but the underwriter looks not so much at you as the victim you are likely to hit. The elderly particularly get no benefit out of being on Medicare or military medical. Neither group has

any income to lose so they get reamed again.

2. You can insure the world to $300 k on a single limit or God knows with an umbrella with absolutely no assurance the world has done it for you. Anyone who believes compulsory insurance works need only look at NY where it has been compulsory longer than anyone in this group is old. The NYPD goes up to the South Bronx to confiscate license plates? Sure they do.

3. Minor injuries are over-compensated, major ones badly undercompensated.

4. Sorting out duplicate payments and who pays what is a major element of the cost of insurance in general.

This is not the place to hash it out but I would be wary of blanket statements like that one Brian. Sounds too much like Digital Good, Morse Bad, New Good, Old Bad.

Dick BK

2353. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 20:43:41 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <1Uqn8.2777$xa5.97694@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38348

"Jester" <maverick@topgun.comSPAM> wrote

> Are the majority of people who want to see the code requirement lifted,
are
> they those that have not put the time forth to learn the code?

Morse is my favorite operating mode, and I can operate comfortably
at 40+ WPM.

I don't care one way or the other if there is a Morse code test
as a condition to entry to amateur radio.

73, de Hans, K0HB
Grand Exhalted Liberator of the Electric Smoke

2354. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 21:58:54 UTC
From: mARTy <marty@mindfulless.com>
Message-ID: <60E0EC951963027F.A51CC5C204D5FD35.5A7EAF5D99A10DCF@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 38349

On a neverending quest for knowledge (and free stuff), CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

**Jerry Oxendine wrote:
**> ... but I do notice that folks tend to
**> memorize the tests, plug in a radio, and never continue the study that will
**> unlock a whole fascinating world
**
**I memorized the Q&A in junior high school and then got a EE degree.

CODE??? Ya mean I gotta learn Morse Code to talk on amateur radio?? How utterly revoltin'!! OK, OK......trollin' motor off <G>.

Seriously, I just passed my Element 2 test a week ago and am still patiently (??) waiting for my callsign. Yes, it was
quite easy (I missed one). I didn't memorize, but I did read "Now You're Talking" nearly 3 times to finally grasp what
I needed to know. Too easy, after only studying for a week & a half?? I'm not an 'old-timer' so I have no reference
point. I've been studying code since I passed the Technician test, and think perhaps I will actually be ready for the
test when it's offered the middle of next month. I live in an extremely small farm town and really haven't much use for
cross-town communication. I doubt there is even a repeater that I could reach from here, as the closest town of any
size is 40+ miles away. My goal is to talk with people in other states, other countries. You know, what people THINK
all hams do.
I also want to continue increasing my code speed to the point where it would be 'acceptable' so others will want to
communicate with me. What would be an acceptable code speed to actually begin making contacts without boring them to
death??
Subpart 97.503(a) of the FCC rules says "A telegraphy examination must be sufficient to prove that the examinee has the
ability to send correctly by hand and to recieve correctly by ear texts in the international Morse code at no less than
the prescribed speed..." So does this mean that when I go to take my test that I could be asked to send code as well as
recieve it?? Anyone know of this actually happening??
Everywhere I look I see iambic paddles (or other devices) for sending code. If I've read things right, they will send a
continuous stream of dit's and then you add the dah's where they're needed?? I'm not sure how these work but it seems
like I should first learn sending code with an old-fashioned key. Any hints, suggestions??
Sorry to jump into the middle of your conversation, but I've got 100's of questions.....

2355. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 23:23:13 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7ln97$5q$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38350

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C9E1E39.162F0CB2@IEEE.org...
> Jerry Oxendine wrote:
> > ... but I do notice that folks tend to
> > memorize the tests, plug in a radio, and never continue the study that
will
> > unlock a whole fascinating world
>
> I memorized the Q&A in junior high school and then got a EE degree.
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Not unlike Cecil, I memorized the stuff in high school and went
on to an Associate degree in electronics, 4 years military
electronics and a 30+ year career in telecommunications
field. OK, so maybe I didn't have a clue about that
colpitts oscillator diagram I memorized when I passed
the test...but I didn't hang up my brain after getting the
license either.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2356. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-24 23:35:29 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7lo56$n7k$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38401

"mARTy" <marty@mindfulless.com> wrote in message
news:60E0EC951963027F.A51CC5C204D5FD35.5A7EAF5D99A10DCF@lp.airnews.net...
> On a neverending quest for knowledge (and free stuff), CAM
<Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>
> **Jerry Oxendine wrote:
> **> ... but I do notice that folks tend to
> **> memorize the tests, plug in a radio, and never continue the study that
will
> **> unlock a whole fascinating world
> **
> **I memorized the Q&A in junior high school and then got a EE degree.
>
> CODE??? Ya mean I gotta learn Morse Code to talk on
> amateur radio?? How utterly revoltin'!!
> OK, OK......trollin' motor off <G>.
>
> Seriously, I just passed my Element 2 test a week ago and am
> still patiently (??) waiting for my callsign.

Congrats and welcome.

> Yes, it was
> quite easy (I missed one). I didn't memorize, but I did
> read "Now You're Talking" nearly 3 times to finally grasp what
> I needed to know. Too easy, after only studying for a week
> & a half?? I'm not an 'old-timer' so I have no reference
> point. I've been studying code since I passed the Technician
> test, and think perhaps I will actually be ready for the
> test when it's offered the middle of next month. I live in
> an extremely small farm town and really haven't much use for
> cross-town communication. I doubt there is even a repeater
> that I could reach from here, as the closest town of any
> size is 40+ miles away.

Depending on the terrain, your antenna, the power you are
running you may have no problem reaching
repeaters even greater than 40 miles.

> My goal is to talk with people in
> other states, other countries.

Get your antenna(s) up now while you are waiting.

> You know, what people THINK all hams do.
> I also want to continue increasing my code speed to the

> point where it would be 'acceptable' so others will want to
> communicate with me. What would be an acceptable code
> speed to actually begin making contacts without boring them to
> death??

Once licensed for HF, get on the air as soon as possible
at the code speed you have when you pass the test. Good hams
will accomodate your "newcomer" status.

> Subpart 97.503(a) of the FCC rules says "A telegraphy examination
> must be sufficient to prove that the examinee has the
> ability to send correctly by hand and to recieve correctly by ear
> texts in the international Morse code at no less than
> the prescribed speed..." So does this mean that when I go to take
> my test that I could be asked to send code as well as
> recieve it?? Anyone know of this actually happening??

The test is recieve ONLY. The FCC dropped the sending
part of it quite a number of years ago.

> Everywhere I look I see iambic paddles (or other devices)
> for sending code. If I've read things right, they will send a
> continuous stream of dit's and then you add the dah's where
> they're needed?? I'm not sure how these work but it seems
> like I should first learn sending code with an old-fashioned
> key. Any hints, suggestions??

Start with the "old fashioned" key. If you really find a liking to
using morse code, you can move up to the "paddles" as you
see fit.

> Sorry to jump into the middle of your conversation,
> but I've got 100's of questions.......

You've come to the right place. Ask away.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2357. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 00:03:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020324190312.09243.00002676@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 38402

>Subject: Re: California Hams!
>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>Date: 03/23/02 20:05 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <dD9n8.1177$JT5.91564321@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>

>> So, now, looking down the road again, do you see
>> coming any pressure for the elimination of the CW-only
>> parts of the various bands? I mean serious pressure,
>> the kind of pressure that has done away with the testing.
>
>Who cares?

All of those people for whom weak signal work is important, that's who.
Remebr, "CW" is NOT just manual Morse Code...There are numerous other
applications for those segments of the bands.

>The ARRL has. Which almost drove me away as a member.

We'll get them to try harder next time, Brian. Just what WOULD it take to
get rid of you?

>Anyway, the sands of
>time are scouring away the deep mental scarring of years of unnecessary
>Morse exams.

The only one's with "mental scars" are those who tried to "finagle", worm,
squirm, and otherwise try to find a way to NOT learn the code...Had they put as
much into learning it as trying to avoid it, it would have been a moot point.

>Why dredge it all up again?

Why ask why?

Steve

2358. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 02:55:15 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c9fe575_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38442

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C9D61B9.9B3BA88C@IEEE.org...
> K0HB wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
> > > Is this an unusual problem? Are there any solutions?
> >
> > It's a common problem. When training Navy radio ops it was called "word
> > anticipation", and we solved it by training the ops with completely
random
> > "nonsense" practice tapes. The character sequences ("words") were of
random
> > length and contained no recognizable words. Hard copy thus became a
> > completely automaton-ic connection between the eardrums and the
fingertips,
> > with no intervening conscious mental processing of any kind.
>
> But I have been advised to practice head copy to increase my speed.
> Head copy requires recognizing words.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

I remembering studying and studying CW (Farnsworth method) at 15 wpm because we fully expected to just "jump" in and get our General tickets (my husband and I). He did fine studying that way, but I could not gain speed with character recognition. I am a speed typist and call myself a pattern typist. I don't know if there's an actual name to the method but I type by word recognition. I know the pattern to words, and my fingers fly over the keyboard in that pattern. I applied this to my CW study and, as soon as I started learning words, my speed increased...alas but I only passed the 5wpm test...came close on the 15, but hung it up after the first try.

Kim W5TIT

2359. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 03:05:26 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3c9fea67_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38443

"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:FBon8.173919$Nn6.9417795@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
>
> W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3c7afa4f_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C7AA83C.B5200A0F@earthlink.net...
> > > W1RFI wrote:
> > > >
> > > > From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> > > >
> > > > >W5TIT - Kim wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >> There's no stretch at all, Dave. I don't like CW for me, it goes
> no
> > > > >farther
> > > > >> than that. I draw the conclusion that it is not a reliable mode
> for
> > > > >> emergencies because of a lack of operators and/or its prior use
in
> > recent
> > > > >> disasters.
>
> Kim,
>
> I am certainly not joining this thread to get into an argument with
you--or
> anyone for that
> matter. But this discussion and your post above begs a question in my
mind:
> If you cannot
> read Morse, well, don't use CW, how do you know whether there was CW
traffic
> WRT
> the 9/11 incident? I am just asking, not trying to put you down.
>
> Jerry
> K4KWH
>

That was my question, Jerry. I think (goodness knows things get so
convoluted in these threads) that the general belief was that no CW ops took
place for the WTC disaster.

I also have been moderately involved with EmCom since being a ham. I no longer hold my MARS appointment but used to do MARS net control, have done NTS net control, have done RACES net control, etc., by the way all via UHF/VHF, except MARS. Other than standard net traffic like reports, etc., there are rarely any messages carried via the VHF/UHF nets to any CW nets.

So, my observation, at least for this area and from what I've heard in other major EmCom events, CW is little used. But, I asked the question to see if any CW traffic had been conducted at WTC.

By the way, I am not Dick Carroll or Larry Roll, or Dave Heil. I don't take your questions or observations as arguments...LOL

Kim W5TIT

2360. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 03:48:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C96AD84.8B94B33E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38403

CAM wrote:

> No matter how hard I try or how many hours I practice, I just can't
> seem to get past 15wpm hard copy. I cannot seem to buffer more than
> four characters so any word longer than four characters becomes a
> random stream of characters. If the actual words are the expected
> words, I can copy 20+ wpm. But if the actual words deviate from
> the expected words, I am lucky to copy 10wpm. For instance:
>
> If I am copying f-u-t-u-r- and the next character is "e", I am
> perfectly OK. If the next character is "i", my entire copy of
> that word is blown. The unexpected character causes a different
> subroutine to be executed in my head and it takes a couple of
> seconds to recover. In the meantime, I have missed one or more
> words.
>
> Is this an unusual problem? Are there any solutions?

You're trying to write down each character as it comes in. That will
only work well up to around the speed you are presently at.
Throw away your pencil and start listening for words. Tune in W1AW's
code practice
sessions that start at 35wpm and listen for words that you can
identify-the short ones such as and, the, it, me, this, etc, and try
to hear them as word sounds not individual letters that you
have to put together into words.You won't get much at all at 35wpm, but
by the time they reduce it down to 20wpm it begins to sound dead slow.
After a few sessions, at 15 wpm the copy -in your head- is dead easy.
You will be surprised. As you keep doing this, you'll build a CW
vocabulary and start hearing and copying complete sentences in your
head.
The only thing holding you back is your own impatience. Getting good
at it takes time.

The best way to get good at pencil copy (at speed) is to be good at
head copy first.

2361. Re: Remotely Controlled HF for New Upgrades?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 03:48:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C96ADD3.F2EDDD0B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38404

K0HB wrote:

> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote
>
> > Anyway, it seems possible to overcome some
> > of the problems the new upgrading Technicians are
> > going to have, with their move to HF, through the
> > use of what amounts to a community antenna.
> > Once code is dropped there will be a relative
> > flood of such people, will there not?
>
> It is my considered opinion that everyone who wants
> to be on HF is already there, and that the awaited drop
> of Morse testing will result in only a modest trickle of
> new HF operators.

You may be right, and if you are, the 5wpm test is no
barrier after all.

2362. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 03:48:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C96C0D0.17F625DF@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38405

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Seems only reasonable that anyone who ascribes
> > to be a ham radio operator would be more than agreeable to
> > learn the most basic of radio communications modes.
>
> Not after being told by you that he/she won't choose to learn
> Morse code after the code requirement if dropped.

Didn't need to be told by me. You NCI types have all yelled so
loud and long about the code requirement being a "Hazing Ritual"
they already know all about it.

2363. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 03:48:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C96C107.7C94EF5D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38406

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Some of the PCTA folk wished to do away with code waivers and
> > > their wish was granted. Moral: Be careful what you wish for.
> >
> > Be careful what you say for you may be termed a liar. The existance of waivers was
> > not the problem, their misuse was.
>
> Many of the PCTA folk believed that virtually all code waivers were suspect.

Virtually all were.

2364. Re: Conditions, Covenants and Cue-Ess-Tee!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 03:48:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C96C1D1.CEA704B4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38407

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Wow! Talk about the pot calling the kettle black. Time was when
> > > you wouldn't listen to a nocode tech because you thought they
> > > had nothing useful to say.
> >
> > On the subject of CW, that would be correct.
>
> Val hasn't passed a Morse code exam yet.
>
> > > Now you are defending one.
> >
> > One finally came along who understands CW!
>
> You once said that someone who doesn't know Morse code cannot
> possibly understand CW and therefore can have nothing valid to
> say about the mode. Have you changed your mind?

You're lying again, Cecil. I said they couldn't possibly be knowledgeable about all CW's attributes. Big difference and you know it. Val said he has long been looking over the shoulder of his CW ham neighbor. Val probably knows about as much about CW, without actually knowing the code, as you do.

2365. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 03:48:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C96C3B4.8D4BFE34@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38408

W1RFI wrote:

> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >> What I implied is that there is more to the story than theory, and clearly
> >there
> >> is.
> >>
> >Why not become famous by telling the world exactly what is wrong with the
> >theory?
>
> If he can, I bet that would be an earth-shaking story in one of the IEEE
> proceedings.
>
> Dick, what would help here is an example of that "more to the story," showing
> how a human is able to decode OOK CW below Shannon's limit. That is, I assume,
> what you mean by "more to the story." If I am mistaken, please do explain what
> that "more to the story" is.

So why not just lie about every single statement I make? I said nothing about Shannon being wrong about anything. It's Cecil's application of Shannon to situations where it does not apply that is incorrect. Shannon never made an attempt to evaluate a specific communications channel, such as the one I was using. Shannon stated the maximum that was possible, not what one would find in any specific situation. When the channel I occupy allows CW to make it through when PSK31 cannot, for whatever reason, polar phase shifting in that particular case, then Cecil's misapplication of Shannon is not only invalid and misdirected but misinforming to newcomers.l.

2366. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 03:48:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C96C62B.41AE999A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38409

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> When you say that it has value but that no one will
> >> learn it unless they are required to do so by the circumstance of the test
> >>you are sending a very confused message.
>
> >Might be confusing to you but the people who won't learn it sure understand!
>
> My point exactly. Those who read your message will infer that something that
> an old time CW op tells them that most people will not learn unless they have
> to learn it to pass a test is not worth learning.

Stop changing what I say! YOU said it isn't worth learning, not me. I said it is so much worth learning that the FCC should require hams to learn it! We already know from years of experience that most won't if they don't have to for licensing. You seem to be sure that all the "Hazing Ritual" crap spewed by Stevenson and Cecil and all the rest of the code haters will somehow convince them that it is indeed worth it! Amazing!

> I believe that you are wrong
> and that CW has enough value that people should learn and use it even if they
> are not tested for it.
>

So now convince the Hazing Ritualists.

>
> >> You choose the latter every time, and argue with me when I say the former.
> >What
> >> conclusion do you expect people to draw from that, Dick?
>
> >Not the one you do.
>
> Okay, but what do you think that new or hams who have no knowledge of CW and
> its values will think of the mode after they read an experienced old timer
> saying that no new hams will learn CW unless it is on the test?

You really think they will consider a mode that has long been branded as a "hazing ritual" by all the code haters to be worth even looking into? What planet did you say you came from?
And I DID NOT say "no one would learn it". I said so few will that it will die out as a viable useful mode. If so few people can use it that there is no one around to copy it, how can you consider it valuable?

2367. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 03:48:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C96C6A1.618554A5@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38410

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >You actually believe, against all
> >evidence, that I want CW to go away.
>
> I don't believe that you want CW to go away, Dick. I believe that the things
> you are saying, in your belief that saying them will somehow save the test, are
> going to talk new hams out of learning CW.
>
> If the test is dropped, will you still tell new hams that most people will not
> bother learning CW because it is not tested, or will you be saying different
> things to try to explain the value of the mode?

You can mislead newcomers all you want, I'll tell them the facts. Every ham
should know how to use CW.

2368. Re: Conditions, Covenants and Cue-Ess-Tee!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 03:48:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C96C70B.32BE792A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38411

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > One finally came along who understands CW!
>
> In spite of your saying that CW is not worth learning unless it is tested!

Ed,. *YOU ARE A LIAR*. I said no such thing. Nor anything that could be rationally misinterpreted to mean that. YOU said that.

2369. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 03:48:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C96C764.AAF7CB03@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38412

CAM wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> > > One finally came along who understands CW!
> >
> > In spite of your saying that CW is not worth learning unless it is tested!
>
> Val, here's a question for you. Is Dick correct in his opinion that
> you would not learn Morse code if it was not required?

Are *ALL* you alleged "code supporters" such liars? Val is one of the few who clearly would learn it even if not required.

2370. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 04:35:55 UTC
From: mARTy <marty@mindfulless.com>
Message-ID: <0C426EDAC148648C.3F26EC495FB3917C.8FC14DAD84C56BB1@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 38413

On a neverending quest for knowledge (and free stuff), "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:

**
**"mARTy" <marty@mindfulless.com> wrote in message
**news:60E0EC951963027F.A51CC5C204D5FD35.5A7EAF5D99A10DCF@lp.airnews.net...

{judicious snipping will be done to make this a bit more managable }

**> Seriously, I just passed my Element 2 test a week ago and am
**> still patiently (??) waiting for my callsign.
**
**Congrats and welcome.

Thanks!
**
**> My goal is to talk with people in
**> other states, other countries.
**
**Get your antenna(s) up now while you are waiting.

Funny you should say that! I've plowed thru over 5000 messages on the antenna group, read most of the ARRL Antenna
book, and am now looking at the Antenna Compendium (#6). With the weather like it is (rain, snow, & wind) I'm thinking
of putting something in the attic just to see how well it would work.
**
**> What would be an acceptable code
**> speed to actually begin making contacts without boring them to
**> death??
**
**Once licensed for HF, get on the air as soon as possible
**at the code speed you have when you pass the test. Good hams
**will accomodate your "newcomer" status.

That's encouraging. If ya hear somebody 3-4 weeks from now coughing & sputtering, asking for a slow-down, you'll know
who it is!
**
**> Subpart 97.503(a) of the FCC rules says "A telegraphy examination
**> must be sufficient to prove that the examinee has the
**> ability to send correctly by hand and to recieve correctly by ear
**> texts in the international Morse code at no less than
**> the prescribed speed..." So does this mean that when I go to take
**> my test that I could be asked to send code as well as
**> recieve it?? Anyone know of this actually happening??

**
**The test is recieve ONLY. The FCC dropped the sending
**part of it quite a number of years ago.

Thanks for the clarification.
**
**> Everywhere I look I see iambic paddles (or other devices)
**> for sending code. If I've read things right, they will send a
**> continuous stream of dit's and then you add the dah's where
**> they're needed?? I'm not sure how these work but it seems
**> like I should first learn sending code with an old-fashioned
**> key. Any hints, suggestions??
**
**Start with the "old fashioned" key. If you really find a liking to
**using morse code, you can move up to the "paddles" as you
**see fit.

Any recomendations on where to get a moderately priced straight key?? I was hoping to find one at the small hamfest I
went to yesterday but all I found was a little $10 thing made by MFJ that looked like I'd end up pushing it all over the
table.
**
**> Sorry to jump into the middle of your conversation,
**> but I've got 100's of questions.......
**
**You've come to the right place. Ask away.

Thanks for the help Bill.
**
**Cheers,
**Bill K2UNK
**
**

2371. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 04:39:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9EAA04.75634B11@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38414

Dick Carroll wrote:
> The only thing holding you back is your own impatience. Getting good
> at it takes time.

I've been at it for 51 years. Exactly how much time are you talking about?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2372. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 04:41:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9EAA80.502D42E4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38415

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Seems only reasonable that anyone who ascribes
> > > to be a ham radio operator would be more than agreeable to
> > > learn the most basic of radio communications modes.
> >
> > Not after being told by you that he/she won't choose to learn
> > Morse code after the code requirement if dropped.
>
> Didn't need to be told by me. You NCI types have all yelled so
> loud and long about the code requirement being a "Hazing Ritual"
> they already know all about it.

When the Morse code exam is gone, the hazing ritual will cease to
exist. There won't be any reason not to learn Morse code.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2373. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 04:46:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9EAB9C.BBE83EB4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38416

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > Some of the PCTA folk wished to do away with code waivers and
> > > > their wish was granted. Moral: Be careful what you wish for.
> > >
> > > Be careful what you say for you may be termed a liar. The existance of waivers was
> > > not the problem, their misuse was.
> >
> > Many of the PCTA folk believed that virtually all code waivers were suspect.
>
> Virtually all were.

Dick, you sure change your mind a lot. You said above that the existence of waivers
was not the problem but now you say virtually all waivers were suspect. You cannot
have it both ways.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2374. Re: Conditions, Covenants and Cue-Ess-Tee!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 04:49:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9EAC4A.3923696B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38417

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > You once said that someone who doesn't know Morse code cannot
> > possibly understand CW and therefore can have nothing valid to
> > say about the mode. Have you changed your mind?
>
> You're lying again, Cecil. I said they couldn't possibly be
> knowledgeable about all CW's attributes. Big difference and you know
> it. Val said he has long been looking over the shoulder of his CW ham
> neighbor. Val probably knows about as much about CW, without actually
> knowing the code, as you do.

But, but, but, Dick. You have said for years that someone who doesn't
know Morse code cannot possibly understand CW. I'm the one who said a
person can have knowledge about CW without having Morse code skill.
You denied that was possible.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2375. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 04:56:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9EAE14.18D623B4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38418

Dick Carroll wrote:
> When the channel I occupy allows CW to make it through when PSK31
> cannot, for whatever reason, polar phase shifting in that particular case, then
> Cecil's misapplication of Shannon is not only invalid and misdirected but
> misinforming to newcomers.l.

I have explained a dozen times or more that your CW and PSK31 did NOT occupy
the same channel since you were trying to use a computer to copy PSK31
but not CW. What is it about that simple concept that you cannot comprehend?
You were NOT using the same equipment for both modes so your observation
is relatively meaningless.

There are three values in Shannon's theorem: Power, bandwidth, and throughput.
If these three values are not the same for two modes, a valid comparison
is not being made. An observation akin to yours is that 1000 watt SSB gets
through when one watt CW fails. So what?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2376. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 05:04:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9EAFEC.EFD3AFED@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38419

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You seem to be sure that all the
> "Hazing Ritual" crap spewed by Stevenson and Cecil and all the rest of the code
> haters will somehow convince them that it is indeed worth it! Amazing!

When the code test hazing ritual ceases to exist there will be one less reason
not to learn Morse code.

> So now convince the Hazing Ritualists.

It is the code TEST hazing ritual to which we are objecting, Dick. Nobody
objects to someone choosing to learn Morse code.

> You really think they will consider a mode that has long been branded as a
> "hazing ritual" by all the code haters to be worth even looking into?

There you go again, Dick, confusing the code TEST with CW, the mode. It is
the CODE TEST that is the hazing ritual. CW, the mode, is NOT the hazing
ritual. CW, the mode, is a lot of fun and useful for some people and is allowed
almost anywhere on the ham bands. How you can still be confused about that is
beyond belief.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2377. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 05:06:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9EB057.73D33573@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38420

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You can mislead newcomers all you want, I'll tell them the facts. Every ham
> should know how to use CW.

"Every ham should know how to use CW but no ham will learn it unless it is
required." Isn't that what you have been saying?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2378. Re: Conditions, Covenants and Cue-Ess-Tee!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 05:14:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9EB236.54558042@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38421

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > > One finally came along who understands CW!
> >
> > In spite of your saying that CW is not worth learning unless it is tested!
>
> Ed,. *YOU ARE A LIAR*. I said no such thing. Nor anything that could be
> rationally misinterpreted to mean that. YOU said that.

Dick, you said that new hams won't learn CW unless they are required to do so.
Remember the argument? If we end the draft, not enough people will volunteer.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2379. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 05:18:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9EB33F.86C0F737@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38422

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > >
> > > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> > > > One finally came along who understands CW!
> > >
> > > In spite of your saying that CW is not worth learning unless it is tested!
> >
> > Val, here's a question for you. Is Dick correct in his opinion that
> > you would not learn Morse code if it was not required?
>
> Are *ALL* you alleged "code supporters" such liars? Val is one of the few who
> clearly would learn it even if not required.

So Val is an exception to your statement. How many other exceptions to
your statement do you reckon there are? Enough to make your statement
false? If only 10% of new hams choose to learn Morse code and use CW
then your statement is false. I believe at least 10% of new hams will
use CW, maybe more.

People usually support the side that makes them happy, Dick. Why are
you supporting the side that makes you unhappy?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2380. Re: Remotely Controlled HF for New Upgrades?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 06:09:10 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <aazn8.3753$ub3.3491@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38423

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote

>
> You may be right, and if you are, the 5wpm test is no
> barrier after all.
>

I don't think any test is a barrier. Barriers are placed to
keep people out.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
Grand Exhalted Liberator of the Electric Smoke

2381. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 06:38:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020325013842.19784.00002529@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 38424

>Subject: Re: California Hams!
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 03/24/02 23:41 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C9EAA80.502D42E4@IEEE.org>

>When the Morse code exam is gone, the hazing ritual will cease to
>exist.

What hazing ritual?

Steve

2382. Re: For Discussion: ARRL Fee's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 07:31:08 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a7n5l021hdu@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 38433

Who knows.... they may not be recieving a full membership fee for the first year, but I am betting that half (at least) of the people that would subscribe to the ARRL under a First Year incentive program, may still stick around, therefore increasing the subscription numbers of the organization. As opposed to not having them at all right now.....

Tnx for the message forwarding! Lemme know what he says.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

>
> Ryan, perhaps its not economically feasable for the ARRL to do this, but I
> sure wish the national organization has greater participation from the
> average ham. I think we would have a more balanced organization if this
> were so.
>
> Send Jim Haynie a message with your suggestion. I think its ARRL
numbergram
> #7147 (discount to first-timers).
>
> ;^)
> Brian
>
>
>
> Brian
>
>

2383. Re: HF after Code Testing Ends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 07:37:03 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a7n5l231hdu@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 38432

I won't be able to utilize the HF bands even if I wanted to based on some other issues, not directly related to ham radio regardless of licensure or rule changes..... for quite a few years.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message news:u9jtnhaflj614d@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all!
>
> So, by sometime in 2004 (?) code testing here in the USA
> will be at an end, for any class of license.
>
> 1) Are there any estimates of how many Technicians
> will effectively upgrade, and in what time frame? That
> is, passing the General test doesn't get you a radio, or
> a station, or an antenna system. All of that takes money
> and space, covenants or no. I wonder how many of
> today's Technicians are in a position to EFFECTIVELY
> get on HF when the rules change in '03 or '04 or '05,
> whenever. In any event, consideration of this problem
> perhaps explains the strength of the hand-wringing over
> covenants in the March QST!
>
> Val
>
>
>
>

2384. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 11:12:42 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020325061242.16464.00000001@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38425

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> I believe that you are wrong
>> and that CW has enough value that people should learn and use it even if
>> they are not tested for it.

> So now convince the Hazing Ritualists.

And who did you have in mind? Of the ones here that I think might fit your description, all have learned Morse code. Some of them use it routinely in their hamming. Cecil uses it almost 100%.

Do you think I need to tell them that they need to learn Morse code? Do you think I need to tell them other hams should learn Morse code? Cecil and Bill have been saying that they believe that Morse code has enough value that hams will learn it whether they are tested or not.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2385. Re: Remotely Controlled HF for New Upgrades?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 11:15:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020325061549.16464.00000002@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38426

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> You may be right, and if you are, the 5wpm test is no
>barrier after all.

What is that going to do to the beliefs of the barrier ritualists?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2386. Re: DARC didn't fly with Germany's administration

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 11:17:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020325061730.16464.00000003@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38427

From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net

>The interesting fact about the poll taken by DARC is
>that only about 1/3 of DARC's members even cared
>enough to vote ... thus, the result represents a 52%
>"majority" amongst only 1/3 of the members ...

What percentage of amateurs chose to "vote" by filing comments for the
restructuring NPRM?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2387. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 11:21:23 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020325062123.16464.00000004@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38428

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>> Do count the weak ones; the Morse guys are digging them out of the mud! :-)

>And what of the SSB Op who'se digging SSB signals out of the mud? Are their
>efforts somehow diminished because they're using the "wrong" mode?

I made that suggestion to Carl because I know that he is not a very experienced
CW op, so if he made the comparison, I wanted to ensure he was doing so based
on real-world conditions.

I believe that the SSB op who is doing the same is a good operator.

Why do you feel that SSB is a "wrong" mode?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2388. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 11:24:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020325062443.16464.00000005@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38429

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>If "bits is bits" in a digital system, then we should have no trouble
>machine copying Dick's "Banana Boat Swing."

Bits is bits, but if the bits are not transmitted in a determinate state, they cannot be received so.

To date, humans are the best decoders of things like banana boat swing, especially those that sometimes send dahs shorter than dits. (I have heard this.) Humans have a capability of pulling together a complete picture from a partial description. I don't believe that the way humans do that is understood well enough yet that it has been duplicated in code.

>Was the "CW, a Digital Protocol" in the April issue an April Fools joke?

I didn't read it, so I don't know.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2389. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 11:26:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020325062608.16464.00000006@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38430

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>I know the ARRL didn't. That's why they were unprepared for the noi/nprm.

The ARRL sent a letter to the FCC before the NOI/NPRM came out.

>But we've gone over this again and again.

And changed history in the process. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2390. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 11:32:38 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020325063238.16464.00000007@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38431

From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com

>Sure they can...just as Cecil and I memorized all we
>needed to memorize to pass the written General over
>40 years ago. 16 pages of pretty easy to memorize
>stuff...including 14 schematics.

Cecil has claimed a photographic memory. Most cannot memorize the material in the pools without understanding.

Even in 1963, I passed my General with a combination of learning, memorizing, lucky guessing and hoping that some of the tough questions did not appear on my exam.

Which is closer to what you did, Bill, the above, or rote memorization without any understanding?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2391. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 16:00:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C9F49B0.9859984A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38434

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >When the Morse code exam is gone, the hazing ritual will cease to
> >exist.
>
> What hazing ritual?

The hazing ritual that Dick brought up.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2392. Re: IN LOVING MEMORY OF A SILENTKEY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 16:50:21 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C9F554D.68BB211F@psu.edu>
Source record: 38435

Did W7FEZ write a book once, Cecil? I remember a book about becoming a Ham, I think it was printed sometime in the 1980's, maybe a little later. It was one of my favorites when I was just getting into the hobby.

- Mike -

CAM wrote:
>
> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> > May he have ever resting Peace....Via con Dios
>
> Please add my SK friend, W7FEZ, to that list. And I think
> the expression is, "Go with God" which in Spanish is
> something like, "Vaya con Dios", an imperative form of

2393. You can't pass this item up!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 18:59:18 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <asKn8.5028$ub3.2388@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38436

http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=1341648551

--
(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

2394. Changing Tests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 19:02:16 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0203251102.38c7a678@posting.google.com>
Source record: 38437

Everytime a test is changed, what is lost is the ability to compare or contrast test results from year to year. Perhaps that goal is not as important to all who test as it seems to be to Ham operators.

Just heard over the weekend that the Scholastic Achievement Test (SAT) is contemplating a major overhaul of its question pool to reduce or replace many of its multiple choice analogy questions with written essays.

In my opinion, this change represents a different emphasis in what college admissions directors are looking for in college applicants. And that is the purpose of the SAT -- not to compare state against state, school against school, this year's students against last year's.

Every change in the Ham licensing pool should represent the same thing: a change in what a Ham needs to know in order to participate in the hobby with accompanying privileges.

To test CW or not, to test at 5/13/20 wpm; to test packet; to test antenna design; to test ATV -- would we be better adding more modes to the test than in reducing them?

2395. Re: You can't pass this item up!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 19:34:44 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <oZKn8.5617$se.559026@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38438

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote

> http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=1341648551

> (���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

Gee... Hans... now who could have submitted that one??? ;-)

Clever... I liked it....

Rich

2396. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 22:51:42 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7o9v4$v68$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38439

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020325063238.16464.00000007@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>
> >Sure they can...just as Cecil and I memorized all we
> >needed to memorize to pass the written General over
> >40 years ago. 16 pages of pretty easy to memorize
> >stuff...including 14 schematics.
>
> Cecil has claimed a photographic memory. Most cannot memorize the
material in
> the pools without understanding.
>
> Even in 1963, I passed my General with a combination of learning,
memorizing,
> lucky guessing and hoping that some of the tough questions did not appear
on my
> exam.
>
> Which is closer to what you did, Bill, the above, or rote memorization
without
> any understanding?

Much of the rote memorization was without understanding.
I could solve equations (math was easy for me), but I didn't
understand WHY the equation "worked". Once I took
physics, we got through the basic concepts of Ohm's law.
It wasn't until college that I learned the derivation (and thus
the understanding) of capacitance, reactence, inductance, etc.

There were 14 diagrams in the ARRL manual that were
shown as the "Draw a diagram of..." type. I memorized
all 14 without knowing the "why" of how any of them
worked.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2397. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-25 23:06:20 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7oalh$jv2$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38440

"mARTy" <marty@mindfulless.com> wrote in message
news:0C426EDAC148648C.3F26EC495FB3917C.8FC14DAD84C56BB1@lp.airnews.net...
> On a neverending quest for knowledge (and free stuff), "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
> **> My goal is to talk with people in
> **> other states, other countries.
> **
> **Get your antenna(s) up now while you are waiting.
>
> Funny you should say that! I've plowed thru over 5000 messages on the
antenna group, read most of the ARRL Antenna
> book, and am now looking at the Antenna Compendium (#6). With the weather
like it is (rain, snow, & wind) I'm thinking
> of putting something in the attic just to see how well it would work.

It worked fine for me. If you have a typical wood frame house without
foil backed insulation in the attic roof you'll get out OK. I run 100
watts to a 15 meter/10 meter (21 MHz and 28MHz) folded
dipole. I worked Europe, Hawaii, and many states without much
effort. If you can hear it, you can probably work it with the
attic antenna.

> **Start with the "old fashioned" key. If you really find a liking to
> **using morse code, you can move up to the "paddles" as you
> **see fit.
>
> Any recomendations on where to get a moderately priced straight key??
> I was hoping to find one at the small hamfest I
> went to yesterday but all I found was a little $10 thing made
> by MFJ that looked like I'd end up pushing it all over the table.

Call up HRO, AES or any of the ham suppliers in QST magazine.
I seem to also recall that Radio Shack had a cheap straight
key in their catalog.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2398. Yup, is free re: fwd: Free gift

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 01:28:32 UTC
From: eugene_thomas_74@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <4a49db11.0203251728.1d6fa25d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 38441

Only for U.S. residents.

~ Ann

martin77smith@hotmail.com (martin) wrote:
>Hi,
>
>
>Forward this to your friend ...
>
>Get a Cellphone Magic Flash Detector for free while stock last.
>Limited offer on first come first serve only.
>http://track.floppybank.com/click-21949-81482
>

2399. Re: Slowest loading ham pages on the net?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 03:28:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020325222836.21793.00000068@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 38449

In article <35098761FA.104620E9A12@ncvillage.net>, DT2314@ncvillage.net (Doug Thompson) writes:

>
>A few other hams and I are embarked on a quest to find the most awful
>and slowest loading ham pages on the web. So far, we've only looked at
>the slowest pages (and slowness indicates poor design and "awfulness"
>too), and the top candidate is
>
>http://personal.atl.bellsouth.net/atl/w/4/w4amp
>
>Has anyone any other candidates for "ham web pages which really suck?"

No, not unless you have one of your own...

73 de Larry, K3LT

2400. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 03:28:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020325222837.21793.00000070@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 38444

In article <pskn8.11956$pl4.2138117318@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> However, a certain amount of
>> uncomfortableness with the "new standard" is inevitable, in
>> my view. We're all only human and therefore have weaknesses.
>
>I have no reservations about the exam you took or your qualifications to be
>an amateur radio operator.
>
>Brian

Of course you don't, Brian, especially you hope to meet the same dumbed-down requirements yourself, someday -- like in 2027?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2401. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 03:28:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020325222837.21793.00000069@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 38446

In article <3C9D0725.785096D5@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Is this an unusual problem? Are there any solutions?

I'd suggest some serious random character copying practice. I got
mine from the 5-character spy stations. I'd sit and copy them for
about 15-minutes at a time several sessions a day. Got to 20 WPM
really fast that way. Are they still on-the-air -- or has the end of the
Cold War caused them to go QRT? I haven't really looked for them
for several years.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2402. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 03:28:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020325222837.21793.00000071@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 38448

In article <YMkn8.11962$rV4.2140424331@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>Why? No where in Part 97 is there a line expressing the government wants >faster code. The ARRL took it upon itself to force 13wpm code (disguised as >Farnsworth Code, not Morse Code) on unsuspecting newbies who don't know any >better. Now all the VEs are doing it.

And naturally, Brian finds it easier to whine about it than to make the effort to actually do it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2403. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 03:28:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020325222838.21793.00000073@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 38445

In article <BZ0n8.1028$Bw7.75761923@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>
>Larrah, Aye sed Mericans, not Mexicans. So whose your favorite Mexican on
>the bus?

The one who just put in a hard day's work picking cabbages in order to make an honest living to support his family. No doubt about it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2404. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 03:28:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020325222838.21793.00000072@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 38447

In article <2Rkn8.11965$HW4.2140505210@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>
>Larry, the ultimate "shack on his hip" ham. Can you post a photo?
>
>Brian

Brian:

All you gotta do is Czech out my record on QRZ.COM.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2405. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 03:59:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C980902.2E71EB34@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38450

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3C944694.15BC233F@worldnet.att.net...
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > I said long ago that so few will be inclined to actually learn Morse
> code
> > > > without a test that it will inevitably fade out as a viable
> communications mode.
> > >
> > > That's what we thought you said. Now you must attempt to talk as many
> > > newcomers out of learning Morse code as possible in order for your
> > > prediction to be correct.
> >
> > Well, it's easy to see where you come from. You actually believe, against
> all
> > evidence, that I want CW to go away. That's your line, and that of NCI. A
> few of you
> > guys are masters at obfuscation.
>
> The reason Cecil and others believe you don't seriously
> want CW to continue is because your comments here simply
> do NOT convey any great dedication to the mode. It
> is as if you want CW to die out so you can then say..."See,
> I told you so." Your mileage may vary...but that IS
> the perception YOU have created for yourself.

I suppose when idiots are doing the perceiving, that is what should be
expected.

2406. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 03:59:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C980D32.F43A8E7E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38351

CAM wrote:

> K0HB wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
> > > Is this an unusual problem? Are there any solutions?
> >
> > It's a common problem. When training Navy radio ops it was called "word
> > anticipation", and we solved it by training the ops with completely random
> > "nonsense" practice tapes. The character sequences ("words") were of random
> > length and contained no recognizable words. Hard copy thus became a
> > completely automaton-ic connection between the eardrums and the fingertips,
> > with no intervening conscious mental processing of any kind.
>
> But I have been advised to practice head copy to increase my speed.
> Head copy requires recognizing words.

Unless you're ready to selfdiscipline yourself to Navy standards, go with head copy.

I got pretty good at copying coded groups, and when the need is to get it on paper, perfect copy with minimal fuss, there is no better way than to train to copy without knowing or even caring what you're copying. I passed the 18wpm 5-letter- groups test at the FCC office with flying colors, but then immediately -barely- failed the 20wpm plain language test for that very reason- I anticipated a word in the middle of a string where I had almost a full minute of perfect copy on either side of it, but not quite enough..(I anticipated the word 'additional' and the correct copy was 'adding machine'. I know that because he called me up to the desk and asked me if I knew what the correct word was, and I did not, and he told me. You don't have time to think about it in the middle of the test at 20wpm)..The examiner counted both sides twice before giving me the bad news.

That was during the morning when tests were given for commercial licenses, and I was going for the 2nd class radiotelegraph. That was the reason I never did get it. I came back that afternoon for the ham radio test session and passed the 20wpm on the Extra exam, though.

2407. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 04:00:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C980F44.8413831E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38352

Brian P Burke wrote:

> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20020319204808.27626.00000357@mb-fi.aol.com...
> > In article <u9darbppq9om73@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
> > <vgermann@socket.net> writes:
> >
> > >Well, I ** did ** pass the Technician test this evening,
> > >with 100 percent.
> >
> > Val:
> >
> > Congratulations on the remarkable achievement of passing a test
> > that can be passed by any reasonably intelligent 2nd-grader with
> > a copy of "Now You're Talking!" Now, to get your General, you've
> > got to somehow beat that nasty 'ole 5 WPM Morse hazing ritual.
> > Good luck -- you're gonna need it
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> Val, Darth Vader had twin son's; one good and one evil. You saw the good
> one in Star Wars.

Oh, and the bad one was responsible for the Grate Hazing Ritual. We got it.

2408. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 04:00:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C980FCE.5B3F3A8A@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38353

Brian P Burke wrote:

> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> news:u9hempmc8kq3e7@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> > CAM wrote
> >
> > >Hope you realize that Dick and Larry will view you forever
> > >as a post restructuring dumbed-down amateur radio operator.
> >
> > Well, I'm not sure of that at all.
>
> We are.
>
> > However, a certain amount of
> > uncomfortableness with the "new standard" is inevitable, in
> > my view. We're all only human and therefore have weaknesses.
>
> I have no reservations about the exam you took or your qualifications to be
> an amateur radio operator.

And neither do I. You, on the other hand, forced yourself to wait for yours on the Grate Dumbdown.

2409. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 04:00:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C98121F.C724B9EA@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38354

CAM wrote:

> Jerry Oxendine wrote:
> > ... but I do notice that folks tend to
> > memorize the tests, plug in a radio, and never continue the study that will
> > unlock a whole fascinating world
>
> I memorized the Q&A in junior high school and then got a EE degree.

Well, there you have it, folks. Memorize the Q&A and get your EE degree.

2410. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 04:00:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C981382.2A4235C4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38355

Richard McCollum wrote:

> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> news:iXkn8.11973$S35.2141080695@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:l0Sm8.1190$se.98802@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > > It has, BTW, the
> > > only real no-fault law in the US as well as some really good places
> for an
> > > expense account lunch.
> >
> > Nothing to brag about. No fault laws are bad.
> >
> >
>
> Not really compared to what they replace and the problem they are intended
> to solve. Florida did it mostly as a reaction to the uninsured and simply
> transferred the first $10k to the victim. New Jersey is the epitome of
> the Trial Lawyer Rape and Relief Act which solved the lawyer's problem of
> clients running out of money before trial.
>
> Handling injuries at retail is expensive and the object of the exercise is
> to keep the expense level down, stop overcompensating children's head
> bumps, and make the payments more certain.
>
> I do not know what Delaware's threshold is these days; I hope it is more
> than the original $10k but their approach was unique. Driving is
> inherently a dangerous activity so one must insure himself against the
> first $10 k or whatever which is deducted from any judgement. Say it is
> 10 and you have a 25k claim which in most cases requires about 45-50k to
> pay the expense. So the jury gives you 50, the judge deducts 10, the
> attorney gets the customary 40 percent of 40k or 16 and the plaintiff is
> where he belongs after all the wailing moaning and groaning but the lawyer
> gets less. Not a huge improvement if the threshold is 10k but now say it
> is 25k which happens to be the Financial Responsibility Limit in both NE
> and WI and for all the moaning the lawyer is cut in half and the plaintiff
> gets not a lot more than if he had simply gone back to work. I think the
> whole bill was on one page. It had a salutory effect on the plantiff's
> Bar.
>
> A Tort System which is what most states are still on has several failings
> beyond expense.

>
> 1. You may be a decent driver but the underwriter looks not so much at you
> as the victim you are likely to hit. The elderly particularly get no
> benefit out of being on Medicare or military medical. Neither group has
> any income to lose so they get reamed again.
>
> 2. You can insure the world to $300 k on a single limit or God knows with
> an umbrella with absolutely no assurance the world has done it for you.
> Anyone who believes compulsory insurance works need only look at NY where
> it has been compulsory longer than anyone in this group is old. The NYPD
> goes up to the South Bronx to confiscate license plates? Sure they do.
>
> 3. Minor injuries are over-compensated, major ones badly undercompensated.
>
> 4. Sorting out duplicate payments and who pays what is a major element of
> the cost of insurance in general.
>
> This is not the place to hash it out but I would be wary of blanket
> statements like that one Brian. Sounds too much like Digital Good, Morse
> Bad, New Good, Old Bad.
>
> Dick BK

Dick, everyone dishes out one-liners on occasion where they are truly called
for (like now) but what would you expect from a fella who knows nothing else?

2411. Re: Conditions, Covenants and Cue-Ess-Tee!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 04:23:09 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a7q94i1nfa@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 38391

I understand CW completely. It is a rather simple method of transmission.
Now the language/ciphers that are sent along that medium I am now where near
proficient, just at the skimming by level.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

> But, but, but, Dick. You have said for years that someone who doesn't
> know Morse code cannot possibly understand CW. I'm the one who said a
> person can have knowledge about CW without having Morse code skill.
> You denied that was possible.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2412. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 04:31:26 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a7q94k2nfa@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 38390

I have a question for all then.... If the argument of that Morse Code gets through when other modes don't may be true, what about relaying information? What about message traffic i.e. NTS??? It seems that most people using that argument seem to think that the distance MUST be the FURTHEST away and MUST be done with no intermediaries along the way.....

Just something that has been in the back of my mind as I read some of these messages over the past months....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message news:3C96C3B4.8D4BFE34@worldnet.att.net...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >
> > >> What I implied is that there is more to the story than theory, and clearly
> > >there
> > >> is.
> > >
> > >Why not become famous by telling the world exactly what is wrong with the
> > >theory?
> >
> > If he can, I bet that would be an earth-shaking story in one of the IEEE
> > proceedings.
> >
> > Dick, what would help here is an example of that "more to the story," showing
> > how a human is able to decode OOK CW below Shannon's limit. That is, I assume,
> > what you mean by "more to the story." If I am mistaken, please do explain what
> > that "more to the story" is.
>
> So why not just lie about every single statement I make? I said nothing about
> Shannon being wrong about anything. It's Cecil's application of Shannon to
> situations where it does not apply that is incorrect. Shannon never made

an attempt
> to evaluate a specific communications channel, such as the one I was
using. Shannon
> stated the maximum that was possible, not what one would find in any
specific
> situation. When the channel I occupy allows CW to make it through when
PSK31
> cannot, for whatever reason, polar phase shifting in that particular case,
then
> Cecil's misapplication of Shannon is not only invalid and misdirected but
> misinforming to newcomers.l.
>
>
>

2413. Re: OT - Plug Needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 05:01:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020326000104.27329.00000025@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 38359

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gtfttr1.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

> Does anyone have a source for the male cable plug that would mate
> with a 7-pin miniature tube socket?
>
> I don't think that Amphenol even makes such a critter any more.

It's difficult to just get 7-pin tube sockets, Phil. Welcome to
the new world of electronics. :-)

At one time, roughly 30 years ago, there were such things, also
tube tester "socket savers" and what I liked, an extender with
little tabs on the socket end rim that let one clip on leads or
scope probes.

You can do a Search for tube sockets and like things but those
will be specialty items for guitar amplifiers and vacuum tube music
systems. One place you might try is www.nelson-radio.com in
Roswell, NM. They are offering a whole kit of tube tester socket
savers, possibly built for military tube testers, but no price given.

Ask in r.r.a.homebrew too.

> Policy Reference - it's a good policy to use the proper plug for the
> socket rather than poke wires into the holes.......

Out of order, counselor! :-)

If things get really bad, just grab some connector pins that fit the
socket holes, solder or crimp wires on them, sleeve the
connection and run the wires any place you want. I've done that
way, way back in time.

2414. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 05:01:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020326000105.27329.00000026@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 38357

In article <xf8n8.5$LJ2.2968@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
<K0HB@earthlink.net> writes:

>"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
>
>> Is this an unusual problem? Are there any solutions?
>
>It's a common problem. When training Navy radio ops it was called "word
>anticipation", and we solved it by training the ops with completely random
>"nonsense" practice tapes. The character sequences ("words") were of random
>length and contained no recognizable words. Hard copy thus became a
>completely automaton-ic connection between the eardrums and the fingertips,
>with no intervening conscious mental processing of any kind.

Hmmm...that's right up there with knot-tying and sail-handling.
Will the Navy ever get to iron hulls and steam power?

How many Navy "radio ops" have had to train at being automatic
morse decoders in the last 30 years?

2415. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 05:01:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020326000106.27329.00000027@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 38356

In article <3C96C6A1.618554A5@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

> You can mislead newcomers all you want, I'll tell them the facts. Every ham
>should know how to use CW.

WHY?!?

2416. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 05:01:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020326000106.27329.00000028@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 38358

In article <3C96C3B4.8D4BFE34@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

> So why not just lie about every single statement I make? I said nothing about
>Shannon being wrong about anything. It's Cecil's application of Shannon to
>situations where it does not apply that is incorrect. Shannon never made an
attempt
>to evaluate a specific communications channel, such as the one I was using.
>Shannon stated the maximum that was possible, not what one would find in any
specific
>situation. When the channel I occupy allows CW to make it through when PSK31
>cannot, for whatever reason, polar phase shifting in that particular case,
then
>Cecil's misapplication of Shannon is not only invalid and misdirected but
>misinforming to newcomers.l.

Do you want a copy of Shannon's paper as printed in the Bell System Technical
Journal? I can send you one in private mail. Everything is in there so you
can
judge for yourself.

2417. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 05:10:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020326001020.28502.00000018@mb-mt.aol.com>
Source record: 38360

In article <20020325222837.21793.00000069@mb-ch.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <3C9D0725.785096D5@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
>>Is this an unusual problem? Are there any solutions?
>
>I'd suggest some serious random character copying practice. I got
>mine from the 5-character spy stations. I'd sit and copy them for
>about 15-minutes at a time several sessions a day. Got to 20 WPM
>really fast that way.

Just HOW did you check your "copy," Boris?

Did you whip out your one-time pad and decode the groups?

Does the DoD, NSA, and CIA know what you did?

2418. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 05:25:30 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <eDTn8.273$t01.203@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38361

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

> How many Navy "radio ops" have had to train at being automatic
> morse decoders in the last 30 years?

None. They didn't decode Morse -- they simply copied it down.
A cryptologist then decoded the hard copy.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2419. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 05:59:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020326005954.21793.00000078@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 38362

In article <3C9EAA04.75634B11@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>> The only thing holding you back is your own impatience. Getting good
>> at it takes time.
>
>I've been at it for 51 years. Exactly how much time are you talking about?

Cecil:

As long as it takes. Think how good a CW op you'll be by 2105!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2420. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 05:59:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020326005954.21793.00000077@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 38366

In article <sx2n8.216922$uv5.18731391@bin6.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>, "Jester" <maverick@topgun.comSPAM> writes:

>Are the majority of people who want to see the code requirement lifted, are
>they those that have not put the time forth to learn the code?

Yes, for the most part.

>Here is the point at least learning the code takes a sort of discipline and
>an effort to show you are serious or dedicated to amatuer radio, if not I am
>afriad it will turn into 11 meter free for all.

There is plenty of evidence that the HF phone sub-bands have been
that way for years. IMHO, there is not practical need to add to the
existing chaos by further reducing licensing standards, particularly
with regard to code testing -- but that's the way we're going, like it
or not.

>You want to remove the code
>and what leave the question pool as it is ?

Not me. The only thing that would be acceptable to me would be to
return to the Pre-Restructuring licensing standards.

>Christ they already give yo the answers,

I'll thank you to leave Him out of this.

>all you need to do is memorize the answers and not know anything
>about radio.

I'm sure that's not the intention, but that's usually the way it works out.

>Imagine if they got rid of the road test when you took your
>drivers license, and they gave you all the answers to the written test.

Actually, they did, in the form of a driver's manual. I'm not against the
concept of question pools, per se, because by memorizing answers to
the questions, you do, as an intended or unintended consequence, learn
the material. However, unless you have been exposed to the underlying
technical background explanations behind the Q&A's, you miss out on
a valuable part of your "education" in radio theory. I used the old
ARRL License Manuals for the majority of my licensing study, and found
the information easy to understand and more than thorough enough in
presentation to allow me to pass my tests while still retaining a working
understanding of the material. The question pools, while marginally
useful as a study aid, tend to give a prospective ham an "understanding
bypass" of some of the more complex subjects. In a perfect world, I

would prefer that a licensing syllabus be provided for each license class, outlining the topics covered in the tests, but requiring the testee to do his/her own research to find the answers, or the procedures and formulas for arriving at the answers.

>Think we would have safer roads?

Not unless we get rid of cell phones, lap dogs, about 80% of women drivers, 100% of all drivers from New Jersey and Eastern PA, all drivers over the age of 80, and any driver unable or unwilling to drive at least the posted speed limit on Delaware back roads.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2421. Re: OT - Plug Needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 05:59:55 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020326005955.21793.00000079@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 38365

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gtfttr1.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>
> Does anyone have a source for the male cable plug that would mate
> with a 7-pin miniature tube socket?
>
> I don't think that Amphenol even makes such a critter any more.

Phil:

In over 25 years of going to hamfests, I've never seen such a thing.

> Policy Reference - it's a good policy to use the proper plug for the
> socket rather than poke wires into the holes.......

Could such a plug be fashioned by embedding some plain pins of
the proper diameter into an epoxy-resin base of some sort? I can
think of several ways to do this, ranging from crude to somewhat
refined, depending on the materials at hand and the ingenuity of
the person making the plug.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2422. Re: You can't pass this item up!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 05:59:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020326005956.21793.00000081@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 38363

In article <oZKn8.5617$se.559026@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> writes:

>
>> http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=1341648551
>
>> (ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½) 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>Gee... Hans... now who could have submitted that one??? ;-)
>
>Clever... I liked it....

What I can't figure out is how the bidding got all the way up to $.02???

73 de Larry, K3LT

2423. Re: Straight Dope on CW's Future?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 05:59:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020326005956.21793.00000080@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 38364

In article <yi2n8.8410$Tk.482758@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
<K0HB@earthlink.net> writes:

>> But what about the public policy aspects. Is there a band plan
>> for bow and arrow?
>
>Yes, in point of fact there is. In my state special hunting seasons
>are set aside for archers, and archers are allowed to hunt in some
>areas that are closed to firearms.

Hansl:

This is true in virtually every state in the country, since arrows don't
fly as far or as fast as bullets, and have a much shorter effective range.
Point?

>> Is there any FCC involvement in that sport?
>
>Why in the world would the FCC be involved in archery?
>Talk about strained analogies!

Amen!

>> Are there organized groups out there sharpening their knives
>> to do away with ranges for bow and arrow?
>
>Nope. Neither is anyone sharpening their knives to
>do away with CW "ranges". CW is in fact the most favored
>mode in ham radio, in that it allowed on virtually all of
>our assigned spectrum, and I have seen NO effort to
>diminish that generous allocation.
>
>> No, sorry, your analogy is, as usual, off the point.
>
>To the contrary, Cecil's analogy was precisely on point.
>
>> Yes, sirree, it's all about HAVING FUN! And gee, I thought
>> we boomers were the FUN generation! Little did I know that
>> REAL GEEZERS were all about FUN!
>
>But Cecil didn't say "it's all about having fun". In fact he
>attached PRIMARY importance to emergency communications.
>Your distortion of his position is dishonest at best!
>
>> Turn out the lights, folks, its all over.
>

>That's what the curmudgeons were saying 40+ years ago when
>I qualified for my first license, but ham radio just keeps getting
>better and better.

Of course, we'll never know how good it could have been if we had
maintained our superior licensing standards!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2424. Re: Straight Dope on CW's Future?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 10:45:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020326054525.08023.00000192@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 38368

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Of course, we'll never know how good it could have been if we had
>maintained our superior licensing standards!

It would be more accurate to say we don't know what the effect would have been. Those that are capable of achievement do so with our without "superior licensing standards." I would like to think that I am a good example of that. I was licensed at a time when the standards to obtain full amateur priveleges were a lot easier than they are now.

Most hams exceed the standards that they had to meet to be given a license. You have done that, too, Larry.

I do not see any problems in ham radio today that I attribute to the nature of the present ham tests. Enforcement? Much of the conduct that gets Riley's attention is done by hams who have met the standards you say are superior. Dumb questions? I sure had 'em, and some patient old timers answered them without railing on me and my license class.

I am sure they were around, but they didn't have rrap to give their sense of self importance a much needed boost.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2425. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 10:45:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020326054530.09499.00000146@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 38367

>Subject: Re: Question Pools and Such!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/26/02 00:01 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020326000106.27329.00000027@mb-bd.aol.com>

>WHY?!?

Why not?

Steve

2426. Re: OT - Plug Needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 10:46:51 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020326054651.08023.00000193@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 38369

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>> I don't think that Amphenol even makes such a critter any more.

>In over 25 years of going to hamfests, I've never seen such a thing.

I've seen them, used as internal connections in some older tube-era consumer electronics. I have the HQ hams scouring their junk boxes for Hans.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2427. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 10:48:52 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020326054852.08023.00000194@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 38370

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> The reason Cecil and others believe you don't seriously
>> want CW to continue is because your comments here simply
>> do NOT convey any great dedication to the mode. It
>> is as if you want CW to die out so you can then say..."See,
>> I told you so." Your mileage may vary...but that IS
>> the perception YOU have created for yourself.

> I suppose when idiots are doing the perceiving, that is what should be
>expected.

That is what I have perceived the effect of your statements to be, too, Dick.
Do you believe that I am an idiot and that Amateur Radio would have been better
off had I not become a ham?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2428. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 10:50:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020326055007.08023.00000195@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 38371

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Of course you don't, Brian, especially you hope to meet the same
>dumbed-down requirements yourself, someday -- like in 2027?

I hope that by 2027 I can meet my full potential as an Amateur Radio operator.
I expect to continue to grow over time.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2429. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 10:54:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020326055405.08023.00000196@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 38373

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>The ARRL took it upon itself to force 13wpm code (disguised as
>Farnsworth Code, not Morse Code) on unsuspecting newbies who don't know any
>better.

Most knowledgeable people believe that Farnsworth-sent code is easier to learn and copy than non-Farnsworth code. It may take a bit more time to learn to hear the letter rather than count dits, but this is, IMHO, more than offset by the fact that the applicant has more time in between characters to recognize the letter.

A second advantage is that it makes it easier for the student to continue on to higher code speed and develop proficiency.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2430. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 10:54:38 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <OrYn8.6577$Eb5.619549@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38372

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C981382.2A4235C4@worldnet.att.net...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> > This is not the place to hash it out but I would be wary of blanket
> > statements like that one Brian. Sounds too much like Digital Good,
Morse
> > Bad, New Good, Old Bad.
> >
> > Dick BK
>
> Dick, everyone dishes out one-liners on occasion where they are truly
called
> for (like now) but what would you expect from a fella who knows nothing
else?

I have lived to regret a few of mine. Someday I will understand the attitude, NOT. One of my friends, a Life Actuary now teaching applied Math at a good state engine school, wanted to outlaw kids going to school within 300 miles of their home. He got tired of what boiled down to enrolling at UW Stevens Point (not where he teaches but where he lived at the time) with the idea that 'yah I need to get a job but I won't let 'em change me, I'm already perfect'. We are seeing the same thing here.

Back in my coaching days I asked an old bridge partner who happened to be a shrink about 13 year old boys. His response was that with three exceptions they are adults (probably why churches bless the pubic hair) Experience, Identity Separate from the Herd, and the realization that long-term goals require short-term sacrifice, the ability to set priorities, plan, and execute it. Without the last they are crummy daddies and we sure as hell have enough of that, without the identity there is no value filter, and without the experience if one spends enough time ducking it there is no adulthood. Kind of a mind-bender at the time and since. He did a lot of work for the reformatory in Green Bay BTW.

It's called the Peter Pan Syndrome: I will never grow up.

2431. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 10:56:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020326055605.08023.00000197@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 38374

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> I memorized the Q&A in junior high school and then got a EE degree.

> Well, there you have it, folks. Memorize the Q&A and get your EE degree.

Yes, one can do that. One can also get an EE degree first, or not at all, or
get an EE degree and never get a ham ticket.

Is there a point to your pointing out the obvious?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2432. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 10:58:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020326055805.08023.00000198@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 38375

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>Christ they already give yo the answers,

>I'll thank you to leave Him out of this

Do you now believe that you have the right to tell Him where he can and cannot go? Some believe that He is in everything. He might take some exception to your "no Christs allowed" proclamation.

I will, of course, leave it to Him to deal with.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2433. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 11:03:23 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020326060323.08023.00000199@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 38376

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

> Stop changing what I say! YOU said it isn't worth learning, not me. I said
>it is
>so much worth learning that the FCC should require hams to learn it!

That may be the message you would like to convey, but over and over again, you have expressed that idea much closer to:

> And I DID NOT say "no one would learn it". I said so few will that it will
>die out as a viable useful mode.

Do you think that saying that so few will learn it that it wil die out as a viable, useful mode will encourage newcomers to learn it and use it? If all of the experienced old-time hams said that Morse code is a dying mode that few will bother to learn, what do you think newcomers will infer from that statement?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2434. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 11:08:36 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020326060836.08023.00000200@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 38377

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>But I have been advised to practice head copy to increase my speed.
>Head copy requires recognizing words.

Yes, but in doing so, perhaps you can use the same mental techniquez that you use to recognize printed words that contain a typo. After all, you probably did not get thrown for a loop when you saw the typo in the above sentence.

Or, perhaps names. If a ham says "NAME GEORGI," especially if an overseas ham, the I at the end probably will not throw you.

What is probably happening is that when you copy a word with an unexpected character, your error-checking routines kick in. In reality, if the word is relatively unimportant, perhaps you can not care whether you made a mistake that does not influence your overall understanding of what was being sent. If you can copy NAME GEORGI okay, then your fear of having made an error is probably causing you to miss the next words.

It is only a QSO, so if you get the ham's name and call right, you can miss as much of the rest as happens, with no change to the Universe of any import. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2435. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 11:10:51 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020326061051.08023.00000201@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 38378

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>That's the way I am now and I am limited by how fast I can print.

That is the reason for the advice to just listen. If you are I are talking, you are not writing down every word. You may take notes of important things. That listen and write notes technique may not help you with the unexpected, but it will let you copy CW faster than you can write.

I can write about 25 wpm, but head copy up to 55 wpm on a good day, 45 on a bad.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2436. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 14:05:43 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ua0v0bkmjb9ne7@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38379

Dick Carroll wrote:

>Val is one of the few who clearly would learn it even if not required.

This is correct, for two reasons:

1) For me, code is simply a part of my received wisdom about amateur radio, from many years ago. So, I just wouldn't "feel right" unless I learned how to operate CW.

2) I've seen it in operation, close up, for some time, and have seen how efficient it is. A couple of times a year I head out to a semi-remote place for what is called a "star party." In fact, several hundred other amateur astronomers go to the same relatively remote place, all at once, and set up telescopes, swap stories, observe the sky, you name it. The idea of stetting up a station at such an event, and communicating back here to Columbia, on only a few watts, and maybe off a handfull of AA batteries, really and truly appeals to me!

Val

2437. Re: Remotely Controlled HF for New Upgrades?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 14:49:34 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <2U%n8.1926$Ya2.87796@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38381

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote >

>
> Scary prospect, isn't it?
>

No.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
Most Reverend Keeper of the Codes of Q

2438. Re: Remotely Controlled HF for New Upgrades?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 14:54:46 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ua11s4in0av645@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38380

K0HB wrote:

>It is my considered opinion that everyone who wants
>to be on HF is already there, and that the awaited drop
>of Morse testing will result in only a modest trickle of
>new HF operators.

Hm. Even the trickle will be modest!

If this turns out to be true, and I guess it could, what then
will have all the angst about code actually have been
about? The impression that has been given is of a
great oppressed population, yearning to be free -- on HF!
You mean there really isn't anyone there?

Scary prospect, isn't it?

Val

2439. KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 15:49:19 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ua152i91d1gk85@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38382

Hello, all!

I did not get a direct reply to my question about what will happen on HF after code testing once-and-for-all goes away, probably within a couple of years. However, in another thread, KOHB stated that in his opinion the post-code-testing "flood" of new operators on HF would be only a "modest trickle," because "everyone who wants to be on HF is already there," or something to this effect. Is this view widely held?

That is, the general impression I have received, which could certainly be in error, is that code testing has created a great pent-up mass of VHF-only operators, and others, who are at the ready to instantly leap onto HF if only the "hazing ritual" be done away with.

But can it be true that there is NO "pent-up mass" out there, in actual fact, and that it's really and truly true that "everyone who wants to be on HF is already there" -- code test or no? I find this hard to believe, for a couple of reasons.

First, if the above is true then why all the angst about code and code testing? Did no one ever CHECK and see just how many folks really WERE being held back or kept out of amateur radio due to the testing for code? If KOHB is right, well, apparently no one ever did that, and the whole "pent-up mass" could in fact caucus inside a phone booth, relatively speaking!

This seems like a substandard way to make policy, at least to me. Where have I gone wrong?

Secondly, who in fact has been the driving force behind the whole NCI business if not those who either were themselves, or were speaking for, the presumed great mass which was being kept off HF, or out of amateur radio, by code testing? If that mass doesn't really exist then I have to confess my amazement. What's it all REALLY been about if "everyone who wants to be on HF is already there?

Imagine that after the Emancipation Proclamation, and the War of Northern Aggression, we had found that in truth and fact there simply WERE no slaves to free, and that the whole thing had been an, er, misunderstanding! Wouldn't THAT have been a deal, eh?

Is something like this actually happening, today, with respect to those people assumed to be held back by code and code testing? That is, at the end of the day, and after the Amateur Radio Civil War Over Code, the victims of same DON'T REALLY EXIST?!

Staggering, if true, in my view, that all the blood-letting has been for nought.

So, what HAS it all been about, if KOHB is right?

Val

2440. Re: Remotely Controlled HF for New Upgrades?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 16:07:09 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ua163s5pq708bd@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38383

K0HB wrote, in response to my statement about
the "scary" prospects for amateur radio if his comment
was true about end of code testing NOT resulting in
many new HF operators:

>No.

Sorry, not sufficient, at ALL!

Val

2441. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 16:19:42 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020326111942.02252.00000069@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 38384

In article <20020326001020.28502.00000018@mb-mt.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>
>Just HOW did you check your "copy," Boris?

I just handed my copy to Comrade Natasha, who's usual response was "That's none of your business."

>Did you whip out your one-time pad and decode the groups?
>
>Does the DoD, NSA, and CIA know what you did?

Probably not, since it was just copying practice.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2442. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 16:19:42 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020326111942.02252.00000068@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 38385

In article <3c9fea67_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>
>By the way, I am not Dick Carroll or Larry Roll, or Dave Heil.

>Kim W5TIT

For which, my colleagues and I are eternally grateful!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2443. Spark & CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 16:30:31 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <ua18h081rul23a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38386

I'm just wondering, and really not to start the same old fight all over again...

When spark was on its way out, was there as much dissention in the literature of the day as there appears to be with CW today? Arguments that if the kids don't learn spark, they will never be "real" hams? That spark can be done with an automotive coil and a battery in an emergency, while other modes require circuitry? That spark needs to be a permanent part of the spectrum to preserve history?

Just some thoughts, mindya...

Jim

2444. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 17:12:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020326121200.02252.00000070@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 38389

In article <ua152i91d1gk85@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>
>That is, the general impression I have received,
>which could certainly be in error, is that code
>testing has created a great pent-up mass of
>VHF-only operators, and others, who are at
>the ready to instantly leap onto HF if only the
>"hazing ritual" be done away with.

Val:

The "pent-up mass" of VHF-only operators have, for the most
part, already matriculated to HF by taking of the liberal grandfathering
provisions of Restructuring. Eliminating the "hazing ritual" for good
won't really have as great an impact, because there will still be the
necessity to take the written tests. That will continue to keep a lot
of people out of ham radio. Only a "license in the cereal box" type
of total giveaway would have any chance of creating a mass influx
of the type you're talking about, and even then, it is doubtful. Probably
one of the biggest surprises of Restructuring is the way we've seen it
as NOT being the answer to ham radio's growth woes. Let's face
it -- were competing against the Internet, cell phones, wireless
everything -- ham radio doesn't stand a chance. This hobby/service
is on it's way out, one way or the other.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2445. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 17:12:01 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020326121201.02252.00000072@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 38387

In article <20020326055805.08023.00000198@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>>Christ they already give yo the answers,
>
>>I'll thank you to leave Him out of this
>
>Do you now believe that you have the right to tell Him where he can and
>cannot
>go? Some believe that He is in everything. He might take some exception to
>your "no Christs allowed" proclamation.
>
>I will, of course, leave it to Him to deal with.

Ed:

I was referring to invoking His name in the manner used in the original posting. I do realize that He is involved in all things, to an extent, but perhaps not in such a great extent here. After all, His Father gave us free will to think and act on our own.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2446. Re: Straight Dope on CW's Future?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 17:12:01 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020326121201.02252.00000071@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 38388

In article <20020326054525.08023.00000192@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
writes:

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
>>Of course, we'll never know how good it could have been if we had
>>maintained our superior licensing standards!
>
>It would be more accurate to say we don't know what the effect would have
>been.

Ed:
Ed:

I think it can be somewhat accurately predicted. Amateur Radio would
have continued to grow at a low but steady rate, and we would not have
the "balkanization" we have now if there were no possibility of reducing
or eliminating code testing standards. Sure, the whiners would still be
with us, but their whining wouldn't be getting them anywhere, unless and
until they stopped whining and applied the same energy to learning the
code.

> Those that are capable of achievement do so with our without "superior
>licensing standards." I would like to think that I am a good example of
>that.

>I was licensed at a time when the standards to obtain full amateur priveleges
>were a lot easier than they are now.

Perhaps, but at a later point on the timeline of ARS' history, more
comprehensive and challenging standards were adopted, and prospective
hams continued to achieve them with little or no problems.

>Most hams exceed the standards that they had to meet to be given a license.
>You have done that, too, Larry.

Maybe so, but once again, I have to make it clear that this debate is
not about me. I don't consider myself to have been anything particularly
special as a prospective ham, especially since it took almost fourteen
years for me to convince myself to glue my butt to the chair and make
a legitimate effort to learn the code.

>I do not see any problems in ham radio today that I attribute to the nature
>of the present ham tests.

Of course you don't Ed, because you make your living working for
an organization which MUST, by it's very design, have a positive outlook

with regard to the future of the ARS. The rest of us are free to see
the real world for what it is.

>Enforcement? Much of the conduct that gets Riley's
>attention is done by hams who have met the standards you say are superior.

I've always gone out of my way to make it clear that I acknowledge that very
same fact. And virtually 100% of the violations made by these Pre-
Restructuring Extra-class hams involve behavior witnessed while operating
on the HF phone bands. It has nothing to do with CW or code testing.
Microphones are what cause on-the-air chaos, and it is the desire to get
an HF microphone in one's hot little hand which is the primary motivation
behind the reduction/elimination of code testing. The cause/effect
relationship is crystal clear. Keep in mind, I'm not so much a CW-lover
as I am totally disenchanted with HF phone. I embrace all of the HF
non-voice modes, mainly because that's where the better operators
seem to be.

>Dumb questions? I sure had 'em, and some patient old timers answered them
>without railing on me and my license class.

Actually, I did not have the same experience.

>I am sure they were around, but they didn't have rrap to give their sense of
>self importance a much needed boost.

Well, I'll have to give you that one. We all seem to be so affected.

>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

73 de Larry, K3LT
73 de Larry, K3LT

2447. Re: Straight Dope on CW's Future?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 17:43:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203260943.56cfbc9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 38392

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:<u9hdmfbpekgo8e@corp.supernews.com>...

> [I haven't seen N2EY's fourth installment on the
> history of amateur radio. Has it appeared?

Still undergoing update. Will be posted when ready. You can
see older versions in google.

> Here is the original message:

> --

> W1RFI wrote, in connection with a comment that without
> the licensing requirement CW, which has great intrinsic
> value, will likely fall into disuse:
>
> >Then why don't you say that CW Morse has value and is
> >worth learning even if one is not tested for it? When
> >you say that it has value but that no one will learn it
> >unless they are required to do so by the circumstance
> >of the test you are sending a very confused message.
>
> Perhaps it is your message that is just a bit confused.
> I think that the concern revolves around the band plans and
> what will happen when a relatively small number of amateurs
> use CW in an environment where the changing of standards
> is swelling the ranks of Hams in general, no pun intended,
> and airspace is getting more and more crowded with every
> passing year. That is, what else can the ultimate result
> of the testing changes be other than, in the end, more hams,
> and by extension, more hams who know nothing about CW?
> This seems pre-ordained to me. Am I wrong?

I think it's too early to tell.

Consider the following:

1) The 2000 restructuring has only produced an increase of about 8000
hams in almost two years. Compare the total license and new license figures
for the period since April of 2000 and for an equal length of time before
April 2000. N0BK's "wet firecracker" description sums it up pretty well.

2) For many years the USE of CW/Morse has been mostly driven by forces other
than legal ones. Sure, it had to be learned for the test, but those who had
no interest in the mode had no requirement to actually use it - just as those
without technical interest have no requirement to build anything.

3) Band plans are a whole 'nother ball of wax that is in constant motion. Oddly enough many of the digital folks want to contain the expansion of the 'phone/image subbands on HF.

> Sure, the mode is "valuable" and sure it will remain "in use"
> for that reason. But once it loses its official support, and
> once it falls to a fringe within the fringe that is amateur
> radio, how long before the band plans change and it becomes
> a fugitive on the waves, which will start the ultimate slide?

That depends entirely on USE of the mode. Many of us who actually USE CW/Morse will continue to do so and encourage others to do the same.

> Hasn't all of this been in the works for about 30 years now?

More like 25.
>
> That is, from my reading and talking to other hams, it seems
> that very few of the "all-in-one" rigs that have ever been made
> can do a truly top-notch job with CW. That is, for today's big
> commercial makers it's NEVER been a priority. And what do
> I see this month in big, glossy ads in QST? A lot of all-in-one
> rigs, as the flagships.

Sure. But some of them do a wonderful job, and those interested in CW/Morse have learned to find the rigs that are best for it. Or they build rigs, either from scratch or kits. In addition, used equipment is plentiful and often inexpensive for what you get. For example, a 15 year old Ten Tec Corsair II, loaded with filters, will do an excellent job on CW/Morse and costs less than most new bottom-of-the-line rigs.

> So, it's a bit, er, ah, of a dodge to
> say that CW will just get along once testing goes away. Where
> is any commercial support for it, hm? I don't see much, other
> than QRP . . . which by its very nature is small potatoes
> expense-wise, at least in comparison with towers, beams
> and amps. There isn't likely to ever be big money in little
> tiny amps and antennas, I don't think.

Ham radio is not a big money item anyway.

Suppose there are 500,000 active US hams, and they each spend $1000/yr on new equipment. That's only a $500 million dollar market, total.
>
> It seems to me that there's an avalanche, a slow-motion one,
> headed down the mountain, and in my view, CW is at the
> bottom of the hill ready to be buried. And I don't think
> anything is going to stop it.
>
> Am I wrong?

I think it's way too early to tell.

> -- End original message --
>
> Now, I'm sure I've made some errors, perhaps of fact, perhaps
> of interpretation. But, the main elements are:
>
> ** How can the end of code testing NOT lead, eventually,
> to a dramatic decline in the use of the mode, especially in
> relative terms. Won't this happen because the combination
> of the already extant relative decline in CW use, coupled
> with the undoubted relative increase in the numbers of
> un-coded hams, will lead, as sure as night follows day,
> to ever-increasing pressure on CW in the band plans?

Maybe. But there is also reverse pressure from digital folks.
And there may not be a flood of new hams - just look at what has
not happened since April 2000.

> For
> instance, what will NCI do when the code test goes way?

Its founder, Bruce Perens, has said that there will no longer be
any need for the organization to exist once its stated objective
has been achieved.

> I think I can guess, can't you? And who will resist this
> pressure, with any effectiveness? I don't see anyone.

NCI's executive director (WA6VSE) has stated here that he
personally OPPOSES expansion of the phone/image subbands.
>
> ** Sooner or later, won't CW be severely cut back, or
> even removed, in the band plans, especially since there
> is very likely to be organized pressure to do exactly that?

All depends on usage.
>
> ** Finally, and at the last ditch, isn't it true that CW is
> hardly a cash-cow for the big commercial makers?
> That is, isn't it VERY unlikely that their economic interests
> would ever lie in promoting the voluntary use of code on the
> bands? I think this statement is likely true. And won't that
> lack of economic interest create a subtle, or even non-subtle,
> atmosphere at QST to, er, ah, not rock any mode boats?
> Human nature is human nature, after all, and their advertising
> budget is already under pressure, or so it says in the March
> issue. The gun looks loaded to me, regardless of what
> anyone on the staff actually thinks or believes!

If that's the case, it's been that way for decades.
>
> Once again, how far off am I, regardless of the goodness
> or badness or the whateverness of the outcome, in your
> individual opinion? That is, what IS gonna happen, do

> you think, to CW and to the band plans? And WHY is
> that going to happen?
>
> Now, I guess it's anyone's Constitutional right to say
> something like "The future is hard to predict, yadda,
> yadda. . ." but that would hardly be either interesting
> or helpful. How about some intellectual activity!

What really matters is what happens on the amateur bands in question. If they are full of hams using CW/Morse, that will speak louder than any argument here. And if they are empty of CW/Morse but jammed with SSB, that will speak louder too.

So let me say this, Val - what do YOU want to happen? You can influence the future - just go for that General and/or Extra and USE your favorite mode(s) on the air.

Listen to, say, 40 or 20 meters CW during a contest like the CW SS, DX 'test or Field Day. All that activity is generated by a few thousand stations - probably more like a few hundred on any given band at any given time. The bands can be that busy all the time if we USE them.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2448. Re: Spark & CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 17:44:36 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <8s2o8.2475$Ya2.108382@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38393

"Jim Weir" <jim@rst-engr.com> wrote

> When spark was on its way out, was there as much dissention in the
> literature of the day as there appears to be with CW today?

Every change in the rules stirs up some entrenched interest
group. There are still folks bitching about dis-incentive
licensing.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
Most Reverend Keeper of the Codes of Q

2449. Re: OT - Plug Needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 18:23:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CA0BC92.A4CB899C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 38394

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >> I don't think that Amphenol even makes such a critter any more.
>
> >In over 25 years of going to hamfests, I've never seen such a thing.
>
> I've seen them, used as internal connections in some older tube-era consumer
> electronics. I have the HQ hams scouring their junk boxes for Hans.

The last time I checked (admittedly some years ago), Vector still made
such a critter.

Dave K8MN

2450. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 19:04:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020326140408.18297.00000099@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 38397

In article <eDTn8.273$t01.203@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
<K0HB@earthlink.net> writes:

>> How many Navy "radio ops" have had to train at being automatic
>> morse decoders in the last 30 years?
>
>None. They didn't decode Morse -- they simply copied it down.
>A cryptologist then decoded the hard copy.

Just out of curiosity, WHICH "Navy" were you a morseman in?

TTY and on-line encryption/decryption were already a part of
the United States Navy in 1940. Just how do you think the
"Red" and "Purple" Japanese intercepts were disseminated to
USN units in early 1941? Manual copy on a mill?!?!?

Note: The USN developed the poly-key "rotor" machine which
the US Army adopted in 1939. That code was NEVER
compromised through intercepts.

What do you think ex-CWO (USN) Walker was stealing full
information about in the seventies? Hint: On-line crypto
equipment that bypassed error-prone manual morse methods
in favor of getting it direct over any comm circuit.

For two decades the boomers of the USN have been cruising
around depending on non-morse methods of full alert and
launch orders. Are you going to propagandize morsemanship
in the USN and say they had sparkies in the radio rooms in
the 1980s?!?!?

"Let's Pretend" was a 1940s kiddies show on radio. If you want
to extend that to some fantasy fairyland sixty years later, be
my guest. Just don't try to command believeability on telling
fairy stories all about How It Was in the 1930s and then moving
it ahead by thirty to forty years.

This is the year 2002.

2451. Re: Spark & CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 19:04:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020326140409.18297.00000100@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 38398

In article <ua18h081rul23a@corp.supernews.com>, "Jim Weir" <jim@rst-engr.com>
writes:

>I'm just wondering, and really not to start the same old fight all over
>again...

...he said, tongue firmly planted in cheek... :-)

>When spark was on its way out, was there as much dissention in the
>literature of the day as there appears to be with CW today? Arguments that
>if the kids don't learn spark, they will never be "real" hams? That spark
>can be done with an automotive coil and a battery in an emergency, while
>other modes require circuitry? That spark needs to be a permanent part of
>the spectrum to preserve history?

Absolutely! Damn kids of today anyway who didn't appreciate the
skill, perseverence, and absolute dedication of the old sparkies!

When vacuum tubes arrived it was just like being handed
everything! Might as well have non-spark licenses included
in oatmeal cannisters as give-aways! Dumbed-down testing
all about those unneeded "tubes" when it was all about
TELEGRAPHY and the skill of TUNING to head-copy noise!

>Just some thoughts, mindya...

...and another small incendiary device thrown in there to fan
the flames of the superiors of the Arcaic Radiotelegraphy
Service, their dedications and sacrifices. :-(

2452. Re: OT - Plug Needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 19:04:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020326140410.18297.00000102@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 38395

In article <20020326054651.08023.00000193@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
writes:

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
>>> I don't think that Amphenol even makes such a critter any more.
>
>>In over 25 years of going to hamfests, I've never seen such a thing.

Roll is a technical moron, is barely able to discern which end of
the soldering iron is the hot end. If he can "copy" random-
character code groups in morse "for practice," then he is hardly
an authoritative voice of what electronic hardware was available
a quarter century ago. Pfui.

Hint: "Amphenol" didn't make that little molded plug that fit a
7-pin miniature tube socket.

>I've seen them, used as internal connections in some older tube-era consumer
>electronics. I have the HQ hams scouring their junk boxes for Hans.

Phil might like one. Hans is too busy promoting Old Navy.

2453. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 19:04:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020326140410.18297.00000101@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 38396

In article <20020326111942.02252.00000069@mb-fc.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <20020326001020.28502.00000018@mb-mt.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>
>>Just HOW did you check your "copy," Boris?

>Probably not, since it was just copying practice.

...so you just sat there and copied nonsense-appearing groups.

HOW DID YOU KNOW IF THE COPY WAS *CORRECT?*

"Accuracy transcends speed..."

2454. Re: IN LOVING MEMORY OF A SILENTKEY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 19:51:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA0D144.1BF73E93@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38399

mike coslo wrote:
> Did W7FEZ write a book once, Cecil? I remember a book about becoming a
> Ham, I think it was printed sometime in the 1980's, maybe a little
> later. It was one of my favorites when I was just getting into the hobby.

He never mentioned it to me.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2455. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 19:55:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA0D21D.C52CF943@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38400

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3C9D0725.785096D5@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Is this an unusual problem? Are there any solutions?
>
> I'd suggest some serious random character copying practice. I got
> mine from the 5-character spy stations. I'd sit and copy them for
> about 15-minutes at a time several sessions a day. Got to 20 WPM
> really fast that way. Are they still on-the-air -- or has the end of the
> Cold War caused them to go QRT? I haven't really looked for them
> for several years.

I'm trying to learn head copy, Larry, because I can only print about
15wpm. What good will random character practice do if I don't write
them down?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2456. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 19:57:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA0D2B6.2AF8DD30@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38451

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> And naturally, Brian finds it easier to whine about it than to make the
> effort to actually do it.

Larry, when are you going to stop whining about Brian?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2457. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 20:01:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA0D386.40A70ABB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38452

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Jerry Oxendine wrote:
> > > ... but I do notice that folks tend to
> > > memorize the tests, plug in a radio, and never continue the study that will
> > > unlock a whole fascinating world
> >
> > I memorized the Q&A in junior high school and then got a EE degree.
>
> Well, there you have it, folks. Memorize the Q&A and get your EE degree.

It wasn't a bad way to go, Dick. Ham radio got an ignorant young ham but
the world got an Electrical Engineer.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2458. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 20:05:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA0D494.710F66E2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38453

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3C9EAA04.75634B11@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Dick Carroll wrote:
> >> The only thing holding you back is your own impatience. Getting good
> >> at it takes time.
> > >
> > >I've been at it for 51 years. Exactly how much time are you talking about?
> >
> > As long as it takes. Think how good a CW op you'll be by 2105!

I haven't been impatient. I suspect I've simply reached my limit.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2459. Re: Straight Dope on CW's Future?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 20:09:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA0D580.6DC833E8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38454

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Of course, we'll never know how good it could have been if we had
> maintained our superior licensing standards!

And we'll probably never know if it would have died because of
the outdated licensing standards.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2460. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 20:18:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA0D781.799861B4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38455

Valentine Germann wrote:
> So, what HAS it all been about, if KOHB is right?

If ham radio would have been the same with and without the code
requirement, then then answer is obvious. The governmental code
requirement is unnecessary. All unnecessary governmental requirements
should be eliminated. Do you disagree?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2461. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 20:18:19 UTC
From: RussellTodd@istoreplus.net
Message-ID: <217b8ae4.0203261218.42dfc78b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 38456

In my opinion, and make note that I speak for no one but myself, and in my experience, the people who whine the most about "no code" are the plug-n-play-CB-Radio crowd who got on VHF because the test was easy. Again, this is based on my experience. In my opinion, not only would HF all sounding like 14.313 or 3950, there would be a run on Linear Amps by people who have no idea of what they are doing or why and we'd end up with HF signals getting into everything from phones to toasters and the population in general hating Ham operators.

I am in agreement that the "loud cry" is from a very small group of people who don't want to jump through the necessary hoops to "earn" HF privelages. If they have "learning disabilities" give them wheelchairs with CB's on them but for gods sake don't let them on HF. The Code test is more than just memorizing the code. There is a state of mind that comes with code that the "no coders" are dismissing and failing to understand. Why don't we just get rid of that darn bothersome "driving" part of the drivers license and just take the written test? While we're at it, lets not make those surgeons do internships at hospitals and let them just get on with it after the written test.

I don't think the Pro-Coders are asking for anything unreasonable. Its not "hazing", its not punishment, and so what if everyone and their brother has a cell phone and code MAY NOT be relevant in the next nuclear holocaust? Its a necessary part of the progression from plug-n-play-CB-er to bonafide Radio Opeator who understands what happens when you push the button in on the microphone.

While I don't think there is a large mass of "no-coders" waiting for Lincoln to free them from the slavery of VHF, I do think that every idiot that has $2,000 will go out and buy an HF rig and turn HF into shit over a 2-year period of time after the code is dropped. I don't care what the figures say, (figures never lie but liars figure) the percentage of the population that is attracted to Ham radio is never going to be as much as the no-coders claim. We're an unusual group of strange people that think RF is more fun than sitting in front of a tv or computer screen or any other interest.

Keep the code or every moron from here to eternity is going to be on HF. If you think its bad now, you ain't heard nothing yet!

2462. Re: Remotely Controlled HF for New Upgrades?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 20:20:59 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <LK4o8.3120$Ya2.129560@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38457

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote

> Sorry, not sufficient, at ALL!
>
> Val

You asked a simple question. I responded with a simple
answer. If that's a problem, go to http://www.amishrakefight.org/gfy
for additional detail.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2463. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 20:29:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020326152905.00434.00000262@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 38458

>Subject: KOHB's Modest Trickle!
>From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>Date: 03/26/02 10:49 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <ua152i91d1gk85@corp.supernews.com>

>.....and others, who are at
>the ready to instantly leap onto HF if only the
>"hazing ritual" be done away with.

What hazing ritual?

steve

2464. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 20:31:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020326153134.00434.00000263@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 38459

>Subject: Re: 15wpm hump
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/26/02 14:04 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020326140408.18297.00000099@mb-fp.aol.com>

>This is the year 2002.

From a guy whose war stories ALL center around 1950-something, the
question that begs asking is..."what's your point"..???

2465. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 20:34:56 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <QX4o8.3138$Ya2.131017@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38460

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

> >> How many Navy "radio ops" have had to train at being automatic
> >> morse decoders in the last 30 years?
> >
> >None. They didn't decode Morse -- they simply copied it down.
> >A cryptologist then decoded the hard copy.
>
> Just out of curiosity, WHICH "Navy" were you a morseman in?
>
> on-line encryption/decryption were already a part of
> the United States Navy in 1940.

Bullshit!

Sorry Mr. Nonpar Ticipant, but you asked a question about
Navy radio ops decoding Morse. I answered your question
accurately. Now you wish to divert attention from your
question dumbass question with some reference to what
you watched and didn't understand on the history channel.

Good luck on this one now!

73, de Hans, K0HB

2466. Re: IN LOVING MEMORY OF A SILENTKEY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 20:50:23 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CA0DF10.63717F9B@psu.edu>
Source record: 38462

I'll have to head to the library to check the book's Author out again.

- Mike -

CAM wrote:
>
> mike coslo wrote:
> > Did W7FEZ write a book once, Cecil? I remember a book about becoming a
> > Ham, I think it was printed sometime in the 1980's, maybe a little
> > later. It was one of my favorites when I was just getting into the hobby.
>
> He never mentioned it to me.

2467. Re: Spark & CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 20:52:59 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Lc5o8.7615$se.715587@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38463

"Jim Weir" <jim@rst-engr.com> wrote in message
news:ua18h081rul23a@corp.supernews.com...
> I'm just wondering, and really not to start the same old fight all over
> again...
>
> When spark was on its way out, was there as much dissention in the
> literature of the day as there appears to be with CW today? Arguments
that
> if the kids don't learn spark, they will never be "real" hams? That
spark
> can be done with an automotive coil and a battery in an emergency, while
> other modes require circuitry? That spark needs to be a permanent part
of
> the spectrum to preserve history?
>
> Just some thoughts, mindya...
>
> Jim

Ever try building a coherer??

There are better historians than me in the group but beyond a few ozone freaks I doubt if spark's passing was mourned all that much. It was not all that easy to do and believe it or not there were AM stations that were basically spark. The Ford coil transmitter from a cannibalized Model T (and their buzz box was a different caper than the Kettering ignition BTW) was largely mythology. And the rise of broadcast radio made it something of a dead duck long before it was outlawed.

And do not envision it as tube-type equipment sprung full blown. The state of the art for many years was raw unfiltered AC so it probably did not sound a whole lot different until electrolytics came out in cheap quantities. Even four mikes of paper, foil, and wax cap is a wonder to behold.

By and large the Amateur Service is not anti-technology although things usually have to get pretty cheap. The sideband wars were fought on the ham bands and better technology won. One offshoot of that is the use of LSB below 10 MHZ where the rest of the world is USB only; the wars were over before the standard was set and tradition lives on. And I would suspect that the rather disasterous experiences with Amateur repeaters on 15 kHz splits influenced a lot of commercial and government users at the time although 12.5 on UHF is no big deal today.

The major changes in the technology of Amateur Radio tend to be driven by the availability of high-grade Junque and they are not always smooth. The

whole hobby had to learn about linear amps in the 50s; some of the groupies recall getting enthused over 'grounded grid' linears with varying results. Build we must.

So I am not too sure the situations are comparable. You make a basic assumption that tradition reigns and tradition is the only reason for maintenance of a cw test. You are simply wrong on both counts.

Dick NBK

2468. Re: Straight Dope on CW's Future?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 20:54:27 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ua1mui4c8oqrb5@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38461

N2EY wrote, after I stated that the ultimate result of all the recent testing changes has to be MORE hams, and by extension, more hams who don't care about CW:

>I think it's too early to tell.
>
>Consider the following:
>
>1) The 2000 restructuring has only produced an increase
>of about 8000 hams in almost two years. Compare the total
>license and new license figures for the period since April of
>2000 and for an equal length of time before pril 2000. N0BK's
>"wet firecracker" description sums it up pretty well.

Hm. So, would it be correct to say that the creation of the current Technician license DID have an effect, and DID bring more people into the fold, in a burst that started ten or so years ago. Then, as the 1990s went on, some of those folks DID qualify with code at the first level, and it was these same folks, and mostly them alone, who came onto HF in a big way HF after April, 2000, restructuring. That is, there was no real influx of NEW people onto the HF bands, OR into amateur radio, when the code requirement was dropped to 5 wpm for ALL license classes. Would that be right?

>2) For many years the USE of CW/Morse has been mostly driven
>by forces other than legal ones. Sure, it had to be learned for the
>test, but those who had no interest in the mode had no requirement
>to actually use it - just as those without technical interest have no
>requirement to build anything.

Well, right, in that there never has been a legal REQUIREMENT to USE CW on the air, am I right? However, was it not a fact that if one took the trouble to learn code at 13 wpm, or some higher level, then it occurred to at least SOME people that it sure would be silly NOT to use it, since it worked so well for some things? Would that be a fair statement? That is, THIS is the argument I think I am seeing from some code supporters. Does this idea hold any water?

>3) Band plans are a whole 'nother ball of wax that is in constant
>motion. Oddly enough many of the digital folks want to contain
>the expansion of the phone/image subbands on HF.

That would be "odd" only if they were the same ones wanting to put an end to code testing, and by extension erode the long-run numbers of people with an interest in CW. Would THAT be a fair statement? Is everyone going to just be friends now?

[As for the future of the band plans and CW]:

>That depends entirely on USE of the mode. Many of us who
>actually USE CW/Morse will continue to do so and encourage
>others to do the same.

Yes. And if CW has allies in the digital ranks, well, that will
bode well for the future of CW in the band plans, at least for
a good while, say 10 to 20 years. Would that be fair?

[snip items about commercial interest in CW, which has
been small for quite some time, though some transceivers
do accomodate the mode.]

>Ham radio is not a big money item anyway.
>
>Suppose there are 500,000 active US hams, and they each
>spend $1000/yr on new equipment. That's only a $500 million
>dollar market, total.

That's a fair-sized market, I think! That's half a billion dollars!
And looking at QST and its advertising, the ratio between HF
and VHF related ads is at least FOUR-TO-ONE, in full-page
ads, and higher than that in smaller ones. That is, if there IS
any real money in amateur radio, it does seem to be in HF.
Is that a fair statement?

[In response to my comment that the new testing procedures
must inevitably lead to more hams and more non-CW hams]:

>Maybe. But there is also reverse pressure from digital folks.
>And there may not be a flood of new hams - just look at what
>has not happened since April 2000.

That is VERY interesting, and well could explain the rush to
now do away completely with code testing, in hopes of finally
having the desired effect. And if this does not work, will
elimination of the written exams follow?

[About NCI and band plans]:

>Its founder, Bruce Perens, has said that there will no longer be
>any need for the organization to exist once its stated objective
>has been achieved.

>NCI's executive director (WA6VSE) has stated here that he
>personally OPPOSES expansion of the phone/image subbands.

So, everyone WILL just be friends now, and NCI will go away?

[Finally, about the future of CW]:

>What really matters is what happens on the amateur bands in
>question. If they are full of hams using CW/Morse, that will speak
>louder than any argument here. And if they are empty of CW/Morse
>but jammed with SSB, that will speak louder too.

>
>So let me say this, Val - what do YOU want to happen? You can
>influence the future - just go for that General and/or Extra and USE
>your favorite mode(s) on the air.

I intend to do this, and to promote CW within the local club here.
However, I would like to know the speed of the current I will be
rowing against!

>Listen to, say, 40 or 20 meters CW during a contest like the CW SS,
>DX test or Field Day. All that activity is generated by a few thousand
>stations - probably more like a few hundred on any given band at any
>given time. The bands can be that busy all the time if we USE them.

This brings to mind a whole bunch of other interesting questions,
which I will bring up later in other threads. Thank you very much
for your reply here. It has been a very big help!

Val

2469. Re: Straight Dope on CW's Future?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 21:14:41 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <5x5o8.7642$se.717373@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38466

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ua1mui4c8oqrb5@corp.supernews.com...
>
> This brings to mind a whole bunch of other interesting questions,
> which I will bring up later in other threads. Thank you very much
> for your reply here. It has been a very big help!
>
> Val

This refarming and bandplan thing has two other things worth considering:

1) U.S. Phone bands have been restricted forever to give the rest of the world a place to hide. Whether this is a consideration to the FCC today is an open question but it is the tradition.

2) You might find the SSB vs AM wars back in the 50s and 60s instructive. Both modes were legal in the phone bands. The sidebanders went to the high side (also very traditional) the big AMers went low and the middle was a war zone. SSTV has had a similar history as has RTTY and digital modes. Proves only that we can handle conflict more or less and that ultimately mode wars are settled by use and effectiveness far more than regulatory fiat.

So asking a fiat for digital modes is kind of non-traditional but possibly worth it to either get it going or laugh it out of existence real quick.

Dick NBK

2470. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 21:16:43 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <%y5o8.7643$se.717654@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38467

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ua1o8bdo6vk302@corp.supernews.com...

are incandescently uninteresting
> to me at this point.
>
> Val
>

Is that like arousing a firestorm of apathy???

2471. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 21:16:46 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ua1o8bdo6vk302@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38464

CAM wrote, in response to a message concerning
the startling implication that the CW testing might not
have been anywhere near as big a problems for
amateur radio as some claimed, as follows:

>If ham radio would have been the same with and without
>the code requirement, then then answer is obvious. The
>governmental code requirement is unnecessary. All
>unnecessary governmental requirements should be
>eliminated. Do you disagree?

Your continued misunderstandings, which by now have
to be seen as deliberate, are incandescently uninteresting
to me at this point.

Val

2472. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 21:19:51 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ua1oe7dtoq2n74@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38465

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote, in reference to my
use of "hazing ritual" concerning code testing:

> What hazing ritual?

Well, you know, THAT "hazing ritual," the one
with all the electronic theory in it. Ham Radio is never
going anywhere until all that nonsense is eliminated! :-)

Val

2473. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 21:42:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA0EB3E.6053E0ED@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38470

Russell Todd wrote:
> In my opinion, not only
> would HF all sounding like 14.313 or 3950, ...

You mean all of HF would sound like 13wpm and 20wpm coded hams?

> The Code test is more than just memorizing the code. There is a state
> of mind that comes with code that the "no coders" are dismissing and
> failing to understand.

Sounds like the religious ham version of "Once Morsed, Always Morsed".
Where in Part 97 is that "state of mind" described? Does the "state
of mind that comes with code" ensure that SK hams go to ham heaven?

> I don't
> care what the figures say, (figures never lie but liars figure) the
> percentage of the population that is attracted to Ham radio is never
> going to be as much as the no-coders claim.

Huh????? It's the PCTA folk who are afraid that HF will be overrun by
masses of unwashed CBers.

> Keep the code or every moron from here to eternity is going to be on
> HF. If you think its bad now, you ain't heard nothing yet!

When I got on HF in 1951, most of the AMers were predicting that
SSB would be the ruin of ham radio. "If you think QRM is bad now,
just wait until the band is covered with Single Sidewinders." I
assume you would have been one of those hams?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2474. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 21:44:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA0EBB7.E1BE7808@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38471

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
> >.....and others, who are at
> >the ready to instantly leap onto HF if only the
> >"hazing ritual" be done away with.
>
> What hazing ritual?

The hazing ritual that Dick brought up. Unless I am mistaken,
Dick brought up the hazing ritual for the first time this year.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2475. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 21:49:40 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ua1q62e6toubb0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38468

Russell Todd wrote, in response to my message about
CW testing and what is going to happen on HF after it is
eliminated:

>In my opinion, and make note that I speak for no one but
>myself, and in my experience, the people who whine the
>most about "no code" are the plug-n-play-CB-Radio crowd
>who got on VHF because the test was easy.

No doubt these people exist. However, the venom that this
debate has generated points to something deeper, something
involving people who have made it to the top, or nearly to the
top, of the heap. And then we have the people who think that
just because they're hot stuff in some other radio life they
should automatically be hot stuff in amateur radio lfe. But not
too many of THOSE folks are INSIDE the tent. . . are they?

>In my opinion, not only would HF all sounding like 14.313 or
>3950, there would be a run on Linear Amps by people who
>have no idea of what they are doing or why and we'd end up
>with HF signals getting into everything from phones to
>toasters and the population in general hating Ham operators.

Ouch! But that WOULD sell a LOT of amps, right? That would
be good, wouldn't it? Just kidding.

>I am in agreement that the "loud cry" is from a very small group
>of people who don't want to jump through the necessary hoops
>to "earn" HF privelages.

This has occurred to me, too. But maybe those folks have SOME
HF privileges, but not ALL of those privileges. Maybe, some people
just couldn't stand it that there was ANYone "above" them, especially
due to something as "sillly" as a 20 wpm, or 13 wpm, code test.

>If they have "learning disabilities" give them wheelchairs with CB's
>on them but for gods sake don't let them on HF.

That must have been AWFUL, the abuses there.

>The Code test is more than just memorizing the code. There is
>a state of mind that comes with code that the "no coders" are
>dismissing and failing to understand. Why don't we just get rid
>of that darn bothersome "driving" part of the drivers license and
>just take the written test? While we're at it, lets not make those
>surgeons do internships at hospitals and let them just get on with
>it after the written test.

Careful, your're waxing mystical here, something that just drives
the code opponents wild (or seems to), though I understand it!

>I don't think the Pro-Coders are asking for anything unreason-
>able. Its not "hazing", its not punishment, and so what if every-
>one and their brother has a cell phone and code MAY NOT be
>relevant in the next nuclear holocaust? Its a necessary part of
>the progression from plug-n-play-CB-er to bonafide Radio
>Operator who understands what happens when you push the
>button in on the microphone.

You see, this is what I have always thought, too! But even in
Europe they're abandoning it!

>While I don't think there is a large mass of "no-coders" waiting
>for Lincoln to free them from the slavery of VHF, I do think that
>every idiot that has $2,000 will go out and buy an HF rig and
>turn HF into shit over a 2-year period of time after the code is
>dropped.

I wonder about this. From what others have said there just ain't
that great mass of folks out there chomping to get on HF and
duke it out with the current denizens there. I guess we'll see, and
pretty soon, too! And, in spite of current opinion, if the demons
are in fact unleashed, who will put them back into their place?
I wonder about THAT, too!

>I don't care what the figures say, (figures never lie but liars
>figure) the percentage of the population that is attracted to
>Ham radio is never going to be as much as the no-coders
>claim. We're an unusual group of strange people that think
>RF is more fun than sitting in front of a tv or computer screen
>or any other interest.

This is true, and helps support the idea that there will NOT be
a flood of new people onto HF. Could it be that anyone
with enough of an interest to spend the money on HF, which
ain't cheap, one way or another, doesn't actually view, and didn't
actually view, or wouldn't actually view, code as that much of
a problem, if it were/had been retained in a reasonable way?
Could it be that the long-run baby HAS been thrown out with
the short-run bath water?

>Keep the code or every moron from here to eternity is going
>to be on HF. If you think its bad now, you ain't heard nothing
>yet!

Yeah, I was just over on the "DX" newsgroup and reading
about all the "lids" involved in that "Ducie" station business.
I can't wait to get involved in things like that . . . NOT!

Val

2476. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 21:53:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA0EDD2.6CF1CB7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38472

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> CAM wrote, in response to a message concerning
> the startling implication that the CW testing might not
> have been anywhere near as big a problems for
> amateur radio as some claimed, as follows:
>
> >If ham radio would have been the same with and without
> >the code requirement, then then answer is obvious. The
> >governmental code requirement is unnecessary. All
> >unnecessary governmental requirements should be
> >eliminated. Do you disagree?
>
> Your continued misunderstandings, which by now have
> to be seen as deliberate, are incandescently uninteresting
> to me at this point.

Val, you either are for or against unnecessary governmental
requirements. Libertarians are agin' 'em.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2477. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 21:53:52 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ua1qdua99mir5c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38469

Richard McCollum wrote, concerning my
incandescent uninterestedness in CAM's
postings:

>Is that like arousing a firestorm of apathy???

By golly, yes, that's EXACTLY what it's like!
You're incandescently correct! :-)

Val
(About a week to go before that callsign appears!)

2478. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 22:18:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA0F39A.E12C948F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38473

Valentine Germann wrote:
> No doubt these people exist. However, the venom that this
> debate has generated points to something deeper, something
> involving people who have made it to the top, or nearly to the
> top, of the heap.

Some thought they were the top of the heap 'till the FCC moved
the heap. :-) Some hams tried to substitute CW skill for technical
expertise and are now paying the price for their foolishness.

> Careful, your're waxing mystical here, something that just drives
> the code opponents wild (or seems to), though I understand it!

You mean like CW falling through the cracks in Shannon's Theorem?

> Could it be that anyone
> with enough of an interest to spend the money on HF, which
> ain't cheap, one way or another, doesn't actually view, and didn't
> actually view, or wouldn't actually view, code as that much of
> a problem, if it were/had been retained in a reasonable way?

Or conversely, if amateur radio would be the same with or without
a code requirement, then a code requirement is unnecessary. In
other words, the cost of HF gear may be a greater barrier to
entry than the code requirement.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2479. Re: OT - Plug Needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 22:23:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203261423.435346a3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 38474

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.gtfttr1.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> Does anyone have a source for the male cable plug that would mate
> with a 7-pin miniature tube socket?
>
> I don't think that Amphenol even makes such a critter any more.
>
> Policy Reference - it's a good policy to use the proper plug for the
> socket rather than poke wires into the holes.......
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane <k2asp @ arrl.net>

Phil,

AES is one source, but their online catalog is down for revamping:

http://www.tubesandmore.com

I have some in the inventory, but it will be the weekend before I can look to see if they are 9 pin or 7 pin. Have plenty of sockets if needed.

A request on the newsgroup

rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors

and/or the "glowbugs" reflector may turn something up.

Fabrication from a tube socket and epoxy is quite practical but time consuming.

What equipment needs such a plug?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2480. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-26 22:41:23 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <a7qtej$1ljg$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 38475

W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote:
>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>>If "bits is bits" in a digital system, then we should have no trouble
>>machine copying Dick's "Banana Boat Swing."
>
>Bits is bits, but if the bits are not transmitted in a determinate state, they
>cannot be received so.
>
>To date, humans are the best decoders of things like banana boat swing,
>especially those that sometimes send dahs shorter than dits. (I have heard
>this.) Humans have a capability of pulling together a complete picture from a
>partial description. I don't believe that the way humans do that is understood
>well enough yet that it has been duplicated in code.

Computers also have the capability of pulling together a complete picture
from a partial description, it is just best done differently. FEC
implmenented using convolutional coding takes the bit stream you want
to transmit and transforms it into different stream, with more bits
(i.e. it adds redundancy), where each bit in the resulting stream depends
on a number of bits of the original data (i.e. you can lose some bits from
the resulting stream without losing information about the original data).
The Viterbi decoder at the receiver then takes the possibly errored bits
that were received and classified as "I think it is a 1", "I think it is a 0"
or "I don't know" and guesses at the most probable state for the original
data based on whatever it managed to receive.

The fact that computers can be highly effective at recovering the
underlying bit stream from partial data coded in this way is why the
general design of coding schemes for a noisy, narrow-bandwidth channel
is:

- squeeze as many of the bits, and hence as much redundancy as possible
out of the digital representaiton of the source information, by
compression or other minimal coding. This gives you a bit stream which
represents whatever information you are trying to send with as few bits
as possible but which is fragile, in that if there is little redundancy
remaining then the loss of even a single bit can make a substantial amount
of information unrecoverable (it is this redundancy removal that gives
compressed digital voice its all-or-nothing property).

- Then add the redundancy, and the bits, back in the form of FEC that the
receiver can use effectively to guess at the underlying data based on
partial or errored reception of the transmitted bit stream.

Computers hence can also be very efficient at extracting intelligence
from crap, it is just that they're best off doing so with data coded for

computer consumption rather than people consumption and this makes drawing an apples-to-apples comparison of the effectiveness of each kind of decoder a bit difficult. Comparing each in their application "sweet spot", I think computers have a fundamental advantage over OOK CW due to their ability to make use of 100% duty cycle modulations which put minimal energy in the harmonic sidebands. This seems to apply further up the feeding chain as well, actually. I saw a Bell Labs press release recently crowing about how they managed to get 2.5 Tbps through a single 2,500 mile long fiber, and they apparently managed this by replacing the OOK CW modulation traditionally used for optics with some form of PSK.

Of course, no matter what the theoretical advantages and disadvantages, the devil is in all the implementation details and some humans represent a pretty good implementation of the problem of digging intelligence out of crap SSB and CW/Morse signals, so it wouldn't surprise me if people sometimes still do better than a PC soundcard software implementations of even theoretically good digital modes. As for CW/Morse-decoding software, however, I'll bet the best implementations aren't the ones hams can buy, but rather are possessed by certain 3-letter-acronym government agencies who aren't likely to publish their results.

Dennis Ferguson

2481. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 00:08:19 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CA10D81.B779267A@adelphia.net>
Source record: 38476

Here is where I have an issue. We have many modes that are not tested
for, yet they thrive, or at least have enough people using them that you
can try them out, and find someone to communicate with. I've been having
fun with many different modes since getting my ticket.

Yet here we have a mode which many of it's supporters believe will
disappear or die out if prospective hams do not learn the mode as a part
of the licensing requirement.

If this were truly the case, it isn't a mode worth keeping.

Not that I personally believe that, but that is surely the impression I
get from reading these threads.

- Mike - KB3EIA

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> > Stop changing what I say! YOU said it isn't worth learning, not me. I said
> >it is
> >so much worth learning that the FCC should require hams to learn it!
>
> That may be the message you would like to convey, but over and over again, you
> have expressed that idea much closer to:
>
> > And I DID NOT say "no one would learn it". I said so few will that it will
> >die out as a viable useful mode.
>
> Do you think that saying that so few will learn it that it wil die out as a
> viable, useful mode will encourage newcomers to learn it and use it? If all of
> the experienced old-time hams said that Morse code is a dying mode that few
> will bother to learn, what do you think newcomers will infer from that
> statement?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

2482. Re: Straight Dope on CW's Future?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 00:09:24 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020326190924.22568.00000301@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 38477

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Of course you don't Ed, because you make your living working for
>an organization which MUST, by it's very design, have a positive outlook
>with regard to the future of the ARS.

I can see discussing things with you is a waste of my time. If that is the effect you wished, you got your wish. If that is not the effect you wished, you weren't very bright about forseeing the consequences of your continually spouting this nonsense.

Ed

2483. Re: OT - Plug Needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 00:54:22 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gtlo3u8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 38478

On 26 Mar 2002 05:59:55 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>> Does anyone have a source for the male cable plug that would mate
>> with a 7-pin miniature tube socket?
>>
>> I don't think that Amphenol even makes such a critter any more.
>
>In over 25 years of going to hamfests, I've never seen such a thing.

Oh it did exist as a regular commercial item, which is why I used a
tube socket as the add-on accessory socket on an old radio that
I'm trying to resurrect.

A kind soul here found one in the "parts bin" and is shipping it off.

Someone in the "boatanchor" community suggested that I smash a
burnt-out matching tube and use the base as a plug. Besides
not having any tube equipment or spares in inventory any more,
did anyone ever try to solder to those miniature-base iron
pins?

With thanks to all who responded.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2484. Re: Spark & CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 02:03:29 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <RL9o8.276$u96.17434749@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38479

"Jim Weir" <jim@rst-engr.com> wrote in message
news:ua18h081rul23a@corp.supernews.com...
> I'm just wondering, and really not to start the same old fight all over
> again...
>
> When spark was on its way out, was there as much dissention in the
> literature of the day as there appears to be with CW today? Arguments
that
> if the kids don't learn spark, they will never be "real" hams? That spark
> can be done with an automotive coil and a battery in an emergency, while
> other modes require circuitry? That spark needs to be a permanent part of
> the spectrum to preserve history?
>
> Just some thoughts, mindya...
>
> Jim

Jim, I wasn't there. You'll have to ask Dick.

73, Brian

2485. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 02:05:24 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <EN9o8.278$K46.17230996@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38480

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020326121200.02252.00000070@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article <ua152i91d1gk85@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
> <vgermann@socket.net> writes:
>
> >
> >That is, the general impression I have received,
> >which could certainly be in error, is that code
> >testing has created a great pent-up mass of
> >VHF-only operators, and others, who are at
> >the ready to instantly leap onto HF if only the
> >"hazing ritual" be done away with.
>
> Val:
>
> The "pent-up mass" of VHF-only operators have, for the most
> part, already matriculated to HF by taking of the liberal grandfathering
> provisions of Restructuring. Eliminating the "hazing ritual" for good
> won't really have as great an impact, because there will still be the
> necessity to take the written tests. That will continue to keep a lot
> of people out of ham radio. Only a "license in the cereal box" type
> of total giveaway would have any chance of creating a mass influx
> of the type you're talking about, and even then, it is doubtful. Probably
> one of the biggest surprises of Restructuring is the way we've seen it
> as NOT being the answer to ham radio's growth woes. Let's face
> it -- were competing against the Internet, cell phones, wireless
> everything -- ham radio doesn't stand a chance. This hobby/service
> is on it's way out, one way or the other.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry, growth or no, keeping an irrelevant licensing requirement isn't the
purpose of the government.

73, Brian

2486. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 02:10:32 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7r9r6$5bs$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38481

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020326054530.09499.00000146@mb-cs.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Question Pools and Such!
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 03/26/02 00:01 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20020326000106.27329.00000027@mb-bd.aol.com>
>
> >WHY?!?
>
> Why not?
> Steve

Because there is NO reason for "EVERY" ham to know CW.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2487. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 02:12:21 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <9U9o8.279$f66.17295639@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38482

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ua1o8bdo6vk302@corp.supernews.com...
>
> CAM wrote, in response to a message concerning
> the startling implication that the CW testing might not
> have been anywhere near as big a problems for
> amateur radio as some claimed, as follows:

Unnecessary regulations are always a problem. Irrelevant Morse exams are worse, because 1) there are no other mode exams, and 2) they deny access to some people for no good reason.

Brian

2488. Re: Straight Dope on CW's Future?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 02:30:32 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7rb0l$2u5$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38484

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020326121201.02252.00000071@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article <20020326054525.08023.00000192@mb-cr.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
(W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> >
> >>Of course, we'll never know how good it could have been if we had
> >>maintained our superior licensing standards!
> >
> >It would be more accurate to say we don't know what the effect would have
> >been.
>
> Ed:
> Ed:
>
> I think it can be somewhat accurately predicted. Amateur Radio would
> have continued to grow at a low but steady rate, and we would not have
> the "balkanization" we have now if there were no possibility of reducing
> or eliminating code testing standards. Sure, the whiners would still be
> with us, but their whining wouldn't be getting them anywhere, unless and
> until they stopped whining and applied the same energy to learning the
> code.

So Larry, Dick, etc. just how do you explain the "international"
support for ending code testing? I have read ad nauseum how
this was all an FCC "done deal" regarding code testing in the US.
Is the direction we see towards ending code testing and/or
significantly reducing it an international "done deal"? If yes,
who drove the deal?

> >I do not see any problems in ham radio today that I attribute to the
nature
> >of the present ham tests.
>
> Of course you don't Ed, because you make your living working for
> an organization which MUST, by it's very design, have a positive outlook
> with regard to the future of the ARS. The rest of us are free to see
> the real world for what it is.

Ed, Larry sez there are problems. You just have to take
his word for it. The fact that he can't articulate any problem(s)
isn't important...you just gotta believe ol' Larry.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2489. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 02:30:50 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <u9ao8.283$di6.17880312@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38483

"Russell Todd" <RussellTodd@istoreplus.net> wrote in message
news:217b8ae4.0203261218.42dfc78b@posting.google.com...
> In my opinion, and make note that I speak for no one but myself, and
> in my experience, the people who whine the most about "no code" are
> the plug-n-play-CB-Radio crowd who got on VHF because the test was
> easy. Again, this is based on my experience. In my opinion, not only
> would HF all sounding like 14.313 or 3950, there would be a run on
> Linear Amps by people who have no idea of what they are doing or why
> and we'd end up with HF signals getting into everything from phones to
> toasters and the population in general hating Ham operators.

Morse Code taught me nothing about amplifiers or toasters. What did it
teach you?
As a matter of fact, Morse Code isn't even defined in Part 97. Must not be
very important.

> I am in agreement that the "loud cry" is from a very small group of
> people who don't want to jump through the necessary hoops to "earn" HF
> privelages.

I'm sure you meant to say "unnecessary hoops."

If they have "learning disabilities" give them
> wheelchairs with CB's on them but for gods sake don't let them on HF.
> The Code test is more than just memorizing the code. There is a state
> of mind that comes with code that the "no coders" are dismissing and
> failing to understand.

Coders apparently also dismiss and fail to understand. A fair number of
people who jumped through the unnecessary government hoops want to see the
exam eliminated.

Part 97 does not define the "state of mind" that you seek from amateurs.
Please elaborate.

> Why don't we just get rid of that darn
> bothersome "driving" part of the drivers license and just take the
> written test? While we're at it, lets not make those surgeons do
> internships at hospitals and let them just get on with it after the
> written test.

Agreed, lets make the medical doctors take a Morse Code exam so that it will
qualify them to perform dentistry.

> I don't think the Pro-Coders are asking for anything unreasonable.

I think they are. They want the government to keep them supplied with folks to have a CW qso with, because they cannot sell it on its merits as other modes have to do.

> Its not "hazing", its not punishment, and so what if everyone and
> their brother has a cell phone and code MAY NOT be relevant in the
> next nuclear holocaust? Its a necessary part of the progression from
> plug-n-play-CB-er to bonafide Radio Opeator who understands what
> happens when you push the button in on the microphone.

Learning Morse Code taught me nothing of radio theory.

> While I don't think there is a large mass of "no-coders" waiting for
> Lincoln to free them from the slavery of VHF, I do think that every
> idiot that has $2,000 will go out and buy an HF rig and turn HF into
> shit over a 2-year period of time after the code is dropped.

Wowee!!! You mean like happened on 2M where the silence roars?

I don't
> care what the figures say, (figures never lie but liars figure) the
> percentage of the population that is attracted to Ham radio is never
> going to be as much as the no-coders claim.

What do they claim? How is it different from what the Coders have claimed? Please expand this idea.

We're an unusual group of
> strange people that think RF is more fun than sitting in front of a tv
> or computer screen or any other interest.

Not necessarily.

> Keep the code or every moron from here to eternity is going to be on
> HF. If you think its bad now, you ain't heard nothing yet!

Morse code failed the "riffraff" test. We need enforcement whether we have code exams or not.

73, Brian

2490. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 02:33:53 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <lcao8.285$_j6.17968283@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38485

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ua1q62e6toubb0@corp.supernews.com...
> And then we have the people who think that
> just because they're hot stuff in some other radio life they
> should automatically be hot stuff in amateur radio life. But not
> too many of THOSE folks are INSIDE the tent. . . are they?

?Its important that we keep out people who actually know something about
radio?

Now thats ass backwards.

2491. Re: You can't pass this item up!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 02:39:52 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Yhao8.289$yl6.18044949@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38486

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:asKn8.5028$ub3.2388@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=1341648551
>
> --
> (���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

Hans, can you run the "Little Billy Beeper" story again? It was a classic.
Brian

The latest in Ham Radio accessories!
He never built a Heathkit....
He never plugged in a Collins...
He never tuned up a Drake...
but man, Can he crank on a handie talkie!
Carefully pickled and ready for transplant
into your favorite nephew, you'll be blabbing
away on 2 meters in no time!
Choose "buy it now" and pay only what it's worth!
Thanks for looking!

This is a parody,in case you didn't know that.
Offended? Grow a sense of humor.

2492. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 02:41:25 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <pjao8.293$ml6.18034896@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38487

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020326061051.08023.00000201@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >That's the way I am now and I am limited by how fast I can print.
>
> That is the reason for the advice to just listen. If you are I are
talking, you
> are not writing down every word. You may take notes of important things.
> That listen and write notes technique may not help you with the
unexpected, but
> it will let you copy CW faster than you can write.
>
> I can write about 25 wpm, but head copy up to 55 wpm on a good day, 45 on
a
> bad.

Whats wrong with a code reader and a printer?

Brian

2493. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 02:46:33 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <doao8.300$hn6.18126945@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38488

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020326000105.27329.00000026@mb-bd.aol.com...
> In article <xf8n8.5$LJ2.2968@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
> <K0HB@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
> >
> >> Is this an unusual problem? Are there any solutions?
> >
> >It's a common problem. When training Navy radio ops it was called "word
> >anticipation", and we solved it by training the ops with completely
random
> >"nonsense" practice tapes. The character sequences ("words") were of
random
> >length and contained no recognizable words. Hard copy thus became a
> >completely automaton-ic connection between the eardrums and the
fingertips,
> >with no intervening conscious mental processing of any kind.
>
> Hmmm...that's right up there with knot-tying and sail-handling.
> Will the Navy ever get to iron hulls and steam power?
>
> How many Navy "radio ops" have had to train at being automatic
> morse decoders in the last 30 years?

The few required to sit in the Black Sea or along the 38th parallel and
listen to the occasional 3rd world traffic. There is no other reason.

2494. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 02:49:24 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Uqao8.302$yo6.18188319@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38489

"Jester" <maverick@topgun.comSPAM> wrote in message
news:gYpn8.147694$1g.12010339@bin3.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com...
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C9D0725.785096D5@IEEE.org...
>
> >
> > Is this an unusual problem? Are there any solutions?
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>
> Cecil, Many would tell you to help abolish the code test CW is not needed
> why waste your time studying. Thats just there opinion though is it yours
> too?

Huh?

2495. Help, FM Transmitter for the house

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 02:51:44 UTC
From: Pat <unclepoo2@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <4tao8.140124$q2.14165@sccrnsc01>
Source record: 38490

I am looking for a FM Transmitter for the house
I bought some time ago a Soundfeeder
It's horrible, It drifts only works on 1.5 volts, and barely puts out a signal
from recommendations of a Tech friend of mine, I made these modifications
1. Put on a 3.5 volt DC Power supply on it, and
2. put on a Standard size boombox whip antenna to replace the stub it comes with

These Modifications helped tremendously,
It made it so that the Soundfeeder, which previously barely put out a signal at all, can now be heard in my room
less than 30 feet away. However it can not be picked up all the way down the hall, and my brother would like to use it too

I want something that has the ability to broadcast over 30 feet in a shotgun style house
I don't wish to run anything illegal, or to cause any interference with anyone.
but I would appreciate any suggestions you have.
Preferably something not too expensive.

2496. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 02:55:14 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca2866b$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38714

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ua0v0bkmjb9ne7@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> >Val is one of the few who clearly would learn it even if not required.
>
> This is correct, for two reasons:
>
> 1) For me, code is simply a part of my received wisdom about
> amateur radio, from many years ago. So, I just wouldn't "feel
> right" unless I learned how to operate CW.
>
> 2) I've seen it in operation, close up, for some time, and have
> seen how efficient it is. A couple of times a year I head out to
> a semi-remote place for what is called a "star party." In fact,
> several hundred other amateur astronomers go to the same
> relatively remote place, all at once, and set up telescopes, swap
> stories, observe the sky, you name it. The idea of stetting up a
> station at such an event, and communicating back here to
> Columbia, on only a few watts, and maybe off a handfull of
> AA batteries, really and truly appeals to me!
>
> Val
>

Val, I have one question for you: will you judge other hams based on their feelings about CW? If one simply said, "I don't think CW should be a part of the testing strategy for an amateur radio license" would you then pounce upon the person as though they had just committed sin? *That* is where the difference is between people, as you seem, of reasonable nature, and people like Dick/Larry, et al.

Kim W5TIT

2497. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 02:58:00 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca28711$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38716

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA0D2B6.2AF8DD30@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > And naturally, Brian finds it easier to whine about it than to make the
> > effort to actually do it.
>
> Larry, when are you going to stop whining about Brian?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>

When's Larry going to just plain stop whining?

Kim W5TIT

2498. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 02:58:23 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <jzao8.308$Er6.18348048@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38491

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020326005954.21793.00000077@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <sx2n8.216922$uv5.18731391@bin6.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>,
"Jester"
> <maverick@topgun.comSPAM> writes:

> Not me. The only thing that would be acceptable to me would be to
> return to the Pre-Restructuring licensing standards.

Spark? What about electromagnetic compatability?

2499. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 03:02:14 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca2880f_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38718

"Russell Todd" <RussellTodd@istoreplus.net> wrote in message
news:217b8ae4.0203261218.42dfc78b@posting.google.com...
> In my opinion, and make note that I speak for no one but myself, and
> in my experience, the people who whine the most about "no code" are
> the plug-n-play-CB-Radio crowd who got on VHF because the test was
> easy. Again, this is based on my experience. In my opinion, not only
> would HF all sounding like 14.313 or 3950, there would be a run on
> Linear Amps by people who have no idea of what they are doing or why
> and we'd end up with HF signals getting into everything from phones to
> toasters and the population in general hating Ham operators.
>
> I am in agreement that the "loud cry" is from a very small group of
> people who don't want to jump through the necessary hoops to "earn" HF
> privelages.

That's the biggest misperception the FCC allowed to happen via using CW as a measure for ham licensing: allowing it to be thought that priveleges had to be "earned." They do not. "Earning" privileges has nothing to do with the quality of ham radio or the operator.

[SNIP] of crap

>
> Keep the code or every moron from here to eternity is going to be on
> HF. If you think its bad now, you ain't heard nothing yet!
>

And therein lies the problem with anything but written testing: it leads people to believe that it's OK to use CW as a filtering mechanism to "keep out" others.

Kim W5TIT

2500. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 03:02:53 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <xDao8.3828$Ya2.197638@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38492

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote

>
> Whats wrong with a code reader and a printer?
>

They don't work in most real world HF environments.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2501. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 03:06:20 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <MGao8.318$xv6.18548875@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38493

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020324190312.09243.00002676@mb-cs.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: California Hams!
> >From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
> >Date: 03/23/02 20:05 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <dD9n8.1177$JT5.91564321@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
>
> >> So, now, looking down the road again, do you see
> >> coming any pressure for the elimination of the CW-only
> >> parts of the various bands? I mean serious pressure,
> >> the kind of pressure that has done away with the testing.
> >
> >Who cares?
>
> All of those people for whom weak signal work is important, that's
who.
> Remebr, "CW" is NOT just manual Morse Code...There are numerous other
> applications for those segments of the bands.

Yes, there are. Some are actually digital.

> >The ARRL has. Which almost drove me away as a member.
>
> We'll get them to try harder next time, Brian. Just what WOULD it
take to
> get rid of you?

We're tighter than ever now that they got the picture.

> >Anyway, the sands of
> >time are scouring away the deep mental scarring of years of unnecessary
> >Morse exams.
>
> The only one's with "mental scars" are those who tried to "finagle",
worm,
> squirm, and otherwise try to find a way to NOT learn the code...Had they
put as
> much into learning it as trying to avoid it, it would have been a moot
point.

Well, not the only ones. I'm referring to those that did learn the code.
You're obviously scarred.

2502. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 03:09:46 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca289d4_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38723

CW testing is to ham radio as parallel parking is during a test for a driver's license. CW accomplishment proves nothing, nada, zip, zero for technical or operational skills and parallel parking proves nothing for measuring one's capability to be a safe or accomplished driver.

However, those who sound the horn of "let's keep 'em outta the hobby" probably also feel a lot safer with someone on the road moving at 60-70 mph right next to them...as long as they have passed their parallel parking test.

Kim W5TIT

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:3CA10D81.B779267A@adelphia.net...
> Here is where I have an issue. We have many modes that are not tested
> for, yet they thrive, or at least have enough people using them that you
> can try them out, and find someone to communicate with. I've been having
> fun with many different modes since getting my ticket.
>
> Yet here we have a mode which many of it's supporters believe will
> disappear or die out if prospective hams do not learn the mode as a part
> of the licensing requirement.
>
> If this were truly the case, it isn't a mode worth keeping.
>
> Not that I personally believe that, but that is surely the impression I
> get from reading these threads.
>
> - Mike - KB3EIA
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > > Stop changing what I say! YOU said it isn't worth learning, not me. I said
> > >it is
> > >so much worth learning that the FCC should require hams to learn it!
> >
> > That may be the message you would like to convey, but over and over again, you
> > have expressed that idea much closer to:
> >
> > > And I DID NOT say "no one would learn it". I said so few will that it will

> > >die out as a viable useful mode.
> >
> > Do you think that saying that so few will learn it that it wil die out
as a
> > viable, useful mode will encourage newcomers to learn it and use it? If
all of
> > the experienced old-time hams said that Morse code is a dying mode that
few
> > will bother to learn, what do you think newcomers will infer from that
> > statement?
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI

2503. Re: Straight Dope on CW's Future?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 03:11:15 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca28a2d_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38724

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020326190924.22568.00000301@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >Of course you don't Ed, because you make your living working for
> >an organization which MUST, by it's very design, have a positive outlook
> >with regard to the future of the ARS.
>
> I can see discussing things with you is a waste of my time. If that is
the
> effect you wished, you got your wish. If that is not the effect you
wished, you
> weren't very bright about forseeing the consequences of your continually
> spouting this nonsense.
>
> Ed

Yeah, see? It's maddening isn't it, Ed? We keep hoping that Larry has some sense of...well, sense. It's like trying to reason with a 3-yr old having a temper tantrum. It's useless...just walk away.

Kim W5TIT

2504. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 03:22:18 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <KVao8.330$lm6.18077830@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38494

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020325062608.16464.00000006@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >I know the ARRL didn't. That's why they were unprepared for the
noi/nprm.
>
> The ARRL sent a letter to the FCC before the NOI/NPRM came out.

A "letter?" What about your ex-parte presentation?

The ARRL had already been told to submit a proposal. The ARRL then conducted an unbelieveably faulty poll (which Mike Deignan called "substantive"), with poor interpretation of the data (government by polls were all the rage in those days), resulting in a "Status Quo" position. The FCC finally had to make a move. The ARRL was then notified that the NPRM (not an NOI) was impending, and forced to make a breakneck speed "proposal." The FCC unsuccessfully tried to incorporate this proposal in the NPRM, which then made the released NPRM incoherent. The FCC then tried to revise the mess, creating even more headaches. I commented on a lack of vision and leadership at the ARRL for allowing such a horrendous poll to be taken in the first place, and allowing a faulty poll to make their decisions.

> >But we've gone over this again and again.
>
> And changed history in the process. :-)

Not at all. Its all in our old posts, again and again.

Brian

2505. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 03:24:19 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <DXao8.331$Rv6.18565187@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38495

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C9EAB9C.BBE83EB4@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > Some of the PCTA folk wished to do away with code waivers and
> > > > > their wish was granted. Moral: Be careful what you wish for.
> > > >
> > > > Be careful what you say for you may be termed a liar. The existance
of waivers was
> > > > not the problem, their misuse was.
> > >
> > > Many of the PCTA folk believed that virtually all code waivers were
suspect.
> >
> > Virtually all were.
>
> Dick, you sure change your mind a lot. You said above that the existence
of waivers
> was not the problem but now you say virtually all waivers were suspect.
You cannot
> have it both ways.

Yes he can. He defies logic.

2506. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 03:28:56 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca28e51_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38730

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ua50hqc7qtlq33@corp.supernews.com...
>
> K0HB wrote, about the "Big Project" and my comment that it
> had to do with ARRL's efforts to get the FCC to interpose for
> amateur radio operators where local covenants are concerned.
>
>
> >Nothing of the sort. The "big project" is related to young people
> >and education.
>
> Well, yes, it involves "education," and I'm all for it. However, it is
> explained in an article that begins on p. 94 of the March issue that
> the "meta-purpose" behind the project is the advancement of ARRL
> efforts to influence the Congress, and others, concerning things like
> the CC&R problem. It is much more than "education for education's
> sake" since "the future of amateur radio is at stake" right now.
>
> Val
>

At the risk of sounding flippant: don't buy into the "demise of amateur radio" drumming that the ARRL does so well. It is the "threat" to amateur radio that is really the only way the ARRL knows how to "keep interest." Much like churches keep your interest and keep you coming by threatening the end of the world as though it will happen tomorrow. It's the only "business" they know.

The ARRL is a great organization that needs to learn how to pique the interest of folks to join by using other methodologies--not the same 'ol "threat-to-this-or-that" stuff that they've used for so long. While it's important business to keep abreast of issues that could threaten the hobby; I feel a lot of opportunities are missed due to this being the largest part of the ARRL's "business."

The future of amateur radio is in no worse shape now than it ever has been.

Kim W5TIT

2507. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 03:29:13 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <d0bo8.332$EG6.19144894@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38496

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020325062123.16464.00000004@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >> Do count the weak ones; the Morse guys are digging them out of the mud!
:-)
>
> >And what of the SSB Op who'se digging SSB signals out of the mud? Are
their
> >efforts somehow diminished because they're using the "wrong" mode?
>
> I made that suggestion to Carl because I know that he is not a very
experienced
> CW op, so if he made the comparison, I wanted to ensure he was doing so
based
> on real-world conditions.

Shouldn't it actually be easier for the CW Op, since it has is said to have
an advantage over all other modes?

> I believe that the SSB op who is doing the same is a good operator.
>
> Why do you feel that SSB is a "wrong" mode?

Because we're on r.r.a.p.

Brian

2508. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 03:34:36 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <g5bo8.333$jG6.19127509@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38497

"Richard McCollum" <rmcollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:Mxqn8.3622$Eb5.375618@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> news:iXkn8.11973$S35.2141080695@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Richard McCollum" <rmcollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:l0Sm8.1190$se.98802@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > > It has, BTW, the
> > > only real no-fault law in the US as well as some really good places
> for an
> > > expense account lunch.
> >
> > Nothing to brag about. No fault laws are bad.
> >
> >
>
> Not really compared to what they replace and the problem they are intended
> to solve.

My vision is the drunk or high lowlife with an '88 Cavalier and taped
taillights hits me and me and my insurance comany pay.

Lowlife goes about life in the usual miserable manner.

I pay the bills.

2509. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 03:37:44 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <c8bo8.335$9k6.17975555@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38498

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C981382.2A4235C4@worldnet.att.net...

> Dick, everyone dishes out one-liners on occasion where they are truly
called
> for (like now)

Thank you.

> but what would you expect from a fella who knows nothing else?

This from Dixie? What's Steve always saying about black cooking pots?

2510. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 03:38:27 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <T8bo8.336$zl6.19243307@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38499

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020325222837.21793.00000070@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <pskn8.11956$pl4.2138117318@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian
P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> However, a certain amount of
> >> uncomfortableness with the "new standard" is inevitable, in
> >> my view. We're all only human and therefore have weaknesses.
> > >
> > >I have no reservations about the exam you took or your qualifications to
be
> > >an amateur radio operator.
> > >
> > >Brian
> >
> > Of course you don't, Brian, especially you hope to meet the same
> > dumbed-down requirements yourself, someday -- like in 2027?

Try 1986.

2511. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 03:40:28 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Mabo8.337$WG6.19159224@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38500

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020326055007.08023.00000195@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >Of course you don't, Brian, especially you hope to meet the same
> >dumbed-down requirements yourself, someday -- like in 2027?
>
> I hope that by 2027 I can meet my full potential as an Amateur Radio
operator.
> I expect to continue to grow over time.

Larry might have a new "Favorite Minority on the Bus" by then. Let's hope
anyway. He won't be any farther ahead as an amateur, he's given up
self-inflicted SET's.

2512. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 03:42:06 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <icbo8.338$EL6.19401748@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38501

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C980FCE.5B3F3A8A@worldnet.att.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> > news:u9hempmc8kq3e7@corp.supernews.com...
> > >
> > > CAM wrote
> > >
> > > >Hope you realize that Dick and Larry will view you forever
> > > >as a post restructuring dumbed-down amateur radio operator.
> > >
> > > Well, I'm not sure of that at all.
> >
> > We are.
> >
> > > However, a certain amount of
> > > uncomfortableness with the "new standard" is inevitable, in
> > > my view. We're all only human and therefore have weaknesses.
> >
> > I have no reservations about the exam you took or your qualifications to
be
> > an amateur radio operator.
>
> And neither do I. You, on the other hand, forced yourself to wait for
yours on
> the Grate Dumbdown.

Dick, wipe the fog of time off your brain. I had HF priveleges in 86.
Brian

2513. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 03:44:39 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Hebo8.341$XG6.19160221@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38502

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a7kmq7kut1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> news:pokn8.11954$Jr4.2138529951@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> > news:u9g63ra03gmk94@corp.supernews.com...
> > > Today, with the QRZ site able to put up sample tests of almost
> > > any kind, I think the pools could be done away with, or
> > > made larger, or whatever, thus making the tests "harder."
> >
> > The QPs -are- larger (today).
>
> The reality is that the QRZ site uses the actual question pools.
> If published pools were done away with, anyone could
> still get all the questions via the QRZ site. It'd only
> take a day or so for all the questions to be published on
> the internet. (please, no counter arguments about copyrights
> since we all know how effective that approach is to
> limiting anything via the internet...and the questions are not
> copyrightable because they are products of/for federal
> regulations)
>
> Making the pools larger is one area I (as well as Ed Hare
> and others) have suggested, especially regarding formula/equation
> solving. There's no reason that the three varieties of ohms
> law (given two of the three variables of E, I and R) solve for the
> missing. If each variable had at least 10 values in the question pool
> that would create at least 200 possible answers when solving for
> the third. Not many people will just memorize that.
>
> > The exam you took is the old General and Novice
> > combined, and years of layering new stuff on top. It is far too
difficult
> > an exam for youngsters. While Pepsi and Mitsubishi are killing
themselves
> > trying to develop brand loyalty in the younger crowd, amateur radio
> bumbles
> > along...
> > We gotta make everything "harder" because code is being deemphasized.
My
> > only question is "Why?"
>

> Cause Larry, Dick and others want a "work ethic", a show
> of dedication, a variation of the "I walked to school 3 miles
> uphill both ways" mindset. AKA - The "I did it, so should you" crowd.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Exactly. Well, I could care less about pleasing Larry, Dick, Curley and Moe.

Brian

2514. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 03:47:24 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <ghbo8.343$JP6.19639476@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38503

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020325222838.21793.00000072@mb-ch.aol.com...

> Brian:
>
> All you gotta do is Czech out my record on QRZ.COM.

An amateur and a musician, too? Can I downoad your record in MP3?

Brian

2515. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 03:52:49 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <lmbo8.344$GR6.19739749@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38504

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a7kni0$dh2$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> news:YMkn8.11962$rV4.2140424331@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> > news:3C9A2D99.794DF847@ix.netcom.com...
> > > Might as well study for and do the extra. CW ain't that bad,
> > > maybe you'll get into it and have daily skeds with Larry while
> > > he's driving his bus. The test is done Farnsworth style, that
> > > is, 13 or so wpm characters with 5wpm spacing. Idea is that
> > > you will get faster quicker than with code sent with characters
> > > sent at 5wpm.
> >
> > Why? No where in Part 97 is there a line expressing the
> > government wants faster code.
> > The ARRL took it upon itself to force 13wpm code (disguised as
> > Farnsworth Code, not Morse Code) on unsuspecting newbies
> > who don't know any better. Now all the VEs are doing it.
>
> Brian,
> As you know, I am 100% against the code test.
> BUT, the reality of learning morse code is that it
> is better to learn to hear the characters
> at 13 wpm with 5 wpm spacing.

I'll let the government speak for itself. It says 5wpm Morse, not
Farnsworth code.

> In reality, that benefits the
> test taker because it gives more "dead space" time to
> process and identify what the character sent was. Use of
> "Farnsworth" makes far more sense that sending characters
> at 5 wpm.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

I don't disagree with that, however, we need truth in government. Our
national amateur organization, who is so concerned with the preservation of
one mode above all others, should petition the FCC and change "Morse" to
Farnsworth, and specify 13wpm.

If that's the way we're going to do things, lets change the regs to agree
with it.

Brian

2516. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 03:57:40 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Uqbo8.345$CP6.19634495@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38505

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020325222837.21793.00000071@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <YMkn8.11962$rV4.2140424331@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian
P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >Why? No where in Part 97 is there a line expressing the government wants
> >faster code. The ARRL took it upon itself to force 13wpm code (disguised
as
> >Farnsworth Code, not Morse Code) on unsuspecting newbies who don't know
any
> >better. Now all the VEs are doing it.
>
> And naturally, Brian finds it easier to whine about it than to make the
> effort to actually do it.

Larry merely want a welfare QSO because his favorite mode doesn't appear to
be capable of attracting new talent. Typical Liberal approach to life,
"Hey, lets get the government to force people to do what I want."

2517. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 03:58:34 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Krbo8.346$2S6.19759202@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38506

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020326055405.08023.00000196@mb-cr.aol.com...
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >The ARRL took it upon itself to force 13wpm code (disguised as
> >Farnsworth Code, not Morse Code) on unsuspecting newbies who don't know
any
> >better.
>
> Most knowledgeable people believe that Farnsworth-sent code is easier to
learn
> and copy than non-Farnsworth code. It may take a bit more time to learn to
hear
> the letter rather than count dits, but this is, IMHO, more than offset by
the
> fact that the applicant has more time in between characters to recognize
the
> letter.
>
> A second advantage is that it makes it easier for the student to continue
on to
> higher code speed and develop proficiency.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Then codify it.

2518. Re: OT - Plug Needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 04:06:41 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020326230641.21793.00000150@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 38513

In article <20020326190924.22568.00000301@mb-cv.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>Of course you don't Ed, because you make your living working for
>>an organization which MUST, by it's very design, have a positive outlook
>>with regard to the future of the ARS.
>
>I can see discussing things with you is a waste of my time. If that is the
>effect you wished, you got your wish. If that is not the effect you wished,
>you
>weren't very bright about forseeing the consequences of your continually
>spouting this nonsense.
>
>Ed

Ed:

Suit yourself, but I wish you'd at least explain to me what was untrue about my statement quoted above!

If I implied that your opinions regarding the future of the ARS wern't genuine and heart-felt, then I was obviously out of line. However, there is no denying that you are associated with the ARRL as a paid employee thereof -- and therefore, I think it unlikely that you would make statements in a public forum that would be contrary to your employer's interests -- or at least, it would seem to me that that would not be a very smart thing for you to do. You sure as heck aren't going to see me say anything that would cast public transit in a negative light. I know what side my bread is buttered on, and I know you do as well. And if you don't feel the need to provide adequate disclaimers on your opinions made in this newsgroup, then why would you object to someone pointing out some apparently obvious facts regarding your position?

You've got to keep one thing in mind here, Ed. From my earliest days as a radio amateur, my personal contacts with ARRL HQ officials have been tainted by what I have perceived as an indifferent, inhospitable, and sometimes callous attitude toward me as a rank-and-file member of the organization. This is nothing at all unique to my own personal experience; I've heard the same thing from hams I've discussed this with all over the country. So, if my own attitude toward ARRL HQ and it's personnel seems to be less than total enchantment, you'll just have to forgive me! This attitude of mine didn't form in a vacuum, it is the result of long, consistently negative personal experience. I go to Newington, expecting to be greeted with open arms like a true brother in the hobby of amateur radio, and am instead greeted with

the equivalent of "Who the hell do you think you are, what the hell are you doing here, and what the hell do you want?" -- and it goes downhill from there! All of this after uttering those truly objectionable words, "Hi, I'm Larry Roll, N3CRA -- and I came to see League HQ!"

So, go ahead and tune me out if that's what you want to do. Nothing I've ever said to you in this newsgroup was intended as anything other than an expression of reality as I see it. No personal disrespect was ever intended or implied. Quite the opposite; of all the ARRL HQ personnel I've personally met, I've found you to be refreshingly personable, friendly, and polite at all times. I disagree with you about the state of the ARS, particularly with respect to recent events in the licensing requirements, but I don't require you to agree with me in order for us to remain friends.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2519. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 04:06:42 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020326230642.21793.00000151@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 38507

In article <3CA0D2B6.2AF8DD30@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> And naturally, Brian finds it easier to whine about it than to make the
>> effort to actually do it.
>
>Larry, when are you going to stop whining about Brian?

I dunno, Cecil -- when are you gonna stop whining about people
whining about other people's whining?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2520. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 04:06:42 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020326230642.21793.00000152@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 38510

In article <20020326140410.18297.00000101@mb-fp.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>>>Just HOW did you check your "copy," Boris?
>
>>Probably not, since it was just copying practice.
>
>...so you just sat there and copied nonsense-appearing groups.
>
>HOW DID YOU KNOW IF THE COPY WAS *CORRECT?*

Lennie:

Don't look now, but I wasn't copying for the sake of *having* correct copy in-hand, although I was able to recognize the fact that I was copying correctly after a while. Of course, all I had were neat little 5-by-5 character groups on my paper, but so what? The fact that what I copied meant nothing to me didn't matter, I was just copying it for the sake of doing so, not to gather Intel. Having said that, I do believe that a couple of times I may have hit on the decoding key -- and I did "unscramble" a few "messages." However the decoded message was even more nonsensical to me than the scrambled character groups. If the message had been intended for me, I figure I would have understood it. Obviously, the crypto guys who devised that system knew their business.

BTW -- the messages I did "unscramble" were handed over to the XO of the base comm squadron. I never asked what they meant, and he never told me, but he did try to talk me into cross-training!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2521. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 04:06:43 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020326230643.21793.00000153@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 38508

In article <3CA0D21D.C52CF943@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>I'm trying to learn head copy, Larry, because I can only print about
>15wpm. What good will random character practice do if I don't write
>them down?

I used to use the random-character "spy" transmissions for both
"head" and "pencil" copying practice. It seemed to help me learn
not to anticipate what was going to be sent next, even though I
still have a problem with that when having 2X-CW QSO's. At least
I don't have a problem with basic character recognition, for which I
say the "spy" station practice was a big help. A lot of times, when
hams say they're having problems developing any useful copying
speed, they still don't have the entire alphabet/number/prosign sets
committed to completely reflexive recognition. And the only that
will come is through adequate, consistently applied practice.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2522. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 04:06:43 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020326230643.21793.00000154@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 38511

In article <3CA0D494.710F66E2@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>> >I've been at it for 51 years. Exactly how much time are you talking about?
>>
>> As long as it takes. Think how good a CW op you'll be by 2105!
>
>I haven't been impatient. I suspect I've simply reached my limit.
>--
>cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Cecil:

I've been saying the same thing about myself. I've been sitting at a fairly stable plateau of 18 - 20 WPM pencil copy and 25 - 30 WPM "head" copy for virtually my entire ham career. I'd love to get up to a solid, dependable 40 - 50 WPM like the big-scoring CW contesters, but compared to them, I'm just a beginner, from a standpoint of raw numbers of hours spent operating. I say that when it comes to any physical skill, repetitive practice is the thing that brings out the raw talent! Unless, of course, these 40 WPM-plus guys are just some sort of CW-savants, which could be the case.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2523. Re: Straight Dope on CW's Future?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 04:06:44 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020326230644.21793.00000155@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 38509

In article <20020326190924.22568.00000301@mb-cv.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>Of course you don't Ed, because you make your living working for
>>an organization which MUST, by it's very design, have a positive outlook
>>with regard to the future of the ARS.
>
>I can see discussing things with you is a waste of my time. If that is the
>effect you wished, you got your wish. If that is not the effect you wished,
>you
>weren't very bright about forseeing the consequences of your continually
>spouting this nonsense.
>
>Ed

Ed:

Suit yourself, but I wish you'd at least explain to me what was untrue about my statement quoted above!

If I implied that your opinions regarding the future of the ARS wern't genuine and heart-felt, then I was obviously out of line. However, there is no denying that you are associated with the ARRL as a paid employee thereof -- and therefore, I think it unlikely that you would make statements in a public forum that would be contrary to your employer's interests -- or at least, it would seem to me that that would not be a very smart thing for you to do. You sure as heck aren't going to see me say anything that would cast public transit in a negative light. I know what side my bread is buttered on, and I know you do as well. And if you don't feel the need to provide adequate disclaimers on your opinions made in this newsgroup, then why would you object to someone pointing out some apparently obvious facts regarding your position?

You've got to keep one thing in mind here, Ed. From my earliest days as a radio amateur, my personal contacts with ARRL HQ officials have been tainted by what I have perceived as an indifferent, inhospitable, and sometimes callous attitude toward me as a rank-and-file member of the organization. This is nothing at all unique to my own personal experience; I've heard the same thing from hams I've discussed this with all over the country. So, if my own attitude toward ARRL HQ and it's personnel seems to be less than total enchantment, you'll just have to forgive me! This attitude of mine didn't form in a vacuum, it is the result of long, consistently negative personal experience. I go to Newington, expecting to be greeted with open arms like a true brother in the hobby of amateur radio, and am instead greeted with

the equivalent of "Who the hell do you think you are, what the hell are you doing here, and what the hell do you want?" -- and it goes downhill from there! All of this after uttering those truly objectionable words, "Hi, I'm Larry Roll, N3CRA -- and I came to see League HQ!"

So, go ahead and tune me out if that's what you want to do. Nothing I've ever said to you in this newsgroup was intended as anything other than an expression of reality as I see it. No personal disrespect was ever intended or implied. Quite the opposite; of all the ARRL HQ personnel I've personally met, I've found you to be refreshingly personable, friendly, and polite at all times. I disagree with you about the state of the ARS, particularly with respect to recent events in the licensing requirements, but I don't require you to agree with me in order for us to remain friends.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2524. Re: OT - Plug Needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 04:06:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020326230645.21793.00000156@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 38512

In article <20020326140410.18297.00000102@mb-fp.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>
>>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>>
>>>> I don't think that Amphenol even makes such a critter any more.
>>
>>>In over 25 years of going to hamfests, I've never seen such a thing.
>
>Roll is a technical moron,

Len:

NOW there is something that is certainly true, at least in comparison
to others in this newsgripe like Ed Hare, Hansl, Jim Miccolis, Cecil,
and even your own good self! However, as a strictly AMATEUR radio
operator, I can usually hold my own in purely practical matters of a
technical nature.

>is barely able to discern which end of
>the soldering iron is the hot end.

Now, there you would be wrong, because I do manage to pick up
the cool(er) end most of the time!

>If he can "copy" random-
>character code groups in morse "for practice," then he is hardly
>an authoritative voice of what electronic hardware was available
>a quarter century ago. Pfui.

Well, as it happens, I did a lot of kitbuilding a quarter century ago,
including a Heathkit color TV, an HW-101, HW-8 (2 ea.), Heathkit
SW RX, Heathkit ï¿½-Matic keyer, and numerous non-kit homebrew projects.
So, I've inhaled my share of rosin-core solder fumes [twitch].

>Hint: "Amphenol" didn't make that little molded plug that fit a
>7-pin miniature tube socket.

Otay, Buckwheat -- who made it, then?

>>I've seen them, used as internal connections in some older tube-era consumer
>>electronics. I have the HQ hams scouring their junk boxes for Hans.
>
>Phil might like one. Hans is too busy promoting Old Navy.

You mean Hansl is that cool-looking blonde in the Old Navy ads?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2525. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 04:09:09 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <FBbo8.349$3M6.19425458@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38514

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a7knve$cp2$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> news:CUkn8.11966$q%4.2140799037@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> > news:u9iq2otos16s10@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> > > As for the satellites, I hope to track them, listen to them,
> > > and photograph them -- at the same time. We'll see!
> > >
> > > Val
> >
> > That would be worthy of an article in QST. The ARRL has been interested
> in
> > the marriage of technologies articles, with amateur radio as the tie-in.
>
> Interesting thoughts too.
>
> If Val has the set-up to track the satellites...to which
> he has slaved a telecope for photographing the
> satellites, then that same "set-up" could drive a
> small dish to really zero in on the satellite for
> listening as well as transmitting to the satellite if
> it has ham capabilities..
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Precisely! He would become known as an innovator instead of a throwback.
The marriage of satellite communication, astronomy, and digital photography.
I wouldn't care if the mode were CW. I have great hopes for him.

Brian

2526. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 04:10:46 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <aDbo8.351$4Y6.20073672@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38515

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020325222838.21793.00000073@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <BZ0n8.1028$Bw7.75761923@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Larrah, Aye sed Mericans, not Mexicans. So whose your favorite Mexican
on
> >the bus?
>
> The one who just put in a hard day's work picking cabbages in order
> to make an honest living to support his family. No doubt about it.

Fair enough. Now whose your favorite American?

2527. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 04:14:03 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <fGbo8.354$f%6.20241760@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38516

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:xDao8.3828$Ya2.197638@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote
>
> >
> > Whats wrong with a code reader and a printer?
> >
>
> They don't work in most real world HF environments.

Other digital modes work just fine in HF environments.

2528. Re: Straight Dope on CW's Future?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 04:15:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA14768.E8701237@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38517

Bill Sohl wrote:
> So Larry, Dick, etc. just how do you explain the "international"
> support for ending code testing? I have read ad nauseum how
> this was all an FCC "done deal" regarding code testing in the US.
> Is the direction we see towards ending code testing and/or
> significantly reducing it an international "done deal"? If yes,
> who drove the deal?

Obviously the aliens, Bill. They must have received a transmission
of, "Independence Day", and are trying to get rid of CW before
the actual invasion.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2529. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 04:16:18 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <mIbo8.356$J07.20327659@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38518

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020326140410.18297.00000101@mb-fp.aol.com...
> In article <20020326111942.02252.00000069@mb-fc.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >In article <20020326001020.28502.00000018@mb-mt.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com
> >(Len Over 21) writes:
> >
> >>
> >>Just HOW did you check your "copy," Boris?
>
> >Probably not, since it was just copying practice.
>
> ...so you just sat there and copied nonsense-appearing groups.
>
> HOW DID YOU KNOW IF THE COPY WAS *CORRECT?*

It really didn't matter.

> "Accuracy transcends speed..."

Mode selection transcends all else.

2530. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 04:18:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA14827.1B6D2FA2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38519

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> news:ua1q62e6toubb0@corp.supernews.com...
> > And then we have the people who think that
> > just because they're hot stuff in some other radio life they
> > should automatically be hot stuff in amateur radio lfe. But not
> > too many of THOSE folks are INSIDE the tent. . . are they?
>
> ?Its important that we keep out people who actually know something about
> radio?

That's what happened when some hams tried to equate CW skill with
technical expertise.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2531. Re: Remotely Controlled HF for New Upgrades?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 04:19:18 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <aLbo8.361$y17.20373739@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38520

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:aazn8.3753$ub3.3491@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote
>
> >
> > You may be right, and if you are, the 5wpm test is no
> > barrier after all.
> >
>
> I don't think any test is a barrier. Barriers are placed to
> keep people out.

Hey Hans, good answer. But what if a test is meant to be a barrier - to keep people out, like "riffraff" kind of people?

2532. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 04:28:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA14A63.A30A263@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38521

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3CA0D2B6.2AF8DD30@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> And naturally, Brian finds it easier to whine about it than to make the
> >> effort to actually do it.
> > >
> > >Larry, when are you going to stop whining about Brian?
>
> I dunno, Cecil -- when are you gonna stop whining about people
> whining about other people's whining?

Since when is a question the same thing as whining? When a newcomer ham
asks you a question, do you accuse him of whining?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2533. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 04:30:29 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <FVbo8.364$G67.20650053@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38522

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020326230642.21793.00000152@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <20020326140410.18297.00000101@mb-fp.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> >>>Just HOW did you check your "copy," Boris?
> >
> >>Probably not, since it was just copying practice.
> >
> >...so you just sat there and copied nonsense-appearing groups.
> >
> >HOW DID YOU KNOW IF THE COPY WAS *CORRECT?*
>
> Lennie:
>
> Don't look now, but I wasn't copying for the sake of *having* correct
> copy in-hand, although I was able to recognize the fact that I was
> copying correctly after a while. Of course, all I had were neat little
> 5-by-5 character groups on my paper, but so what? The fact that
> what I copied meant nothing to me didn't matter, I was just copying
> it for the sake of doing so, not to gather Intel. Having said that, I
> do believe that a couple of times I may have hit on the decoding
> key -- and I did "unscramble" a few "messages." However the decoded
> message was even more nonsensical to me than the scrambled
> character groups. If the message had been intended for me, I figure
> I would have understood it. Obviously, the crypto guys who devised
> that system knew their business.
>
> BTW -- the messages I did "unscramble" were handed over to the
> XO of the base comm squadron. I never asked what they meant,
> and he never told me, but he did try to talk me into cross-training!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

"The older I get, The greater I was."

2534. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 04:33:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA14BA7.90FDE845@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38523

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Unless, of course, these 40 WPM-plus guys are just some
> sort of CW-savants, which could be the case.

I would expect CW skill levels to fall under a bell curve and
it would appear that I will never be better than average.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2535. Re: OT - Plug Needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 04:36:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA14C62.643EC8A0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38524

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> So, I've inhaled my share of rosin-core solder fumes [twitch].

And chewed on the solder?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2536. Re: Slowest loading ham pages on the net?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 04:56:43 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CA1510B.E20491A@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 38525
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Well, it's a nice collection of reasonably exotic QSL cards. But
he could have done a better job of scanning them. Lots of
aliasing from the beat of halftone printed cards and scanner
resolution. What he needs to do is first set the scanner to
a higher resolution, 2nd do a 2 dimensional low pass filter,
and 3rd shrink the images to a size appropriate for the
amount of resolution the cards had originally.

The alias products in the images is eating up internet bandwidth
and is a reason for it being slow to load.

Doug Thompson wrote:

> A few other hams and I are embarked on a quest to find the most awful
> and slowest loading ham pages on the web. So far, we've only looked at
> the slowest pages (and slowness indicates poor design and "awfulness"
> too), and the top candidate is
>
> http://personal.atl.bellsouth.net/atl/w/4/w4amp
>
> Has anyone any other candidates for "ham web pages which really suck?"

2537. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 05:26:14 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a7sg3f61mkf@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 38545

Ed.... you and everyone else here will never reach that full
potential.......

Why? There is just so much to learn and explore within radio, that one
person could spend an entire lifetime attempt to master every realistically
concievable aspect of amateur radio and radio communications in general and
still never reach 100%.

That is the beauty of it though.... never ending supply of knowledge and
experience. Only someone like the character Data on the ST:Tng series could
come close. This is why I love this hobby.... there is so much to do and
learn.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020326055007.08023.00000195@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >Of course you don't, Brian, especially you hope to meet the same
> >dumbed-down requirements yourself, someday -- like in 2027?
>
> I hope that by 2027 I can meet my full potential as an Amateur Radio
operator.
> I expect to continue to grow over time.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

2538. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 06:05:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C995DD6.4BD924A6@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38526

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > The only thing holding you back is your own impatience. Getting good
> > at it takes time.
>
> I've been at it for 51 years. Exactly how much time are you talking about?

You've been making the same mistakes for 51 years? And you're a genuis?

2539. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 06:05:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C995E65.7B9B707@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38527

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > Seems only reasonable that anyone who ascribes
> > > > to be a ham radio operator would be more than agreeable to
> > > > learn the most basic of radio communications modes.
> > >
> > > Not after being told by you that he/she won't choose to learn
> > > Morse code after the code requirement if dropped.
> >
> > Didn't need to be told by me. You NCI types have all yelled so
> > loud and long about the code requirement being a "Hazing Ritual"
> > they already know all about it.
>
> When the Morse code exam is gone, the hazing ritual will cease to
> exist. There won't be any reason not to learn Morse code.

Well, that's only 180 out. There won't be any reason for most
newcomers *to* learn it. Just ask them.

2540. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 06:05:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C996099.1D697780@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38528

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > When the channel I occupy allows CW to make it through when PSK31
> > cannot, for whatever reason, polar phase shifting in that particular case, then
> > Cecil's misapplication of Shannon is not only invalid and misdirected but
> > misinforming to newcomers.l.
>
> I have explained a dozen times or more that your CW and PSK31 did NOT occupy
> the same channel since you were trying to use a computer to copy PSK31
> but not CW. What is it about that simple concept that you cannot comprehend?
> You were NOT using the same equipment for both modes so your observation
> is relatively meaningless.
>
> There are three values in Shannon's theorem: Power, bandwidth, and throughput.
> If these three values are not the same for two modes, a valid comparison
> is not being made. An observation akin to yours is that 1000 watt SSB gets
> through when one watt CW fails. So what?

Then there's the crack in Shannon for real world communications where the user has no control over the situation. Keep your scientific comparisons for the lab, they simply were of no use whatever in that situation.
In the channel in use at the time, the CW signal was readable where the PSK31 was not. That's the only valid comparison that can be made. Anything else falls under the Yogi Berra theorem.

2541. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 06:06:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C996157.459D9A6E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38529

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > You can mislead newcomers all you want, I'll tell them the facts. Every ham
> > should know how to use CW.
>
> "Every ham should know how to use CW but no ham will learn it unless it is
> required." Isn't that what you have been saying?

You know what I said, and that sure isn't it. So few will learn it that within a generation it'll be gone.

2542. Re: Remotely Controlled HF for New Upgrades?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 06:06:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C9961CE.19F5D1B4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38530

K0HB wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote
>
> >
> > You may be right, and if you are, the 5wpm test is no
> > barrier after all.
> >
>
> I don't think any test is a barrier. Barriers are placed to
> keep people out.

Ah. No "Hazing ritual" at all. Better duck, here comes NCI.

2543. Re: Slowest loading ham pages on the net?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 10:40:12 UTC
From: joe@joe.com
Message-ID: <3CA1A186.1A58448F@joe.com>
Source record: 38531
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Robert Casey wrote:

> Well, it's a nice collection of reasonably exotic QSL cards. But
> he could have done a better job of scanning them. Lots of
> aliasing from the beat of halftone printed cards and scanner
> resolution. What he needs to do is first set the scanner to
> a higher resolution, 2nd do a 2 dimensional low pass filter,
> and 3rd shrink the images to a size appropriate for the
> amount of resolution the cards had originally.
>
> The alias products in the images is eating up internet bandwidth
> and is a reason for it being slow to load.
>
> Doug Thompson wrote:
>
> > A few other hams and I are embarked on a quest to find the most awful
> > and slowest loading ham pages on the web. So far, we've only looked at
> > the slowest pages (and slowness indicates poor design and "awfulness"
> > too), and the top candidate is
> >
> > http://personal.atl.bellsouth.net/atl/w/4/w4amp
> >
> > Has anyone any other candidates for "ham web pages which really suck?"

Sounds Like fictional dweeb Doug Thompson needs DSL ,DX skills, AND a life.
Pity.

2544. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 11:22:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020327062230.01924.00000468@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 38532

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> There are three values in Shannon's theorem: Power, bandwidth, and
>throughput.

> Then there's the crack in Shannon for real world communications where the
>user has
>no control over the situation.

Can you explain what you believe to be wrong with Shannon's theory in technical
terms?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2545. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 11:25:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020327062556.01924.00000469@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 38533

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> "Every ham should know how to use CW but no ham will learn it unless it is
>> required." Isn't that what you have been saying?

>You know what I said, and that sure isn't it. So few will learn it that
>within a generation it'll be gone.

Cecil, you should cede the point that he is saying that almost no one will learn it unless it is required. That doesn't change the fact that what he is saying will appear to new hams, who know nothing about the practical value of CW, as if CW has no value. Telling new hams that so few want to learn CW that it won't survive is so counterproductive towards having those hams learn CW that I can't believe he keeps repeating it.

I don't think he will ever understand what he is unintentionally doing. Or, he could understand and not be willing to admit that he is hurting his cause.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2546. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 11:27:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020327062733.01924.00000470@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 38534

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Since when is a question the same thing as whining? When a newcomer ham
>asks you a question, do you accuse him of whining?

I don't know if he does it every time, but I have seen him respond here in a
manner pretty close to that.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2547. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 11:28:52 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020327062852.01924.00000471@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 38535

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>> A second advantage is that it makes it easier for the student to continue
>on to
>> higher code speed and develop proficiency.

>Then codify it.

It is codified, Brian. The rules give the VEs the flexibility to make the
decision.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2548. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 11:34:10 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020327063410.01924.00000472@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 38536

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>> I made that suggestion to Carl because I know that he is not a very
>experienced
>> CW op, so if he made the comparison, I wanted to ensure he was doing so
>based
>> on real-world conditions.
>

>Shouldn't it actually be easier for the CW Op, since it has is said to have
>an advantage over all other modes?

Sure, but I was hoping that by having Carl do the comparison himself, he would
have a better feel for CW useage on the bands.

I think it would be even more valid if a CW op counted CW QSOs and an SSB op
counted SSB QSOs in progress.

You game?

We should do it on an evening when there is no big DX pileup to tio the scales.

>> Why do you feel that SSB is a "wrong" mode?

>Because we're on r.r.a.p.

I find it hard to understand why someone would choose to have different views
based upon where he is. I may express them differently in different venues,
but I would like to think that my views remain unchanged from place to place.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2549. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 11:35:38 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020327063538.01924.00000473@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 38537

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>> The ARRL sent a letter to the FCC before the NOI/NPRM came out.

>A "letter?" What about your ex-parte presentation?

The Ex Parte presenation was done after the rulemaking started.

73,
Ed

2550. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 11:37:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020327063722.01924.00000474@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 38538

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> When the Morse code exam is gone, the hazing ritual will cease to
>> exist. There won't be any reason not to learn Morse code.

> Well, that's only 180 out. There won't be any reason for most
>newcomers *to* learn it. Just ask them.

You haven't been asking them, Dick; you have been telling them...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2551. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 11:38:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020327063857.01924.00000475@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 38539

From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net

>> > The only thing holding you back is your own impatience. Getting good
>> > at it takes time.
>>
>> I've been at it for 51 years. Exactly how much time are you talking about?
>
> You've been making the same mistakes for 51 years? And you're a genuis?

He asked for your help, and this is how you respond? For shame!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2552. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 11:40:36 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020327064036.01924.00000476@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 38540

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>> I can write about 25 wpm, but head copy up to 55 wpm on a good day, 45 on
>> a bad.

>Whats wrong with a code reader and a printer?

For you, nothing at all. For me, it wouldn't be nearly as much fun.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2553. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 11:43:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020327064313.01924.00000477@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 38541

From: "K0HB" K0HB@earthlink.net

>> Whats wrong with a code reader and a printer?

>They don't work in most real world HF environments.

The ones that are commercially available right now, perhaps, but that certainly could be improved.

I have been searching for the URL, but a few years back, there was a bit of a contest going on in the EME crowd where they were challenged to use a computer to decode an EME signal. I listened to the .wav file and could not hear the signal, and I am pretty good at knowing that a signal is present. (In the lab, I have used the signal generator keyed on and off and could tell a signal was present about 10-12 dB below the noise in 500 Hz.) Someone decoded it and won the 'test.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2554. Re: Spark & CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 11:44:47 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020327064447.01924.00000478@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 38542

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>Jim, I wasn't there. You'll have to ask Dick.

Or Cecil!

Wanna' bet we get two different answers?

:-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2555. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 13:19:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020327081907.27413.00000332@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 38543

>Subject: Re: Question Pools and Such!
>From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>Date: 03/26/02 21:10 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <a7r9r6$5bs$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>

>Because there is NO reason for "EVERY" ham to know CW.

Why not?

Steve

2556. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 13:25:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020327082519.27413.00000335@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 38544

>Subject: Re: 15wpm hump
>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>Date: 03/26/02 21:46 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <doao8.300$hn6.18126945@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>

>There is no other reason.

Thank you, Your Royal Hindass, for the definitive answer.

Steve

2557. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 16:46:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA1F749.5819D9E5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38546

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > The only thing holding you back is your own impatience. Getting good
> > > at it takes time.
> >
> > I've been at it for 51 years. Exactly how much time are you talking about?
>
> You've been making the same mistakes for 51 years? And you're a genuis?

How many years would it take for you to dunk a basketball?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----
```

2558. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 16:54:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA1F938.A7AD11D0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38547

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Then there's the crack in Shannon for real world communications where the user has
> no control over the situation.

Please explain the crack in Shannon's Theorem for us, Dick. It would make
you famous.

> In the channel in use at the time, the CW signal was readable where the PSK31 was
> not.

That's false, Dick. The computer was in the PSK31 channel and was NOT in
the CW channel. You know that and I know that you know that. Why you choose
to continue to spread your falsehoods when everyone can see exactly what
you are doing is beyond belief.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2559. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 17:02:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA1FB37.3B31BE67@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38548

W1RFI wrote:
> I don't think he will ever understand what he is unintentionally doing. Or, he
> could understand and not be willing to admit that he is hurting his cause.

With the phasing out of the Morse code exams, Morse code has essentially let
him down so he unconsciously hates it? Some hams have said they would rather
see ham radio die than change radically.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2560. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 17:06:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA1FC14.62BD3246@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38549

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> > The only thing holding you back is your own impatience. Getting good
> >> > at it takes time.
> >>
> >> I've been at it for 51 years. Exactly how much time are you talking about?
> >
> > You've been making the same mistakes for 51 years? And you're a genuis?
>
> He asked for your help, and this is how you respond? For shame!

If I've been making mistakes for 51 years, I honestly don't know what they
are. My problem, as I experience it, is that I cannot buffer more than
three or four characters. After the fifth character in a word, I have
simply forgotten what character the word started with.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2561. Re: OT - Plug Needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 19:10:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020327141016.21592.00000058@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 38558

In article <20020326230645.21793.00000156@mb-ch.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>>Roll is a technical moron,
>
>Len:
>
>NOW there is something that is certainly true, at least in comparison
>to others in this newsgripe like Ed Hare, Hansl, Jim Miccolis, Cecil,
>and even your own good self! However, as a strictly AMATEUR radio
>operator, I can usually hold my own in purely practical matters of a
>technical nature.

More bullshit, total AMATEUR. All you are is an OPERATOR of ready-built equipment, a functional illiterate as far as anything that goes on behind the front panel.

The only thing "you can hold your own" is a CD version of the ARRL Handbook...it is lighter than the paper print version.

You are totally LOST on the theory presented within the covers.

>Well, as it happens, I did a lot of kitbuilding a quarter century ago,
>including a Heathkit color TV, an HW-101, HW-8 (2 ea.), Heathkit
>SW RX, Heathkit ï¿½-Matic keyer, and numerous non-kit homebrew projects.
>So, I've inhaled my share of rosin-core solder fumes [twitch].

Oh, my, you ASSEMBLED kits according to instructions that came with the kits! Oh, wow, that makes you a "building expert!"

I am so impressed. Not.

Oh, my, soldered a lot of joints did you? Or smoke more of them?

I knew about two dozen older ladies in Pasadena and nearby (at least two of them grandmothers) who soldered far more joints than you could have, to much greater quality, for spacecraft electronics. [Electro-Optical Systems, Pasadena, CA, a division of Xerox]

They didn't go into all this "let's pretend" crap about being "experts" in spacecraft or electronics. But you do in a radio hobby. Yeah, I do believe you've inhaled too much of something...

Now go off in a corner and copy some more of those "spy station" five-groups and pretend you're Bill Friedman. We can put the nearest mental ward on alert for you...

2562. Re: Spark & CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 19:10:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020327141017.21592.00000059@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 38555

In article <RL9o8.276$u96.17434749@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> Just some thoughts, mindya...
>>
>> Jim
>
>Jim, I wasn't there. You'll have to ask Dick.

Brian, Dick wasn't there either...he was learning all about
TV production at Fort Monmouth and having the FCC come
to him to give him his 2nd Class Commercial Radiotelephone
License test. [after having the J-38 he always carried around
for radio emergencies packed away "for the duration"] :-)

2563. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 19:10:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020327141018.21592.00000060@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 38556

In article <doao8.300$hn6.18126945@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> <K0HB@earthlink.net> writes:
>>
>> >"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
>> >
>> >> Is this an unusual problem? Are there any solutions?
>> >
>> >It's a common problem. When training Navy radio ops it was called "word
>> >anticipation", and we solved it by training the ops with completely random
>> >"nonsense" practice tapes. The character sequences ("words") were of random
>> >length and contained no recognizable words. Hard copy thus became a
>> >completely automaton-ic connection between the eardrums and the fingertips,
>> >with no intervening conscious mental processing of any kind.
>>
>> Hmmm...that's right up there with knot-tying and sail-handling.
>> Will the Navy ever get to iron hulls and steam power?
>>
>> How many Navy "radio ops" have had to train at being automatic
>> morse decoders in the last 30 years?
>
>The few required to sit in the Black Sea or along the 38th parallel and
>listen to the occasional 3rd world traffic. There is no other reason.

Really? :-)

Gosh, Brian, I thought all those seasoned old salts sat around and copied "Fox Skeds" to keep all the Old Navy ship captains informed about How It Is and What They Should Do!

[apparently my "Discovery (or History) Channel" is out of order... :-)]

Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service members arise...out of your wheel-chairs! Let's beep one for the Gipper!

2564. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 19:10:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020327141019.21592.00000062@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 38552

In article <3C996099.1D697780@worldnet.att.net>, Dick Carroll
<dickc58@worldnet.att.net> writes:

> Then there's the crack in Shannon for real world communications where the
user has
>no control over the situation. Keep your scientific comparisons for the lab,
they
>simply were of no use whatever in that situation.

What "crack?!?" The only apparent "crack" is in the cranium.

Claude Shannon used TELEGRAPHY as his example in 1947.

Do you want that BSTJ copy or not?

2565. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 19:10:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020327141019.21592.00000061@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 38557

In article <QX4o8.3138$Ya2.131017@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> writes:

>Sorry Mr. Nonpar Ticipant, but you asked a question about
>Navy radio ops decoding Morse. I answered your question
>accurately.

Yeah..."accurately." Straight out of the Old Navy Hymn Book about on par with Gregorian Chants sung on dockside.

I can find the same answer in a public library...it's packed away on a dusty shelf along with other fantasy such as Nostradamus Predicts "Now You're Talking" content and the Hardy Boys Discover Secrets of Morse.

>Now you wish to divert attention from your
>question dumbass question with some reference to what
>you watched and didn't understand on the history channel.

Poor baby. Got your sleeve insignia all ruffled? Nobody saluted all your hash marks? Somebody say boo about BuShips' yellowed softbounds from 1943?

FWIW, I made part of my income on working on replacements for what was stolen off the USS Pueblo...only to have those stolen by an active-duty USN CWO surnamed Walker years later. No problem...those were replaced later, work supervised by NSA types who didn't wear bell-bottoms. Very little of that made "Discovery Channel documentaries" on TeeVee.

You hang in there with those Old Navy tales about sparkies Saving The Day With Morse back when steam finally huffed and puffed as much as the tale-tellers and spell singers do now.

>Good luck on this one now!

Not a problem. "We've only just begun to fight..." - J. Paul Jones or somebody after he saw the whites of somebody's eyes?

I think a sea-going CD would be nice playing in the background to the rhythmic beeping of salty morse. Some selections on the CD could be "Barnacle Bill The Sailor" to a full-on brassy band (with Annapolis Chorus) of "Anchors Away/Aweigh."

2566. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 19:10:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020327141020.21592.00000063@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 38553

In article <3CA10D81.B779267A@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

> Here is where I have an issue. We have many modes that are not tested
>for, yet they thrive, or at least have enough people using them that you
>can try them out, and find someone to communicate with. I've been having
>fun with many different modes since getting my ticket.
>
> Yet here we have a mode which many of it's supporters believe will
>disappear or die out if prospective hams do not learn the mode as a part
>of the licensing requirement.
>
> If this were truly the case, it isn't a mode worth keeping.
>
> Not that I personally believe that, but that is surely the impression I
>get from reading these threads.

I get the impression that all this furor over Keep Morse Tests Forever
is solely to keep up the self-esteem (or steam) of those that
managed to do it. They NEED the personal perquisites to show how
BIG they are in radio, "expert" and all that puffery. Pfui.

It's an ARRL-sponsored maintenance of manufactured self-importance
for amateurs, government welfare program for the feel-goodies who
think they are warm merde in radio.

2567. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 19:10:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020327141020.21592.00000064@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 38554

In article <20020327062852.01924.00000471@mb-df.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
>>> A second advantage is that it makes it easier for the student to continue on to
>>> higher code speed and develop proficiency.
>
>>Then codify it.
>
>It is codified, Brian. The rules give the VEs the flexibility to make the
>decision.

Nowhere, repeat NOWHERE in Parts 1, 2, or 97 of Title 47 CFR are there ANY specifications defining WORD RATE. None.

VEs could send characters at 20 or 30 "WPM" and say that is "15 WPM" and it could not be proven "illegal" unless the inter-symbol spacing was not according to the old CCITT spec on telegrams.

You can trot out the old "PARIS" arguments and say "everybody accepts that" but that has no real binding in the law. The resident legal beagle will bark about that, of course, and probably Bill everyone for it too. There is just NO definition for "word rate" with International Morse Code in Part 97.

2568. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 19:10:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020327141021.21592.00000065@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 38551

In article <Mabo8.337$WG6.19159224@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>Larry might have a new "Favorite Minority on the Bus" by then. Let's hope >anyway. He won't be any farther ahead as an amateur, he's given up >self-inflicted SET's.

Larry couldn't understand "SETI"... :-)

2569. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 19:10:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020327141022.21592.00000066@mb-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 38559

In article <20020326230642.21793.00000152@mb-ch.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <20020326140410.18297.00000101@mb-fp.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>>>Just HOW did you check your "copy," Boris?
>>
>>>Probably not, since it was just copying practice.
>>
>>...so you just sat there and copied nonsense-appearing groups.
>>
>>HOW DID YOU KNOW IF THE COPY WAS *CORRECT?*
>
>Lennie:
>
>Don't look now, but I wasn't copying for the sake of *having* correct
>copy in-hand, although I was able to recognize the fact that I was
>copying correctly after a while. Of course, all I had were neat little
>5-by-5 character groups on my paper, but so what? The fact that
>what I copied meant nothing to me didn't matter, I was just copying
>it for the sake of doing so, not to gather Intel.

Geez us all. Let me ask a third time...

HOW IN THE HELL DID YOU KNOW IF WHAT YOU "COPIED"
WAS "CORRECT?"

Cut all this bullshit, radio whiz-bang. All you are doing is piling the
merde higher.

With random character groups you wouldn't know if something was
"correct copy" just by "writing it down."

>Having said that, I
>do believe that a couple of times I may have hit on the decoding
>key -- and I did "unscramble" a few "messages."

"Unscramble?!?!?" More bullshit. You couldn't handle a simple
mono-key alphabetic substitution cipher or a beginner's Playfair.

>BTW -- the messages I did "unscramble" were handed over to the
>XO of the base comm squadron. I never asked what they meant,
>and he never told me, but he did try to talk me into cross-training!

...probably to get you the hell out of the wing...if we can believe
that little imaginary story.

2570. ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 19:10:58 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ua458pmp4u6n4f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38550

Brief Discussion of ARRL January Board Meeting --

Each numbered item is a note that I took from my reading of the minutes as published in the March issue of QST. My follow-on comments are in reference to what is contained in the minutes themselves and reflect the fact that I am not a member of ARRL, yet, and so don't have all the history, though I do have some. Perhaps the folks here will fill me in to some extent. As soon as I get my call sign I'll be sending off my membership check to this organization. It's a MUST, as you will soon see!

1) The ARRL Foundation has assets totaling $2.15 million.
This is, no doubt, a good thing in that the interest income from this amount has to be in $100,000 to $200,000 range, depending on how it is handled. Mentioned also in the minutes is something called The Investment Policy Statement, probably outlining how the foundation's funds are placed. In other money matters, the year 2000 financial picture was said to be "as predicted." That is, an operating deficit, unspecified, was incurred. See below.

2) ARRL is working though a few years of deficit spending.
The unspecified deficit for year 2000 was the second one in a row (?) and deficits are predicted for the next few years. Revenue and expenditures are said to have been essentially flat over that time, implying that the deficits are not large. Also mentioned is the fact that the Board has been adding new programs and initiatives, with obvious effects on the budget, it would seem, unless new revenue has been coming on stream, which it likely hasn't!

3) The Big Project and the CC&R problem.
The "Big Project" apparently refers to part of ARRL's efforts to get the FCC to interpose for amateur radio operators where local covenants are concerned. To that end the "Big Project" calls for emphasizing the public service aspects of the avocation. "Clubs must take an active role in portraying themselves as civic organizations," it is said, in the interest of creating support for amateur radio with the public and in Congress, which will have to act decisively before the FCC will, at least in this area. A brand new Public Relations Book is about ready for distribution, dealing in part with the above, most likely.

4) ARRL involvement in Homeland Security.
The entire "emergency communication" function of amateur radio is under review due to the events of last September. Exactly what amateur radio's role will be under an unspecified new regime was not, ah, specified. However, since "emergency communications" IS the first-stated raison de etre for amateur radio and its use of the public airwaves, this review is very important.

5) This year is critical because of WRC 2003.
Big changes are coming and several ARRL sub-groups are working on many unspecified aspects of managing and/or implementing those changes. The end of treaty requirements for code testing is, without a doubt, near the top of the list here, as are what I assume are commercial interference problems in the 7 MHz area. And, of course, there must be others!

6) ARRL will put into place a new "development" program.
For those who don't know, "development" is a word for "fund raising!" The 1990s were most likely good to ARRL and its foundation portfolio. However, total value and interest income may have hit a plateau over the last few months and so new money is needed. See below.

7) New development programs will include "Major Gift" & "Planned Giving."
Every 502c program is in the same boat with money these days. All costs are going up without pause while income is stagnating. A doubling or tripling of the ARRL's endowment would not hurt a thing.

8) There is a need for expanded funding of the Education Project.
Here we see part of the bind it looks like ARRL is in right now. Revenue is flat yet significant problems exist, some of them requiring money if they are to be dealt with effectively. This project is important, as are others.

9) ARRL presentation on CC&R to Congress and FCC problems with 24 GHz.
Apparently competition has broken out at 24GHz and there is a chance that some amateur satellite communications may be interfered with as a result. ARRL believes that the FCC has overstepped its authority in allowing this. A group is to be established by ARRL to monitor the noise at or near this frequency, a function that will also cost additional money. In support of this, the group formerly-known as the Radio Frequency Interference Group will now be termed the Electromagnetic Compatibility Committee.

10) QST pages to be limited, Web Site improved, to cut costs.
Minutes of the Board meetings will be eliminated from the magazine and sent to the Web page. Also, ARRL section notes and contest results were nearly moved as well, all in the interest of cutting pages out of the magazine. What should be or could be "cut" from QST is obviously on the front burner. I wonder what the general feeling is about this in that while membership information seems very important to ME it was WAY down the list of respondents to a recent survey, I believe. Product reviews were Number One, naturally.

11) Space Station school contacts continue, 32 done so far.
This is a fine idea and fits right in with the "Civic Organization" aspect of amateur radio.

12) New Rules & Regs for ARRL Field Organization are adopted, unspecified.
I wonder what these are and if they are immediately important to members at large.

13) Presentation on "software defined radios" made.
This could be very interesting, especially with regard to remote control of a station using a "virtual radio." Sounds like fun!

14) The Club Competition Program needs a boost.
This program seems to be languishing. However, it got scant attention, or so it seems.

15) On 5000 novice band re-farming comments, a big majority was for more phone space.
Here we see a rather large straw in the wind. If it's all about usage then it looks to me like CW is going to getting into more and more trouble.

16) Distinctive garment for ARES volunteers tabled.
This seems like a good idea but it went nowhere, or so it seems.

17) VHF, UHF and microwave contesting need a boost.
This area of amateur radio seems to be languishing as well. However, there did not seem to be much available in the way of possible solutions.

**

2571. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 19:17:18 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <2Voo8.8956$se.862211@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38560

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA1F749.5819D9E5@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> How many years would it take for you to dunk a basketball?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

About long enough to find my mother's old washtub and fill it about
half-full with the hose.

Just why you want a wet basketball I will leave to you ;-)

2572. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 19:34:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020327143441.14735.00000091@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 38561

In article <ua458pmp4u6n4f@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>Brief Discussion of ARRL January Board Meeting --

>5) This year is critical because of WRC 2003.
> Big changes are coming and several ARRL sub-groups are working on many
>unspecified aspects of managing and/or implementing those changes. The end
>of treaty requirements for code testing is, without a doubt, near the top of
>the list here, as are what I assume are commercial interference problems in
>the 7 MHz area. And, of course, there must be others!

The "40m problem" has been on the books since the WARC of
1979. That's a mere 23 years now. Eventually some action will
be taken.

>9) ARRL presentation on CC&R to Congress and FCC problems with 24 GHz.
> Apparently competition has broken out at 24GHz and there is a chance that
>some amateur satellite communications may be interfered with as a result.
>ARRL believes that the FCC has overstepped its authority in allowing this.
>A group is to be established by ARRL to monitor the noise at or near this
>frequency, a function that will also cost additional money. In support of
>this, the group formerly-known as the Radio Frequency Interference Group
>will now be termed the Electromagnetic Compatibility Committee.

"GigaHertz for gigasquirts" - KH2D :-)

>11) Space Station school contacts continue, 32 done so far.
> This is a fine idea and fits right in with the "Civic Organization" aspect
>of amateur radio.

There are approximately 85 thousand public schools in the USA.
So far those school contacts are 1:2656 relative to those schools
not so "privileged" in talking with real, live astrosomebodies.

>13) Presentation on "software defined radios" made.
> This could be very interesting, especially with regard to remote control of
>a station using a "virtual radio." Sounds like fun!

Software Defined Radio is NOT about software-controlled radios.

SDR refers to internal processing of mixing, modulation, and
demodulation done by microprocessor instructions.

>16) Distinctive garment for ARES volunteers tabled.
> This seems like a good idea but it went nowhere, or so it seems.

"Distinctive garment?!?" I just can't believe that. What, cute little
jumpsuits with all kinds of patches sewn on, sleeve insignia
denoting "rank" in the amateur service? :-) :-) :-)

>17) VHF, UHF and microwave contesting need a boost.
> This area of amateur radio seems to be languishing as well. However, there
>did not seem to be much available in the way of possible solutions.

Is that really necessary? Isn't "REAL" ham radio all about
CW on HF working DX?

2573. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 20:49:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020327154923.07502.00000419@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 38562

>Subject: Re: 15wpm hump
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/27/2002 1:10 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020327141022.21592.00000066@mb-fa.aol.com>

>
>Geez us all. Let me ask a third time...

You, "Sir", have NO BUSINESS demanding that someone answer a question. You have about a ga-zillion ignorned questions out there. So take a hike, Punk.

>With random character groups you wouldn't know if something was
>"correct copy" just by "writing it down."

Sure he would. Just as I would. It's called proficiency. Something you are NOT at anything except lying and subtrefuge.

>...probably to get you the hell out of the wing...if we can believe
>that little imaginary story.

Like any of the stories YOU have concocted?

Putz.

2574. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 20:53:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA23152.27C262FA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38563

Valentine Germann wrote:
> 15) On 5000 novice band re-farming comments, a big majority was for more
> phone space.
> Here we see a rather large straw in the wind. If it's all about usage then
> it looks to me like CW is going to getting into more and more trouble.

I don't know about the other bands, but the 40m Novice CW frequencies
are relatively unused. I tended to reside there until I gave up from
lack of activity. At an average time on an average night, there are
1-2 CW QSOs in 50 kHz with lots of QRM from foreign AM stations. If
you don't already have HF listening capabilities, might be a good
time to acquire some and see for yourself.

On a happier note, my ClearSpeach speaker has the ability to allow
CW tones through while killing AM heterodynes.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2575. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 20:55:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA231C6.AF2A6E91@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38564

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > How many years would it take for you to dunk a basketball?
>
> About long enough to find my mother's old washtub and fill it about
> half-full with the hose.

Doing it that way is equivalent to one wpm Morse code.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2576. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 22:32:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a7th9k$2n2$0@208.206.142.81>
Source record: 38565

CAM wrote:
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> > news:ua1q62e6toubb0@corp.supernews.com...
> > > And then we have the people who think that
> > > just because they're hot stuff in some other radio life they
> > > should automatically be hot stuff in amateur radio lfe. But not
> > > too many of THOSE folks are INSIDE the tent. . . are they?
> >
> > ?Its important that we keep out people who actually know something about
> > radio?
>
> That's what happened when some hams tried to equate CW skill with
> technical expertise.

Yep. we insisted that all hams at least know something about Morse code.
Now they aren't required to really know anything!

2577. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 22:44:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a7ti18$50j$0@208.206.142.81>
Source record: 38566

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> There are three values in Shannon's theorem: Power, bandwidth, and
> >throughput.
>
> > Then there's the crack in Shannon for real world communications where the
> >user has
> >no control over the situation.
>
> Can you explain what you believe to be wrong with Shannon's theory in technical
> terms?

It has application only in theory and design work, and is not in any
way useful in analyzing why to use one mode over another when the
equipment available cannot take advantage of the efficiencies noted by
Shannon. If the lesseer mode works under the instant circumstances using
the system that is availabe and the more efficient does not, only a fool
would attempt to force a comparison based on a Shannon analysis.
That is exactly what happened on the morning noted, where I could
easily copy the CW ID on the PSK31 stations but not the PSK31 signal
itself. None of this in any way changes anything Shannon said. It merely
points, again, to "In theory, theory and practice are the same, but in
practice they are often different".

2578. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 22:50:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a7tibp$50j$1@208.206.142.81>
Source record: 38567

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> > The only thing holding you back is your own impatience. Getting good
> >> > at it takes time.
> >>
> >> I've been at it for 51 years. Exactly how much time are you talking about?
> > >
> > > You've been making the same mistakes for 51 years? And you're a genuis?
> >
> He asked for your help, and this is how you respond? For shame!

Did you miss it? He got the help and rejected it. He obviously has been
doing it wrong for 51 years. He is supposed to be smart so how could he
fail to miss the fact that his method has not worked for so long? Shame
on you!

2579. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 22:52:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a7tiga$50j$2@208.206.142.81>
Source record: 38568

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > The only thing holding you back is your own impatience. Getting good
> > > > at it takes time.
> > >
> > > I've been at it for 51 years. Exactly how much time are you talking about?
> >
> > You've been making the same mistakes for 51 years? And you're a genuis?
>
> How many years would it take for you to dunk a basketball?

None. If I couldn't do it from the ground I'd use the right tool, a
ladder.
```

2580. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 22:55:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a7tikt$50j$3@208.206.142.81>
Source record: 38569

CAM wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > >> > The only thing holding you back is your own impatience. Getting good
> > >> > at it takes time.
> > >>
> > >> I've been at it for 51 years. Exactly how much time are you talking about?
> > >
> > > You've been making the same mistakes for 51 years? And you're a genuis?
> >
> > He asked for your help, and this is how you respond? For shame!
>
> If I've been making mistakes for 51 years, I honestly don't know what they
> are. My problem, as I experience it, is that I cannot buffer more than
> three or four characters. After the fifth character in a word, I have
> simply forgotten what character the word started with.

If you think you can't do it, you're right.

2581. Re: Straight Dope on CW's Future?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 22:55:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203271455.4d2923ec@posting.google.com>
Source record: 38570

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:<ua1mui4c8oqrb5@corp.supernews.com>...
> N2EY wrote, after I stated that the ultimate result of all the
> recent testing changes has to be MORE hams, and by
> extension, more hams who don't care about CW:
>
> >I think it's too early to tell.
> >
> >Consider the following:
> >
> >1) The 2000 restructuring has only produced an increase
> >of about 8000 hams in almost two years. Compare the total
> >license and new license figures for the period since April of
> >2000 and for an equal length of time before pril 2000. N0BK's
> >"wet firecracker" description sums it up pretty well.
>
> Hm. So, would it be correct to say that the creation of the current
> Technician license DID have an effect, and DID bring more people
> into the fold, in a burst that started ten or so years ago.

The number of US hams grew all throught the 1970s and 1980s, when all
US
ham licenses required a code test. The growth continued after the Tech
lost its code test in 1991. W1RFI posted numbers that show the growth
increased
after 1991, but has slowed somewhat in recent years. We cab play
number games all day, but doing so does not put even one more amateur
signal on the air.

Surges are to be expected - when the "price" of something drops, there
is
usually a surge of "sales".

> Then, as the
> 1990s went on, some of those folks DID qualify with code at the first
> level, and it was these same folks, and mostly them alone, who came
> onto HF in a big way HF after April, 2000, restructuring. That is, there
> was no real influx of NEW people onto the HF bands, OR into amateur
> radio, when the code requirement was dropped to 5 wpm for ALL
> license classes. Would that be right?

It sure seems that way. The main effect of the restructuring was lots
of upgrades, not lots of new hams. IMO the problem is NOT the tests -
it's lack
of publicity.

> >2) For many years the USE of CW/Morse has been mostly driven
> >by forces other than legal ones. Sure, it had to be learned for the
> >test, but those who had no interest in the mode had no requirement
> >to actually use it - just as those without technical interest have no
> >requirement to build anything.
>
> Well, right, in that there never has been a legal REQUIREMENT to
> USE CW on the air, am I right?

Not since about 50 years ago.

There was once a requirement that hams certify
a certain amount of on-air USE of CW/Morse (so many hours in a certain
number of months preceding the renewal application) in order to renew
their licenses. This was changed about 50 years ago to a requirement
to operate using any mode,
then dropped entirely. For at least 35+ years there has been NO
requirement for
any ham to use any mode, or to operate at all.

Neither has there ever been a requirement to USE any of the theory
stuff, either.

The old Novice license went through a period (1967-1978?) when it
conveyed only CW/Morse privileges.

> However, was it not a fact that if one
> took the trouble to learn code at 13 wpm, or some higher level, then it
> occurred to at least SOME people that it sure would be silly NOT to
> use it, since it worked so well for some things? Would that be a fair
> statement?

Sure. Just like if you require all drivers to use a stick shift for
their
driving test, some will like it and buy stick shift cars instead of
automatics.

> That is, THIS is the argument I think I am seeing from some
> code supporters. Does this idea hold any water?

Of course. In fact, that's kind of what happened to me.

My first interest in ham radio came from hearing hams on 75 meter AM.
I wanted to join them, and set out to get a license. Along the way I
discovered that CW was fun once I had decent skills at it. Thus it
became my primary mode.

Would I have learned CW/Morse and used it without the license
requirement? I really don't know.

> >3) Band plans are a whole 'nother ball of wax that is in constant
> >motion. Oddly enough many of the digital folks want to contain
> >the expansion of the phone/image subbands on HF.
>
> That would be "odd" only if they were the same ones wanting to

> put an end to code testing, and by extension erode the long-run
> numbers of people with an interest in CW. Would THAT be a fair
> statement?

All I can say is that at least some anticodetest folks are also
against
expanding the 'phone subbands because doing so will effectively reduce
the
spectrum available for DIGITAL modes.

Some observations:

Some folks say there should be no mode restrictions on amateur HF, and
that such restrictions constitute a form of "welfare" for "narrow"
modes, like CW.
But without mode restrictions, what is to prevent hams from using,
say, the same FM voice standards as on VHF/UHF?

On amateur VHF/UHF there are almost no mode restrictions. (Yes, I
recall 50.0-50.1 and 144.0-144.1). On 2 meters this has resulted in
most of the band being taken up by FM voice repeaters, leaving less
space for new modes to operate. Without any mode restrictions on HF,
it is reasonable to assume something similar would take place.

> Is everyone going to just be friends now?

All depends on how people behave. Look at how some people post here -
I see
a variety of behaviors, ranging from very friendly to very unfriendly.
>
> [As for the future of the band plans and CW]:
>
> >That depends entirely on USE of the mode. Many of us who
> >actually USE CW/Morse will continue to do so and encourage
> >others to do the same.
>
> Yes. And if CW has allies in the digital ranks, well, that will
> bode well for the future of CW in the band plans, at least for
> a good while, say 10 to 20 years. Would that be fair?

I'm 47, so I expect it to be more like 40-50 years at least.>
>
> [snip items about commercial interest in CW, which has
> been small for quite some time, though some transceivers
> do accomodate the mode.]

I would say MOST HF/MF transceivers will do CW. It's just that
relatively few do it well. But good CW transceivers are not hard to
find if one knows what to look for.
>
> >Ham radio is not a big money item anyway.
> >
> >Suppose there are 500,000 active US hams, and they each

> >spend $1000/yr on new equipment. That's only a $500 million
> >dollar market, total.
>
> That's a fair-sized market, I think! That's half a billion dollars!

Compared to what? How much was the market for, say, FRS/GMRS radios
last year?
Or VCRs?

And I would say that my guess was about as high as it gets. I don't
think most US hams spend as much as $1000 total on equipment every
year.

> And looking at QST and its advertising, the ratio between HF
> and VHF related ads is at least FOUR-TO-ONE, in full-page
> ads, and higher than that in smaller ones. That is, if there IS
> any real money in amateur radio, it does seem to be in HF.
> Is that a fair statement?

Nope. Ads simply reflect what the manufacturers are trying to sell,
not what they are actually selling. I can name all sorts of examples
down through the years where highly advertised items did not sell in
large quantities, but rigs that were almost unadvertised sold like
hotcakes.

> [In response to my comment that the new testing procedures
> must inevitably lead to more hams and more non-CW hams]:
>
> >Maybe. But there is also reverse pressure from digital folks.
> >And there may not be a flood of new hams - just look at what
> >has not happened since April 2000.
>
> That is VERY interesting, and well could explain the rush to
> now do away completely with code testing, in hopes of finally
> having the desired effect.

Yup. And that effect will probably not happen. Sure, there will be a
short-term surge of new licenses, and a surge of upgrades - but only a
short-term surge. Just my opinion, but recent history has shown that
to be the case.

> And if this does not work, will
> elimination of the written exams follow?

Nope. But they may be reduced still further.

> [About NCI and band plans]:
>
> >Its founder, Bruce Perens, has said that there will no longer be
> >any need for the organization to exist once its stated objective
> >has been achieved.
>
> >NCI's executive director (WA6VSE) has stated here that he

> >personally OPPOSES expansion of the phone/image subbands.
>
> So, everyone WILL just be friends now, and NCI will go away?

I hope so ;-)

> [Finally, about the future of CW]:
>
> >What really matters is what happens on the amateur bands in
> >question. If they are full of hams using CW/Morse, that will speak
> >louder than any argument here. And if they are empty of CW/Morse
> >but jammed with SSB, that will speak louder too.
> >
> >So let me say this, Val - what do YOU want to happen? You can
> >influence the future - just go for that General and/or Extra and USE
> >your favorite mode(s) on the air.
>
> I intend to do this, and to promote CW within the local club here.

"Just do it" ;-)

Actually, let me offer you a suggestion and a challenge: Learn the
code, sending and receiving, and let us know your progress. Tell us
the methods you use and how long it takes you to go from "this is a
dit" to, say, 15-20 wpm. If you need any help, just holler. My email
address is for-real.

> However, I would like to know the speed of the current I will be
> rowing against!

Do not be misled by the naysayers and negativism sometimes seen here.
There are lots of nice folks on the air using CW/Morse. Join us!

(I prefer 40 meters, around 7030-7045 kHz).
>
> >Listen to, say, 40 or 20 meters CW during a contest like the CW SS,
> >DX test or Field Day. All that activity is generated by a few thousand
> >stations - probably more like a few hundred on any given band at any
> >given time. The bands can be that busy all the time if we USE them.
>
> This brings to mind a whole bunch of other interesting questions,
> which I will bring up later in other threads. Thank you very much
> for your reply here. It has been a very big help!

You are welcome!

Didja download and read the N0HFF book yet?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2582. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 23:03:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a7tj4i$89d$0@208.206.142.81>
Source record: 38571

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Then there's the crack in Shannon for real world communications where the user has
> > no control over the situation.
>
> Please explain the crack in Shannon's Theorem for us, Dick. It would make
> you famous.
>
> > In the channel in use at the time, the CW signal was readable where the PSK31 was
> > not.
>
> That's false, Dick. The computer was in the PSK31 channel and was NOT in
> the CW channel. You know that and I know that you know that.

That's incorrect and YOU know that. The computer was receiving the same IF bandwidth the receiver was using to play the CW. I know, the DSP in the sound card does its own thing and decides its own bandwidth. I can't help it if the CW doesn't need that added restriction on its use, thus is able to go ahead and work where the PSK cannot. That is exactly the point-efficiencies are not all theoretical. Many turn out to be operational-practical. Further, that has nothing to do with the situation at hand. The reason the PSK wouldn't print has been declared by many of the knowledgable to have been phase shifting due to a polar path, which I also am convinced to be true. What does the computer have to do with that?

Why you choose
> to continue to spread your falsehoods when everyone can see exactly what
> you are doing is beyond belief.

Just attempting to counter some of your erroneous BS, OM. You may be a real genuis, and a 51 year licensed ham, but there are holes in your knowledge a Mack truck could easily navigate through.

2583. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 23:05:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a7tj79$89d$1@208.206.142.81>
Source record: 38572

CAM wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > I don't think he will ever understand what he is unintentionally doing. Or, he
> > could understand and not be willing to admit that he is hurting his cause.
>
> With the phasing out of the Morse code exams, Morse code has essentially let
> him down so he unconsciously hates it? Some hams have said they would rather
> see ham radio die than change radically.

I'm coming to believe that you are a fundamentally dishonest person.
You know that is NOT what was said.

2584. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 23:21:21 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Rtso8.1169$7j.86735@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38573

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote

> 3) The Big Project and the CC&R problem.
> The "Big Project" apparently refers to part of ARRL's efforts to get the
> FCC to interpose for amateur radio operators where local covenants are
> concerned.

Nothing of the sort. The "big project" is related to young people and
education.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2585. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-27 23:48:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020327184840.00680.00000251@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 38574

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

> The "Big Project" apparently refers to part of ARRL's efforts to get the
>FCC to interpose for amateur radio operators where local covenants are
>concerned.

Although that is important, the Big Project is an educational initiative. The premise is that Amateur Radio is a valuable classroom tool, not necessarily to recruit new hams, but because through amateur radio, we have learned some about science, geography, international politics, and amateur radio can be used as a teaching tool in the classroom.

The goal is not to teach kids about ham radio, but to use ham radio to support the learning that they are doing in the areas I mentioned. Will we get a few hams out of the deal? Quite likely. Will these kids be better educated ABOUT ham radio, so that twenty years from now, when they sit on that zoning board, they will be making informed decisions.

One message that the ARRL Board has heard loud and clear from hams is that we need to invest in Amateur Radio's future. The "Big Project" is one such investment. The neat part is that ARRL finally wised up. Although there has been a lot of "grass roots" support, they are also going after industry and other types of grants, through the other investment -- the ARRL Development Office. So companies like United Technologies might be willing to kick in a good chunk of change, because of the educational aspects of it all.

The defecit you mention includes things like the hiring of a Development Officer, Mary Hobart, KB1HYD, and staff to manage the Big Project. They also hired a full-time EMC engineer to help the Lab with RFI issues. His plate was instantly full on power-line noise cases. (I think we are actually making progress!)

For the big picture on the Big Project, see:

http://www.arrl.org/FandES/tbp/

and some related news stories:

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2000/05/05/1/ - how it all got started

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2000/12/07/3/
http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2001/06/15/1/

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2586. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 00:03:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020327190328.00680.00000253@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 38575

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>6) ARRL will put into place a new "development" program.
> For those who don't know, "development" is a word for "fund raising!" The
>1990s were most likely good to ARRL and its foundation portfolio. However,
>total value and interest income may have hit a plateau over the last few
>months and so new money is needed. See below.

It goes past that, although the stock market tumble hit ARRL's investment portfolio somewhat, I would imagine. There are two factors at play. First, spectrum pressure is increasing big time. I probably put about 100 staff hours personally into the ARRL's Comments, Reply Comments and Ex Parte filings wrt the RFID/70 cm threat. Maybe about half that on Ultrawideband, and new such threats to our use of spectrum surface more often than ever before. That says nothing about WRC-2003, where the least of our worries is what happens to code testing.

What used to be possible to fund solely from membership dues is not possible in today's regulatory environment. Part of that development is the creation of special funds to which one can contribute. Over the past couple of years, I have either kicked in my own $$$, or sold off the various junque "donated" to ARRL and kicked in OPM, to the Fund for the Defense of Amateur Spectrum, the Big Project and the ARRL Lab Test Equipment Fund.

>7) New development programs will include "Major Gift" & "Planned Giving."
> Every 502c program is in the same boat with money these days. All costs
>are going up without pause while income is stagnating. A doubling or
>tripling of the ARRL's endowment would not hurt a thing.

And the nice part about such fund raising is that the money is raised from people who voluntarily want to give it, targeted toward the part of ARRL's activities that is the most important to them. Those that cannot do so, or do not choose to offer any support over their membership dues, are still supporting the League and the things it does.

>8) There is a need for expanded funding of the Education Project.
> Here we see part of the bind it looks like ARRL is in right now. Revenue
>is flat yet significant problems exist, some of them requiring money if they
>are to be dealt with effectively. This project is important, as are others.

Yeah, but if ARRL could see 200,000 members instead of 165,000, that would make a BIG difference.

>9) ARRL presentation on CC&R to Congress and FCC problems with 24 GHz.
> Apparently competition has broken out at 24GHz and there is a chance that
>some amateur satellite communications may be interfered with as a result.
>ARRL believes that the FCC has overstepped its authority in allowing this.

There are more threats than just that. Right now, 2 m, 70 cm, 2.4 GHz, 5.6 GHz and 24 GHz are on the plate.

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2001/06/15/1/

>A group is to be established by ARRL to monitor the noise at or near this
>frequency, a function that will also cost additional money.

This is mostly being done by volunteers, and the actual costs of this program are, so far, relatively small. The intitial emphasis is on 2.4 GHz. Zack Lau in the ARRL Lab has built up noise sources and Paul Rinaldo and I have written a calibration procedure.

See http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2001/08/09/1/

> In support of this, the group formerly-known as the Radio Frequency
Interference Group
>will now be termed the Electromagnetic Compatibility Committee.

The name change is a name change only. The EMC Committee works on various interference matters, ranging from representing Amateur Radio on various industry committees, maintaining contact with industry groups and companies and trying to mitigate interference before it happens. That is probably 25% of my job at ARRL HQ, the rest being related to spectrum protection and trying to supervise the Lab staff. :-)

>10) QST pages to be limited, Web Site improved, to cut costs.
> Minutes of the Board meetings will be eliminated from the magazine and sent
>to the Web page. Also, ARRL section notes and contest results were nearly
>moved as well, all in the interest of cutting pages out of the magazine.
>What should be or could be "cut" from QST is obviously on the front burner.
>I wonder what the general feeling is about this in that while membership
>information seems very important to ME it was WAY down the list of
>respondents to a recent survey, I believe. Product reviews were Number One,
>naturally.

Actually, Val, the ARRL has been doing a better job than ever before at telling members what is doing. The question is whether QST is the best vehicle to publish those very boring minutes, or whether they are better made available on the Web, freeing up page space for something else.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2587. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 00:08:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA25EE8.8D04203E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38576

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > That's what happened when some hams tried to equate CW skill with
> > technical expertise.
>
> Yep. we insisted that all hams at least know something about Morse code.
> Now they aren't required to really know anything!

What evolved was truly unfortunate. There was the Extra written exam and the Extra code exam. They were given equal weight, i.e. both were pass/fail and both had to be passed to obtain the Extra license. Thus, someone who hardly knew the bare essentials about radio and electronics could gain the highest level in ham radio while another who knew volumes about radio and electronics might not gain that highest level because of the 20wpm Morse code skill exam.

Thus a "King of the Hill" mentality evolved in ham radio where Morse code was given the importance of everything else in ham radio combined. Morse code had the almost supernatural power to elevate basically ignorant people to the highest level in ham radio above much more competent and knowledgeable hams. That religious-like structure was bad for ham radio, has backfired, and is in the process of being remedied. Hams who based their self esteem and importance primarily on Morse code are having their rugs pulled out from under them.

I'm not saying that all hams bought into the above scenario but enough did (and do) to cause the present mess in which we find our hobby. We can recognize those hams today as the ones who hang on to their fantasy by calling present day Extras, "dumbed-down". IMO, having different permanent class levels within ham radio is a bad idea.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2588. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 00:08:39 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020327190839.00680.00000254@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 38577

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>My problem, as I experience it, is that I cannot buffer more than
>three or four characters. After the fifth character in a word, I have
>simply forgotten what character the word started with.

Kind of a Catch 22 here, Cecil, because that problem usually disappears at higher speeds.

You don't seem to have that problem with words. I wonder how the word vs character buffering process is different.

How well do you buffer spoken letters?

Just reaching for whatever I can to help.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2589. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 00:10:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA25F91.F80CBB2A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38578

Dick Carroll wrote:
> That is exactly what happened on the morning noted, where I could
> easily copy the CW ID on the PSK31 stations but not the PSK31 signal
> itself.

You were not using the same equipment for CW and PSK31 so your
observation is apples and oranges. In a similar case, 1000w
SSB will beat one watt CW. So what?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2590. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 00:11:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA25FCB.80E22F6C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38579

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > He asked for your help, and this is how you respond? For shame!
>
> Did you miss it? He got the help and rejected it.

I don't remember getting any useful help, Dick. Where was it?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2591. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 00:13:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA26021.B3FCBC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38580

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > How many years would it take for you to dunk a basketball?
>
> None. If I couldn't do it from the ground I'd use the right tool, a
> ladder.

Then you won't mind if I use the right tool, my SCS PCT2e, to copy CW above 15wpm.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2592. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 00:17:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA26131.CA6E76B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38581

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > If I've been making mistakes for 51 years, I honestly don't know what they
> > are. My problem, as I experience it, is that I cannot buffer more than
> > three or four characters. After the fifth character in a word, I have
> > simply forgotten what character the word started with.
>
> If you think you can't do it, you're right.

I've been tested by a professional, Dick. I cannot buffer more than three
or four characters. A clinical psychologist spelled words to me slowly.
After about the fourth character, I had forgotten what letter the word
started with. The doctor chalked it up to a relatively unimportant aural
processing handicap.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2593. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 00:28:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA263B8.36AF0C6C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38582

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > In the channel in use at the time, the CW signal was readable where the PSK31 was
> > > not.
> >
> > That's false, Dick. The computer was in the PSK31 channel and was NOT in
> > the CW channel. You know that and I know that you know that.
>
> That's incorrect and YOU know that. The computer was receiving the same
> IF bandwidth the receiver was using to play the CW.

The computer was used to process PSK31. The computer was NOT used
to process CW. You were used to process CW. You were NOT used to process
PSK21. THEREFORE, the same equipment was ***NOT*** used for both. It is
similar to comparing 1000w SSB to one watt CW. The comparison conditions
must be the same (or compensated for) or you are comparing apples and oranges.

That you could receive CW while the computer couldn't receive PSK31
is virtually irrelevant. I can run around my house and my computer
cannot do that. The computer is not equipped for running. I am. Your
computer was not equipped for CW. You were. Apples and oranges.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2594. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 00:32:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA264B5.273A9506@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38583

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > With the phasing out of the Morse code exams, Morse code has essentially let
> > him down so he unconsciously hates it? Some hams have said they would rather
> > see ham radio die than change radically.
>
> I'm coming to believe that you are a fundamentally dishonest person.
> You know that is NOT what was said.

Based on what was said, I'm guessing at the nature of your "monsters
from the ID". You remind me of Walter Pidgeon in "Forbidden Planet",
not accepting responsibility for the destruction you are causing.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2595. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 00:41:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA266BF.5BFCF91F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38584

W1RFI wrote:
> You don't seem to have that problem with words. I wonder how the word vs
> character buffering process is different.

Words are immediately turned into concepts and processed on a different
level than letters. A word has an immediate conceptual meaning. Letters
have no meaning until the word is recognized.

> How well do you buffer spoken letters?

I was tested for such by a clinical psychologist. I simply cannot buffer
more than three or four aural characters. I've never been tested visually
letter by letter. Maybe I'll write a program to do that.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2596. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 00:48:44 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MLto8.9423$se.896957@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38585

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA231C6.AF2A6E91@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > How many years would it take for you to dunk a basketball?
> >
> > About long enough to find my mother's old washtub and fill it about
> > half-full with the hose.
>
> Doing it that way is equivalent to one wpm Morse code.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>
>

Mayhap, but you wanted a basketball dunked and it worked in my Funk &
Wagnalls.

2597. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 01:14:38 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <28uo8.269$l93.10610213@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38586

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA23152.27C262FA@IEEE.org...
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > 15) On 5000 novice band re-farming comments, a big majority was for more
> > phone space.
> > Here we see a rather large straw in the wind. If it's all about usage
then
> > it looks to me like CW is going to getting into more and more trouble.
>
> I don't know about the other bands, but the 40m Novice CW frequencies
> are relatively unused. I tended to reside there until I gave up from
> lack of activity. At an average time on an average night, there are
> 1-2 CW QSOs in 50 kHz with lots of QRM from foreign AM stations. If
> you don't already have HF listening capabilities, might be a good
> time to acquire some and see for yourself.

The Novice bands are a discouragement to amateur radio. The quicker Novices
and Plusses are folded in with the rest of amateur radio the better. At
least 15 years too late on this one.

Brian

2598. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 01:16:19 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <D9uo8.271$Qc3.10796499@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38587

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ua458pmp4u6n4f@corp.supernews.com...
> Brief Discussion of ARRL January Board Meeting --
>
> Each numbered item is a note that I took from my reading of the minutes as
> published in the March issue of QST. My follow-on comments are in
reference
> to what is contained in the minutes themselves and reflect the fact that I
> am not a member of ARRL, yet, and so don't have all the history, though I
do
> have some. Perhaps the folks here will fill me in to some extent. As
soon
> as I get my call sign I'll be sending off my membership check to this
> organization. It's a MUST, as you will soon see!

What has your ham neighbor said about these initiatives?

2599. Re: Spark & CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 01:17:15 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <vauo8.273$3c3.10746021@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38588

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020327064447.01924.00000478@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >Jim, I wasn't there. You'll have to ask Dick.
>
> Or Cecil!
>
> Wanna' bet we get two different answers?
>
> :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Welp, with Cecil in the mix we're likely to get at least three different answers!

Brian

2600. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 01:18:38 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Obuo8.274$df3.10939948@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38589

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a7th9k$2n2$0@208.206.142.81...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >
> > > "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> > > news:ua1q62e6toubb0@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > And then we have the people who think that
> > > > just because they're hot stuff in some other radio life they
> > > > should automatically be hot stuff in amateur radio lfe. But not
> > > > too many of THOSE folks are INSIDE the tent. . . are they?
> > >
> > > ?Its important that we keep out people who actually know something
about
> > > radio?
> >
> > That's what happened when some hams tried to equate CW skill with
> > technical expertise.
>
>
>
> Yep. we insisted that all hams at least know something about Morse code.
> Now they aren't required to really know anything!

Neither are you, so "As you were, Soldier."

2601. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 01:25:27 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <biuo8.278$lm3.11354267@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38590

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA25EE8.8D04203E@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > That's what happened when some hams tried to equate CW skill with
> > > technical expertise.
> >
> > Yep. we insisted that all hams at least know something about Morse code.
> > Now they aren't required to really know anything!
>
> What evolved was truly unfortunate. There was the Extra written exam and
> the Extra code exam. They were given equal weight, i.e. both were
pass/fail
> and both had to be passed to obtain the Extra license. Thus, someone who
> hardly knew the bare essentials about radio and electronics could gain the
> highest level in ham radio while another who knew volumes about radio and
> electronics might not gain that highest level because of the 20wpm Morse
> code skill exam.
>
> Thus a "King of the Hill" mentality evolved in ham radio where Morse
> code was given the importance of everything else in ham radio combined.
> Morse code had the almost supernatural power to elevate basically ignorant
> people to the highest level in ham radio above much more competent and
> knowledgeable hams. That religious-like structure was bad for ham radio,
> has backfired, and is in the process of being remedied. Hams who based
> their self esteem and importance primarily on Morse code are having their
> rugs pulled out from under them.
>
> I'm not saying that all hams bought into the above scenario but enough did
> (and do) to cause the present mess in which we find our hobby. We can
> recognize those hams today as the ones who hang on to their fantasy
> by calling present day Extras, "dumbed-down". IMO, having different
> permanent class levels within ham radio is a bad idea.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

The former military and commercial ditty-boppers who were paid to learn code
then come on here and proceed to tell the rest of us why its so great really
frost my ass. Its imperative that the government keep their welfare QSO
system going so that we can revere their greatness. Well, I'm not
impressed.

Brian

2602. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 01:31:45 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <5ouo8.285$Oq3.11616398@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38591

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020327082519.27413.00000335@mb-mr.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: 15wpm hump
> >From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
> >Date: 03/26/02 21:46 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <doao8.300$hn6.18126945@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
>
> >There is no other reason.
>
> Thank you, Your Royal Highness, for the definitive answer.
>
> Steve

Steve, any time. Glad to be of service. But I don't know all the answers.
For instance, I often wonder what makes you tick.

Brian

2603. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 01:35:24 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <wruo8.286$3x3.11974852@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38592

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020327141018.21592.00000060@mb-fa.aol.com...
> In article <doao8.300$hn6.18126945@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> <K0HB@earthlink.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
> >> >
> >> >> Is this an unusual problem? Are there any solutions?
> >> >
> >> >It's a common problem. When training Navy radio ops it was called
"word
> >> >anticipation", and we solved it by training the ops with completely
random
> >> >"nonsense" practice tapes. The character sequences ("words") were of
> random
> >> >length and contained no recognizable words. Hard copy thus became a
> >> >completely automaton-ic connection between the eardrums and the
fingertips,
> >> >with no intervening conscious mental processing of any kind.
> >>
> >> Hmmm...that's right up there with knot-tying and sail-handling.
> >> Will the Navy ever get to iron hulls and steam power?
> >>
> >> How many Navy "radio ops" have had to train at being automatic
> >> morse decoders in the last 30 years?
> >
> >The few required to sit in the Black Sea or along the 38th parallel and
> >listen to the occasional 3rd world traffic. There is no other reason.
>
> Really? :-)

Yep. Intercept (spying) is the last domain of the military ditty-bopper.

2604. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 01:47:12 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <ACuo8.294$SC3.12308873@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38593

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020327063538.01924.00000473@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >> The ARRL sent a letter to the FCC before the NOI/NPRM came out.
>
> >A "letter?" What about your ex-parte presentation?
>
> The Ex Parte presenation was done after the rulemaking started.
>
> 73,
> Ed

Oh yeh, the "letter." The one that said "hold the phone, we're trying to
come up with something, but it'll be too late for the NPRM."

2605. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 01:48:24 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <IDuo8.295$JK3.12774958@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38594

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C995E65.7B9B707@worldnet.att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > > Seems only reasonable that anyone who ascribes
> > > > > to be a ham radio operator would be more than agreeable to
> > > > > learn the most basic of radio communications modes.
> > > >
> > > > Not after being told by you that he/she won't choose to learn
> > > > Morse code after the code requirement if dropped.
> > >
> > > Didn't need to be told by me. You NCI types have all yelled so
> > > loud and long about the code requirement being a "Hazing Ritual"
> > > they already know all about it.
> >
> > When the Morse code exam is gone, the hazing ritual will cease to
> > exist. There won't be any reason not to learn Morse code.
>
> Well, that's only 180 out. There won't be any reason for most
> newcomers *to* learn it. Just ask them.

Why not? Larry says it's PEE-U. Isn't that good enough?

2606. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 01:54:17 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <dJuo8.303$tM3.12877385@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38595

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020327063410.01924.00000472@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >> I made that suggestion to Carl because I know that he is not a very
> >experienced
> >> CW op, so if he made the comparison, I wanted to ensure he was doing so
> >based
> >> on real-world conditions.
> >
>
> >Shouldn't it actually be easier for the CW Op, since it has is said to
have
> >an advantage over all other modes?
>
> Sure, but I was hoping that by having Carl do the comparison himself, he
would
> have a better feel for CW useage on the bands.
>
> I think it would be even more valid if a CW op counted CW QSOs and an SSB
op
> counted SSB QSOs in progress.
>
> You game?

Nope. Have a staffer do it.

> We should do it on an evening when there is no big DX pileup to tio the
scales.
>
> >> Why do you feel that SSB is a "wrong" mode?
>
> >Because we're on r.r.a.p.
>
> I find it hard to understand why someone would choose to have different
views
> based upon where he is.

Why not? I've learned from the PCTA that it's OK to be a complete jerk at
anything other than making an RF emmision in the amateur bands, then its
back to the "Amateur's Code" where everything is sticky sweet. Personally,
I think they're probably jerks on the air, too. Imagine Larry having a QSO
with an OMIK member?

2607. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 01:56:28 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <gLuo8.305$KL3.12835238@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38596

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:a7sg3f61mkf@enews2.newsguy.com...
> Ed.... you and everyone else here will never reach that full
> potential.......
>
> Why? There is just so much to learn and explore within radio, that one
> person could spend an entire lifetime attempt to master every
realistically
> concievable aspect of amateur radio and radio communications in general
and
> still never reach 100%.
>
> That is the beauty of it though.... never ending supply of knowledge and
> experience. Only someone like the character Data on the ST:Tng series
could
> come close. This is why I love this hobby.... there is so much to do and
> learn.
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX

Ryan, you're right. Thanks for the dose of reality.

2608. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 01:57:27 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca3cc87_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38783

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020327223353.02252.00000247@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article <aDbo8.351$4Y6.20073672@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> The one who just put in a hard day's work picking cabbages in order
> >> to make an honest living to support his family. No doubt about it.
> > >
> > >Fair enough. Now whose your favorite American?
> >
> > I don't know if I have a "favorite" person from any country, Brian. I
> > don't play favorites -- I give everyone a chance, if they do the same
> > for me.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >

Always gotta be something in it for you...

Kim W5TIT

2609. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 01:57:41 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <pMuo8.309$DT3.13285432@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38597

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020327062852.01924.00000471@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >> A second advantage is that it makes it easier for the student to
continue
> >on to
> >> higher code speed and develop proficiency.
>
> >Then codify it.
>
> It is codified, Brian. The rules give the VEs the flexibility to make the
> decision.

Show where. Part 97 still says "5wpm Morse."

2610. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 02:02:43 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <7Ruo8.312$xU3.13344994@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38598

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020327141020.21592.00000064@mb-fa.aol.com...
> In article <20020327062852.01924.00000471@mb-df.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
(W1RFI)
> writes:
>
> >From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
> >
> >>> A second advantage is that it makes it easier for the student to
continue
> on to
> >>> higher code speed and develop proficiency.
> >
> >>Then codify it.
> >
> >It is codified, Brian. The rules give the VEs the flexibility to make the
> >decision.
>
> Nowhere, repeat NOWHERE in Parts 1, 2, or 97 of Title 47 CFR are
> there ANY specifications defining WORD RATE. None.
>
> VEs could send characters at 20 or 30 "WPM" and say that is "15
> WPM" and it could not be proven "illegal" unless the inter-symbol
> spacing was not according to the old CCITT spec on telegrams.
>
> You can trot out the old "PARIS" arguments and say "everybody
> accepts that" but that has no real binding in the law. The resident
> legal beagle will bark about that, of course, and probably Bill
> everyone for it too.

I have a colleague who is a foreign national. His immigration attorney
billed him for his Christmas Card. And the guy is a Hindu.

There is just NO definition for "word rate" with
> International Morse Code in Part 97.

Yep. This is where I exited RRAP about a year ago. Did our comm attorney
friend ever come up with a copy of the CCITT spec?

2611. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 02:03:02 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca3cdd3_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38784

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:aYwo8.453$xx6.23230818@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3ca2866b$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> > news:ua0v0bkmjb9ne7@corp.supernews.com...
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > >Val is one of the few who clearly would learn it even if not
required.
> > >
> > > This is correct, for two reasons:
> > >
> > > 1) For me, code is simply a part of my received wisdom about
> > > amateur radio, from many years ago. So, I just wouldn't "feel
> > > right" unless I learned how to operate CW.
> > >
> > > 2) I've seen it in operation, close up, for some time, and have
> > > seen how efficient it is. A couple of times a year I head out to
> > > a semi-remote place for what is called a "star party." In fact,
> > > several hundred other amateur astronomers go to the same
> > > relatively remote place, all at once, and set up telescopes, swap
> > > stories, observe the sky, you name it. The idea of stetting up a
> > > station at such an event, and communicating back here to
> > > Columbia, on only a few watts, and maybe off a handfull of
> > > AA batteries, really and truly appeals to me!
> > >
> > > Val
> > >
> >
> > Val, I have one question for you: will you judge other hams based on
their
> > feelings about CW? If one simply said, "I don't think CW should be a
part
> > of the testing strategy for an amateur radio license" would you then
> pounce
> > upon the person as though they had just committed sin? *That* is where
> the
> > difference is between people, as you seem, of reasonable nature, and
> people
> > like Dick/Larry, et al.
> >

> > Kim W5TIT
>
> They act like a pack of wolves and if we don't respect their pecking
order,
> we'll be torn apart.
>
> So much for the fraternity.
>
>

Really? Ya think? I've never felt anywhere near "torn apart" by anything those oafs have had to say. And, I don't believe in the "brotherhood" of any organization. If one is a crappy person, they can't hide from it by joining a fraternity. Pecking order indeed...

Kim W5TIT

2612. Morse Code Remembered

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 02:03:41 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0203271803.7cf2344a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 38599

Ancient tribes developed rhythmic codes which were subsequently pounded out upon hollow logs, signaling fellow tribesmen from a distance.

-- ENCYCLOPEDIA GALACTICA, 117th Edition, 1026 FE

2613. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 02:05:20 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca3ce5b_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38785

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA29F10.1BC07405@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > You were not using the same equipment for CW and PSK31 so your
> > > observation is apples and oranges. In a similar case, 1000w
> > > SSB will beat one watt CW. So what?
> >
> > I suppose you realize how stupid it sounds to insist that the most
> > efficient mode that won't work is better for the intended use than the
> > lesser in efficiecy that works just fine.
>
> If you think I said that, you are not comprehending.
> [SNIP]

Wait, wait, wait. You believe Dick Carroll can read *AND* comprehend--even if he isn't chewing gum at the same time?! I refer you back to his edumacashun on the Islamic faith...

Read the book of a bigot, you may become the bigot.

Kim W5TIT

2614. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 02:06:03 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <fUuo8.314$s14.13860166@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38600

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C996099.1D697780@worldnet.att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > When the channel I occupy allows CW to make it through when PSK31
> > > cannot, for whatever reason, polar phase shifting in that particular
case, then
> > > Cecil's misapplication of Shannon is not only invalid and misdirected
but
> > > misinforming to newcomers.l.
> >
> > I have explained a dozen times or more that your CW and PSK31 did NOT
occupy
> > the same channel since you were trying to use a computer to copy PSK31
> > but not CW. What is it about that simple concept that you cannot
comprehend?
> > You were NOT using the same equipment for both modes so your observation
> > is relatively meaningless.
> >
> > There are three values in Shannon's theorem: Power, bandwidth, and
throughput.
> > If these three values are not the same for two modes, a valid comparison
> > is not being made. An observation akin to yours is that 1000 watt SSB
gets
> > through when one watt CW fails. So what?
>
> Then there's the crack in Shannon for real world communications where
the user has
> no control over the situation. Keep your scientific comparisons for the
lab, they
> simply were of no use whatever in that situation.
> In the channel in use at the time, the CW signal was readable where the
PSK31 was
> not. That's the only valid comparison that can be made. Anything else
falls under the
> Yogi Berra theorem.

Obviously operator error. In the Air Force, we called it a bad "switch
actuator."

2615. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 02:11:43 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <zZuo8.318$4D3.12323092@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38701

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA1F938.A7AD11D0@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Then there's the crack in Shannon for real world communications where
the user has
> > no control over the situation.
>
> Please explain the crack in Shannon's Theorem for us, Dick. It would make
> you famous.
>
> > In the channel in use at the time, the CW signal was readable where
the PSK31 was
> > not.
>
> That's false, Dick. The computer was in the PSK31 channel and was NOT in
> the CW channel. You know that and I know that you know that. Why you
choose
> to continue to spread your falsehoods when everyone can see exactly what
> you are doing is beyond belief.

Cec, in liberalism, its OK to lie as long as the desired religious outcome is achieved. Like in the Fish and Wildlife Service where 4 FEDERAL employees planted hairs from a captive rare Canadian Lynx and other hairs from a taxidermy display of same. As long as Public Land Use is limited in 15 western states, the lie is justified.

2616. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 02:15:41 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <h1vo8.322$t94.14320737@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38702

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C996157.459D9A6E@worldnet.att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > You can mislead newcomers all you want, I'll tell them the facts.
Every ham
> > > should know how to use CW.
> >
> > "Every ham should know how to use CW but no ham will learn it unless it
is
> > required." Isn't that what you have been saying?
>
>
>
> You know what I said, and that sure isn't it. So few will learn it that
within a
> generation it'll be gone.

Disk, your mission is to get the Pokemon Empire to communicate in Morse
Code. Then it's future will be guaranteed.

2617. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 02:16:46 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <i2vo8.324$824.13905114@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38703

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a7tj79$89d$1@208.206.142.81...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > I don't think he will ever understand what he is unintentionally
doing. Or, he
> > > could understand and not be willing to admit that he is hurting his
cause.
> >
> > With the phasing out of the Morse code exams, Morse code has essentially
let
> > him down so he unconsciously hates it? Some hams have said they would
rather
> > see ham radio die than change radically.
>
>
>
> I'm coming to believe that you are a fundamentally dishonest person.
> You know that is NOT what was said.

I'm certain that Larry has said it. How are you different than Larry?

2618. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 02:18:54 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <i4vo8.329$Z34.14006525@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38704

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020326054852.08023.00000194@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> The reason Cecil and others believe you don't seriously
> >> want CW to continue is because your comments here simply
> >> do NOT convey any great dedication to the mode. It
> >> is as if you want CW to die out so you can then say..."See,
> >> I told you so." Your mileage may vary...but that IS
> >> the perception YOU have created for yourself.
>
> > I suppose when idiots are doing the perceiving, that is what should be
> >expected.
>
> That is what I have perceived the effect of your statements to be, too,
Dick.
> Do you believe that I am an idiot and that Amateur Radio would have been
better
> off had I not become a ham?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed, this is a real cliffhanger. I'm on the edge of my seat waiting for his
reply.

Brian

2619. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 02:24:40 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <I9vo8.334$0l4.15005799@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38705

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3CA10D81.B779267A@adelphia.net...
> Here is where I have an issue. We have many modes that are not tested
> for, yet they thrive, or at least have enough people using them that you
> can try them out, and find someone to communicate with. I've been having
> fun with many different modes since getting my ticket.
>
> Yet here we have a mode which many of it's supporters believe will
> disappear or die out if prospective hams do not learn the mode as a part
> of the licensing requirement.
>
> If this were truly the case, it isn't a mode worth keeping.
>
> Not that I personally believe that, but that is surely the impression I
> get from reading these threads.
>
> - Mike - KB3EIA

Mike, your impression is correct. If the FCC doesn't keep them supplied
with cw QSO's till their dying day, its because we're a bunch of lazy,
knuckle dragging morons with southern accents (re: Larry Roll).

2620. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 02:30:08 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca3d42b_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38787

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020328061738.16830.00000467@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>
> >At the risk of sounding flippant: don't buy into the "demise of amateur
> >radio" drumming that the ARRL does so well. It is the "threat" to
amateur
> >radio that is really the only way the ARRL knows how to "keep interest."
>
> Kim, I challenge you to show me even one place where ARRL has drummed that
the
> end is near. Go to http://www.arrl.org/news/bandthreat/ and tell me if
you
> believe that any of the problems cited are presented out of proportion to
what
> you believe the impact on Amateur Radio to be.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Ed, I didn't want the observation to be taken as a challenge. I don't think the "threats" are really all that serious...at least not as serious as made out to be when one reads the "headline" of concern.

However, wrt to the 70cm band in particular (I can't speak for a lot of others--as I don't know anything about them), I know that in this area the 70cm band is little used...though there's been a little more activity lately due to IRLP.

I was just looking in the ARRL Operating Manual, Fourth Edition, dated 1991. Are there any vast differences in spectrum for amateur radio between then and now? If not, then how much of that may have been attributed, actually, to a response from the radio amateur community vs. direct action from the ARRL on behalf of the radio amateur community?

What I am saying is that "the sky is falling" gets to be old, boring, and rather like crying wolf all the time. I guess I take a more detached approach than maybe some hams. I wouldn't feel the least bit phased by the loss of 70cm--I don't use or listen to it enough to be attached to it and I do believe that we either "use it or lose it." The spectrum is extremely valuable to commercial interests and maybe that keeps me in a job, keeps me talking on my cell phone, keeps me in technologies I really enjoy playing with, etc.

Sorry to sound so callous about it, but to tell you the truth I think the ARRL makes a grave mistake by focusing so much on stuff like "the sky is falling." Where's membership figures? What's the financial status of the ARRL? Is the ARRL still as "influential" as it used to be with the FCC? Don't "we" use statistical data to ascertain that the approach has failed, the mission may need drastic changing, etc.? From a strictly business perspective (and that is the nature of my thought--not the emotionalism of the hobby), the ARRL needs to do something to fully engage the radio amateur community--and band threats don't fully engage the "new breed" of radio amateur [in my opinion]. From a strictly business perspective, *what* would fully engage the radio amateur community...sheesh..that's the ten-thousand dollar question. But band threats ain't it...

How much serious experimentation is there now and will there be in the future with amateur radio? It just cannot be maintained as it has been in the past. Jobs, family, the speed of lifestyle bar many people from such luxury as to sit out in the garage playing with sparks all night. It is probably the serious experimentation, and things such as that, where band threats would have more impact.

Again, mine is an observation strictly from the perspective of business. ARRL gets more members, ARRL gets more impact and is taken much more seriously. Band threats and technical drawings in QST just don't cut it...at least with me. And, by the indications of statistics...not with many more than me also.

Kim W5TIT

2621. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 02:34:16 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <livo8.344$rp4.15271030@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38707

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ua4vrtd5gk4746@corp.supernews.com...
> I'll have to ask him about the ARRL panolply of initiatives!
>
> Val
>
> P.S. "Panoply" -- the complete arms and armor of a warrior!

Hey, lots of us like to talk "arms" on here. I'm currently using a Mini-14 and a junky SKS, but have plans for a CMP AR-15.

Brian

2622. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 02:38:48 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Ymvo8.349$iz4.15845784@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38709

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA26021.B3FCBC@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > How many years would it take for you to dunk a basketball?
> >
> > None. If I couldn't do it from the ground I'd use the right tool, a
> > ladder.
>
> Then you won't mind if I use the right tool, my SCS PCT2e, to copy CW
above 15wpm.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

As long as the sender is complying with the unspecified specification of the
actual Morse Code, then all should be well. But if the sender is a yahoo
with a bug...

2623. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 02:43:39 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca3d766_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38796

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ua6dk1r67nj667@corp.supernews.com...
>
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> >Val, I have one question for you: will you judge other hams based
> >on their feelings about CW? If one simply said, "I don't think CW
> >should be a part of the testing strategy for an amateur radio license"
> >would you then pounce upon the person as though they had just
> >committed sin? *That* is where the difference is between people,
> >as you seem, of reasonable nature, and people like Dick/Larry, et al.
>
> I judge other PEOPLE on how they seem to be conducting them-
> selves in civil society. What * I * have been reading, since 1998
> on this newsgroup, from the anti-code folks, almost to a person, is
> a viciousness that goes WAY beyond any opposition to CW.

I submit that, if you see that only from the anti-code folks, then you are very narrow sighted. It comes from both sides, Val, and has since I have been reading this newsgroup.

>
> There
> is something about the whole "incentive licensing" procedure, and
> the creation of an official Ham Hierarchy, that has brought out the
> worst in a lot of people.
>

Absolutely. This is an idea promulgated by the FCC's testing strategy in the first place. If there had never been a mode preference, I think the situation would not be as it is.

>
> They say it's about the code, and maybe
> some of it is, but it runs a LOT deeper than that, in my view.
>

Yeah, lots deeper. How 'bout this: amateur radio is used as an excuse by a lot of people to play out their bigoted tendancies. I mean, after all, if one doesn't "speak" the same way, "do" things the same way, "act" the same way, or didn't "get here" the same way as another, then one is subject to just as mean a ritualistic beating as if one were personally pulled behind the pickup truck of another.

>
> Now,

> one might expect this kind of thing on _alt.rec.knavesAND fools_
> but I was startled four years ago to see it on THIS group.
>

I don't think I've ever been "startled" by anything here. I've been in too many peace groups, professional organizations and hobby organizations. Politics run deep. Give any topic on this newsgroup long enough and you'll have the liberal lefties vs. the righteous righties--and that's all there is to it. Leave out that most people really don't have the maturity, experience, or care to objectively argue their position, yet respect another's.

>
> And I am
> still startled today. For a while I got caught up in it again but now,
> after only a few weeks "back" on this group, I am simply appalled
> at the abounding bad faith.
>

Oh, it's real easy to get caught up in. The dynamics of mob politics rule in forums such as this.

>
> For me personally CW is part and parcel of amateur radio and
> always will be. Now, with its commercial demise, it's UNIQUE to
> amateur radio, which is, for me, a PLUS, since I am of a historical
> bent AND like to BE a little "unique", in some harmless ways!
> Add to this the idea that CW can be done on little power, with very
> simple equipment, and is understood around the world, and, well,
> it's hard for me NOT to advocate some testing here, especially for
> the very top of the tree, the EXTRA class. I don't see one thing
> wrong with it, for many reasons, NONE of which have anything to
> do with "hazing" or any crap like that. In my view, "arguments"
> like that have brought on the lowering of intellectual content of the
> whole debate, which I think was their original intent. That is, to me
> the whole "anti-code" crowd has seized on code as a stalking
> dog for a bad-faith attack on incentive licensing based on what
> amounts to jealousy. That's my view.
>
> Val
>

You really do seem to be very one-sided in your view, Val...because *both* sides in this newsgroup have been just a blatantly uncaring about each other. I don't know how many times on this newsgroup I have stated that CW is a beautiful thing to listen to...for about twenty seconds...LOL All kidding aside, I have stated many times that I really enjoy watching a good CW op, and I've seen one of the absolute best, KF9AS, a 45wpm gal (and that's on a slow day) with an absolutely mesmerizing CW skill. But, it's her gig, your gig, their gig. It's not my gig. And, to be thought of as dumbed down for my belief on CW...well, it just brings home the absolute ignorance some people can display.

Kim W5TIT

2624. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 02:45:04 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ua4vrtd5gk4746@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38706

Brian P Burke wrote, concerning the ARRL January board meetings, and the various items under discussion there:

>What has your ham neighbor said about these initiatives?

Funny you should ask that! I just got off the land line with him a few minutes ago. However, the major topics of our conversation were:

1) What 2-meter H/T I should get.
2) What it just cost him to bury his home's electrial lines.
3) What tower he's going to put up, since he buried those lines!
4) What I should put up for my first "serious" HF antenna.
5) What a great yard I have for a tower of my own.
6) When serious CW practice begins (next week) and . . .
7) His views about code testing going away soon.

He's been pretty well resigned to this last for quite some time, stating that, even though serious pressure for phone band expansion is right around the corner, there will still be at least SOME band protection for CW into the far future.

I'll have to ask him about the ARRL panolply of initiatives!

Val

P.S. "Panoply" -- the complete arms and armor of a warrior!

**

2625. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 02:50:45 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca3d901_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38798

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a7vfremlk0@208.207.71.160...
>
>
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> >
> > For me personally CW is part and parcel of amateur radio and
> > always will be. Now, with its commercial demise, it's UNIQUE to
> > amateur radio, which is, for me, a PLUS, since I am of a historical
> > bent AND like to BE a little "unique", in some harmless ways!
> > Add to this the idea that CW can be done on little power, with very
> > simple equipment, and is understood around the world, and, well,
> > it's hard for me NOT to advocate some testing here, especially for
> > the very top of the tree, the EXTRA class. I don't see one thing
> > wrong with it, for many reasons, NONE of which have anything to
> > do with "hazing" or any crap like that. In my view, "arguments"
> > like that have brought on the lowering of intellectual content of the
> > whole debate, which I think was their original intent. That is, to me
> > the whole "anti-code" crowd has seized on code as a stalking
> > dog for a bad-faith attack on incentive licensing based on what
> > amounts to jealousy. That's my view.
>
>
>
> And Val, your view is right on target, as the longterm evidence
> gleaned by anyone reading this NG will soon show.
>

Oh, yeah. And you're a real voice of objectivity on this newsgroup, Dick.

>
> For myself, I really regret ever making the first post here. but once
> the battle was engaged- and make no mistake it IS a battle-
>

Battle?! Is that how you see it? That is laughable, at best.

>
> there has
> not been a point at which I felt I could engage on even terms. The
> slander and outright untruths shoveled so liberally by the nocoders has
> been too intense.
>

And you're so rightly right all the time, right? Good grief, Dick. You're
one of the worst, uncaring, beligerant, bigoted people here, Dick.

> The argument has nothing to do with the advance of technology or its
> socalled rejection by hams, as is so often alleged by the code haters.
> It has to do with the overall communications potential of the ARS, and
> what will be lost with the dropping oif all code testing. If the promise
> of a full service license is not enough to persuade new hams to learn
> code to the minimal level of today, there is simply no way that most
> will ever be moved to do it without. Sure some will, numbers far too
> small to ever defend the mode from those who would keep painting it into
> such a small corner that eventually even the most avid CW user will quit
> in total disgust.
>
> Dick

WHY does someone who simply disagrees with CW as a testing element have to bear the regard from you as a "code hater." Do you know how ridiculous you even sound when you say that? It's a stupid fucking mode on ham radio, Dick, not a living breathing entity!!!

And, why do you take it upon yourself, as many do, to value another person based on whether they know or like CW? That's about as bigoted as one can get...though you do fit nicely into that definition, so I don't know why I am so indignant to your attitude. I've come to expect nothing more from you.

Kim W5TIT

2626. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 02:52:42 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca3d975_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38799

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a7vged$op5$0@208.207.71.160...
>
>
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> >
> > Following this coment from someone who calls himself "Len":
> >
> > >>If you need to be a Yiddisher, wear a yarmulke when you post..
> >
> > Steve Robeson wrote:
> >
> > >That's what I like about you, Your Insultingness...you can be
> > >offensive in any number of religions.
> >
> > There comes a time to simply stop responding to people who
> > are worthless individuals and are on the net soley to perform
> > as absolute asswipes -- and have been doing so for YEARS.
> > In my view, the time to stop responding to this poster ["Len"]
> > was even before the InterNet was created, but that wasn't
> > possible, unfortunately. Please, let's all stop responding to
> > this "Len", who has shown what he truly is. Please, no more.
>
>
>
> There are a few posters whose posts I never open. He has long been
> one. The others are added slowly over time, and I just very recently
> added The Gadfly, B.Burke also.
>
> When one has nothing constructive whatever to add to the conversation,
> and instead only adds to the the QRM and QRN on a band, it's time to
> tune on.

heh heh heh, though if you watch carefully Mr "I am ignoring you" will
respond directly to a post of someone he is "ignoring." It's hilarious.
Another favorite tactic is to respond via someone else's post.

What a fake, Dick.

Kim W5TIT

2627. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 02:53:17 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <xAvo8.360$bK4.16494171@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38712

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:u9ao8.283$di6.17880312@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Russell Todd" <RussellTodd@istoreplus.net> wrote in message
> news:217b8ae4.0203261218.42dfc78b@posting.google.com...
> > In my opinion, and make note that I speak for no one but myself, and
> > in my experience, the people who whine the most about "no code" are
> > the plug-n-play-CB-Radio crowd who got on VHF because the test was
> > easy. Again, this is based on my experience. In my opinion, not only
> > would HF all sounding like 14.313 or 3950, there would be a run on
> > Linear Amps by people who have no idea of what they are doing or why
> > and we'd end up with HF signals getting into everything from phones to
> > toasters and the population in general hating Ham operators.
>
> Morse Code taught me nothing about amplifiers or toasters. What did it
> teach you?
> As a matter of fact, Morse Code isn't even defined in Part 97. Must not
be
> very important.
>
> > I am in agreement that the "loud cry" is from a very small group of
> > people who don't want to jump through the necessary hoops to "earn" HF
> > privelages.
>
> I'm sure you meant to say "unnecessary hoops."
>
> If they have "learning disabilities" give them
> > wheelchairs with CB's on them but for gods sake don't let them on HF.
> > The Code test is more than just memorizing the code. There is a state
> > of mind that comes with code that the "no coders" are dismissing and
> > failing to understand.
>
> Coders apparently also dismiss and fail to understand. A fair number of
> people who jumped through the unnecessary government hoops want to see the
> exam eliminated.
>
> Part 97 does not define the "state of mind" that you seek from amateurs.
> Please elaborate.
>
> > Why don't we just get rid of that darn
> > bothersome "driving" part of the drivers license and just take the
> > written test? While we're at it, lets not make those surgeons do
> > internships at hospitals and let them just get on with it after the
> > written test.

>
> Agreed, lets make the medical doctors take a Morse Code exam so that it
will
> qualify them to perform dentistry.
>
> > I don't think the Pro-Coders are asking for anything unreasonable.
>
> I think they are. They want the government to keep them supplied with
folks
> to have a CW qso with, because they cannot sell it on its merits as other
> modes have to do.
>
> > Its not "hazing", its not punishment, and so what if everyone and
> > their brother has a cell phone and code MAY NOT be relevant in the
> > next nuclear holocaust? Its a necessary part of the progression from
> > plug-n-play-CB-er to bonafide Radio Opeator who understands what
> > happens when you push the button in on the microphone.
>
> Learning Morse Code taught me nothing of radio theory.
>
> > While I don't think there is a large mass of "no-coders" waiting for
> > Lincoln to free them from the slavery of VHF, I do think that every
> > idiot that has $2,000 will go out and buy an HF rig and turn HF into
> > shit over a 2-year period of time after the code is dropped.
>
> Wowee!!! You mean like happened on 2M where the silence roars?
>
> I don't
> > care what the figures say, (figures never lie but liars figure) the
> > percentage of the population that is attracted to Ham radio is never
> > going to be as much as the no-coders claim.
>
> What do they claim? How is it different from what the Coders have
claimed?
> Please expand this idea.
>
> We're an unusual group of
> > strange people that think RF is more fun than sitting in front of a tv
> > or computer screen or any other interest.
>
> Not necessarily.
>
> > Keep the code or every moron from here to eternity is going to be on
> > HF. If you think its bad now, you ain't heard nothing yet!
>
> Morse code failed the "riffraff" test. We need enforcement whether we
have
> code exams or not.
>
> 73, Brian

Hello, Russell. Hello? Hellooooooo??? Anybody Home?

What has Morse Code taught you about "what happens when you push the button in on the microphone."

2628. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 02:56:44 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ua50hqc7qtlq33@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38708

K0HB wrote, about the "Big Project" and my comment that it had to do with ARRL's efforts to get the FCC to interpose for amateur radio operators where local covenants are concerned.

>Nothing of the sort. The "big project" is related to young people
>and education.

Well, yes, it involves "education," and I'm all for it. However, it is explained in an article that begins on p. 94 of the March issue that the "meta-purpose" behind the project is the advancement of ARRL efforts to influence the Congress, and others, concerning things like the CC&R problem. It is much more than "education for education's sake" since "the future of amateur radio is at stake" right now.

Val

2629. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 02:57:33 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca3da98_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38851

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA37853.A537FAF8@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > There was, is now but to a far lesser extent, and more than likely
always
> > will be a caste system in the ARS as to some extent as there is in every
> > human activity.
>
> The caste system based on competition has its place in a free
> market, profit-driven, economy and may the best competitors win.
> But in an elective hobby, what is the purpose of putting individuals
> into competition, dividing them into classes, and grinding the "lower"
> classes into the dirt? This hobby is NOT about dog eat dog competition,
> at least, it shouldn't be. Every member and potential member of the ARS
> should be welcomed with open arms.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP
>
>

Absolutely, and yet your attitude, Cecil seems to be translated as one of
hate, at least from what I've seen of some of Val's posts.

Kim W5TIT

2630. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 02:58:19 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ua50l8ha9c2u57@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38710

W1RFI wrote:

>Although that is important, the Big Project is an educational initiative.
>The premise is that Amateur Radio is a valuable classroom tool, not
>necessarily to recruit new hams, but because through amateur radio,
>we have learned some about science, geography, international politics,
>and amateur radio can be used as a teaching tool in the classroom.

I hope to participate locally in this project. I'm all for it!

Val

2631. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 03:04:43 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <fLvo8.366$S_4.17462573@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38713

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ua0v0bkmjb9ne7@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> >Val is one of the few who clearly would learn it even if not required.
>
> This is correct, for two reasons:
>
> 1) For me, code is simply a part of my received wisdom about
> amateur radio, from many years ago. So, I just wouldn't "feel
> right" unless I learned how to operate CW.

Val, go to confession and get over it. After Novice Enhancement came along
I too continued to think that CW was the only "real" mode. Too much
brainwashing.

Several months later a friend came over with a six pack and a pair of dykes
and my 40M loop becamwe a 10M dipole. I've never looked back.

> 2) I've seen it in operation, close up, for some time, and have
> seen how efficient it is.
A couple of times a year I head out to
> a semi-remote place for what is called a "star party." In fact,

QRS

> several hundred other amateur astronomers go to the same
> relatively remote place, all at once, and set up telescopes, swap

QRS

> stories, observe the sky, you name it. The idea of stetting up a
> station at such an event, and communicating back here to
> Columbia, on only a few watts, and maybe off a handfull of
> AA batteries, really and truly appeals to me!

Val, say again all after "efficient." You got excited and jumped your speed
above 10 wpm where I can no longer copy.

73, Brian

2632. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 03:06:48 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca3dcc4_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38854

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ua77phb42gmq71@corp.supernews.com...
>
> mike coslo wrote:
>
> > To be fair Val, there is plenty of blame to go around
> >on both sides of the argument. But the issue is so
> >polarized that the parties are deliberately "misunderstanding"
> >each other, trying to dismiss entire arguments on typos,
> >extrapolating incredible amounts of insinuation from
> >simple statements, and just general cussedness.
>
> There is truth in what you say. However, I learned a long time
> ago that certain people are not worthy of respect. Once that
> fact has been demonstrated then, ah, there is no purpose
> in giving even a single inch, once one has sullied oneself
> by mixing it up with them. For this reason I won't be replying
> to them very damned often in the future. They are not worth it.
>
>
> >Plus there is one not so endearing quality from some of the
> >Procode crowd. That is the concept that "Extra Lites" such
> >as myself are considered second class citizens by so many
> >of them. I'm pro-code, but my inferior status in their eyes turns
> >me right off to thier cause.
>
> Well, what else can you expect from the people who have
> been in the field for many years and have had this system
> forced on them from above! They played the FCC game
> by the rules and climbed the tree fair and square, most of
> them, and then saw the whole thing trivialized, first by the
> "waivers" and then by the other changes. It does not matter
> whether these changes are "better" or "worse" for Ham
> Radio or World Peace, or whatever, the particpants in the
> old system, many of them, are going to be disgruntled.
>

Val, whose ass, exactly, are you kissing? Are we less of a human being
today because you men don't have to hunt for food and bring it home for us
women to feed you with? Are we less today because of all the advancements
we've made through the ages?!

Good grief, you're so syrupy above I can't help but wonder who you are
trying to impress...

Kim W5TIT

2633. Re: Straight Dope on CW's Future?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 03:08:49 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <5Pvo8.369$G45.17812698@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38715

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a7rb0l$2u5$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net...

> So Larry, Dick, etc. just how do you explain the "international"
> support for ending code testing?

W5YI and Shirley McClain held hands and looked to the East, chanting "NCI,
NCI, ..."

2634. Re: Straight Dope on CW's Future?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 03:10:08 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <kQvo8.371$e%4.17480849@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38717

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA14768.E8701237@IEEE.org...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > So Larry, Dick, etc. just how do you explain the "international"
> > support for ending code testing? I have read ad nauseum how
> > this was all an FCC "done deal" regarding code testing in the US.
> > Is the direction we see towards ending code testing and/or
> > significantly reducing it an international "done deal"? If yes,
> > who drove the deal?
>
> Obviously the aliens, Bill. They must have received a transmission
> of, "Independence Day", and are trying to get rid of CW before
> the actual invasion.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Dammit! Why don't you just go on Art Bell and blab the whole damned
thing???

2635. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 03:11:45 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ua51e080j96v01@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38711

W1RFI wrote, concerning the January ARRL board meeting,
a lot of interesting material.

About the need for new funding:

>It goes past that, although the stock market tumble hit ARRL's
>investment portfolio somewhat, I would imagine. There are two
>factors at play. First, spectrum pressure is increasing big time.

[snip]

>What used to be possible to fund solely from membership dues
>is not possible in today's regulatory environment. Part of that
>development is the creation of special funds to which one can
>contribute.

A good idea and I can see from reading those minutes how
complicated the whole business is.

For instance:

>There are more threats than just that. Right now, 2 m, 70 cm,
>2.4 GHz, 5.6 GHz and 24 GHz are on the plate.

Ouch!

>The EMC Committee works on various interference matters, ranging
>from representing Amateur Radio on various industry committees,
>maintaining contact with industry groups and companies and
>trying to mitigate interference before it happens. That is probably
>25% of my job at ARRL HQ, the rest being related to spectrum
>protection and trying to supervise the Lab staff. :-)

Ah, yes, someone has to do it! Holding on to the current spectrum
allocations does seem like a BIG deal, considering what's happening
in the commercial sphere.

[About the minutes being moved to the web site]:

>Actually, Val, the ARRL has been doing a better job than ever before
>at telling members what is doing. The question is whether QST is the
>best vehicle to publish those very boring minutes, or whether they are
>better made available on the Web, freeing up page space for some-
>thing else.

I tell you, I think those minutes have an important function, and
if it were me in charge they would stay in the magazine. No doubt
most people don't read them and think they are a waste of space

but, well, er, I don't! Like that means anything! Anyway, isn't there something in the bylaws about this, about keeping the rank and file informed? I'm not trying to be difficult but it seems to me that as a 501c corporation one of the few things that might be mandated IS providing important organizational information to the members.
But I guess the thing is done.

No matter, thanks for your reply!

Val

2636. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 03:16:53 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca472ca_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38925

If Dick had his way, people would only be allowed to be hams if they thought and acted just like him. Why would he want to allow those with whom he finds so loathsome to be a part of "his" hobby?

Kim W5TIT

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message news:U0Ro8.1638$uk6.79657091@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:a7vfremlk0@208.207.71.160...
>
> > For myself, I really regret ever making the first post here. but once
> > the battle was engaged- and make no mistake it IS a battle- there has
> > not been a point at which I felt I could engage on even terms. The
> > slander and outright untruths shoveled so liberally by the nocoders has
> > been too intense.
>
> Scuse me? If you go back and reread you're old stuff you'll be doubly sorry
> you ever posted on here. No, don't bother.
>
> > The argument has nothing to do with the advance of technology
>
> It has to do with the government imposing arbitrary requirements on its
> citizens.
>
> or its
> > socalled rejection by hams,
>
> ? What does that mean?
>
> > as is so often alleged by the code haters.
>
> dick I don't hate code and I don't hate people who use code. What I don't
> tolerate well is libs who want to get the government to mandate their cause.
>
> > It has to do with the overall communications potential of the ARS, and
> > what will be lost with the dropping oif all code testing. If the promise
> > of a full service license is not enough to persuade new hams to learn
> > code to the minimal level of today, there is simply no way that most
> > will ever be moved to do it without. Sure some will, numbers far too
> > small to ever defend the mode from those who would keep painting it into
> > such a small corner that eventually even the most avid CW user will quit

> > in total disgust.
>
> Dick, dick, dick. If all the wonderful attributes of your favorite mode
> aren't enough to entice people to learn it, then guess what? Hey, the FAA
> still uses AM for critical aviation communications. Why don't you grab
the
> AM banner and see if the FCC will mandate a separate pass/fail exam...
>
>

2637. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 03:20:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a7u267$g48$0@208.207.71.170>
Source record: 38719

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > That is exactly what happened on the morning noted, where I could
> > easily copy the CW ID on the PSK31 stations but not the PSK31 signal
> > itself.
>
> You were not using the same equipment for CW and PSK31 so your
> observation is apples and oranges. In a similar case, 1000w
> SSB will beat one watt CW. So what?
>

I suppose you realize how stupid it sounds to insist that the most
efficient mode that won't work is better for the intended use than the
lesser in efficiecy that works just fine.

2638. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 03:20:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a7u26l$g48$1@208.207.71.170>
Source record: 38720

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > How many years would it take for you to dunk a basketball?
> >
> > None. If I couldn't do it from the ground I'd use the right tool, a
> > ladder.
>
> Then you won't mind if I use the right tool, my SCS PCT2e, to copy CW above 15wpm.

I don't mind at all. If you believe you can't learn to do it yourself,
you are right.

2639. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 03:20:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a7u26p$g48$2@208.207.71.170>
Source record: 38721

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > That's what happened when some hams tried to equate CW skill with
> > > technical expertise.
> >
> > Yep. we insisted that all hams at least know something about Morse code.
> > Now they aren't required to really know anything!
>
> What evolved was truly unfortunate. There was the Extra written exam and
> the Extra code exam. They were given equal weight, i.e. both were pass/fail
> and both had to be passed to obtain the Extra license. Thus, someone who
> hardly knew the bare essentials about radio and electronics could gain the
> highest level in ham radio while another who knew volumes about radio and
> electronics might not gain that highest level because of the 20wpm Morse
> code skill exam.

I certainly agree, it was a real travesty when the Extra class license
exam was relaxed to the point where it required no real knowledge, and
actually not very much Morse code skill either, to achieve as the code
tests could be passed by mostly guessing at multiple choice questions
which were often constructed poorly. It really did destroy the validity
of the entire license class as something Extra, and from that day on it
never has been able to live up to its original intent and its name.

>
> Thus a "King of the Hill" mentality evolved in ham radio where Morse
> code was given the importance of everything else in ham radio combined.

Really? Wonder where I missed that. And I was here, paying attention,
the whole time while you immersed yourself in the "one hit $hit"
culture. But I guess to one who can't string more than four Morse
characters together without forgetting where it's at could be expected
to come up with such a story.

> Morse code had the almost supernatural power to elevate basically ignorant
> people to the highest level in ham radio above much more competent and
> knowledgeable hams. That religious-like structure was bad for ham radio,
> has backfired, and is in the process of being remedied. Hams who based
> their self esteem and importance primarily on Morse code are having their
> rugs pulled out from under them.

And you're the captain of a ship or fools.

>
> I'm not saying that all hams bought into the above scenario but enough did
> (and do) to cause the present mess in which we find our hobby. We can
> recognize those hams today as the ones who hang on to their fantasy
> by calling present day Extras, "dumbed-down".

It's the TEST, dummy. If you have a sham for a test, and no code test
of any consequence, what results can only be obvious.

IMO, having different
> permanent class levels within ham radio is a bad idea.

No surprise there, given your penchant for trivializing ham radio in
its entirety. After all, when the whole thing is worthless how can it be
worthy of a real structure and rules? Let it all hang out,

2640. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 03:21:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a7u272$g48$3@208.207.71.170>
Source record: 38722

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > With the phasing out of the Morse code exams, Morse code has essentially let
> > > him down so he unconsciously hates it? Some hams have said they would rather
> > > see ham radio die than change radically.
> >
> > I'm coming to believe that you are a fundamentally dishonest person.
> > You know that is NOT what was said.
>
> Based on what was said, I'm guessing at the nature of your "monsters
> from the ID". You remind me of Walter Pidgeon in "Forbidden Planet",
> not accepting responsibility for the destruction you are causing.

Not only are you fundamentally dishonest, you have no clue to that
fact, and can't see it in your own responses. It means nothing to you to
totally misrepresent the words of someone with whom you disagree, and
you seem to be obvlious to the fact that you're even doing it.

2641. Re: OT - Plug Needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 03:33:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020327223353.02252.00000248@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 38725

In article <3CA14C62.643EC8A0@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> So, I've inhaled my share of rosin-core solder fumes [twitch].
>
>And chewed on the solder?

No, but it looks like Lennie has...

73 de Larry, K3LT

2642. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 03:33:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020327223353.02252.00000247@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 38726

In article <aDbo8.351$4Y6.20073672@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke"
<bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> The one who just put in a hard day's work picking cabbages in order
>> to make an honest living to support his family. No doubt about it.
>
>Fair enough. Now whose your favorite American?

I don't know if I have a "favorite" person from any country, Brian. I
don't play favorites -- I give everyone a chance, if they do the same
for me.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2643. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 03:33:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020327223354.02252.00000249@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 38728

In article <FVbo8.364$G67.20650053@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> BTW -- the messages I did "unscramble" were handed over to the
>> XO of the base comm squadron. I never asked what they meant,
>> and he never told me, but he did try to talk me into cross-training!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>"The older I get, The greater I was."

Brian:

What makes you say that? The "message" I "decoded" could have been 100% wrong. I'll be the first to admit that. The comm sq. XO was just impressed with my ingenuity, and felt that I may be a good candidate for some kind of crypto-duty. However, I already had a job I liked, and was getting promoted regularly. Cross-training is career death in a lot of cases, especially that one.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2644. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 03:33:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020327223354.02252.00000250@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 38729

In article <20020327141022.21592.00000066@mb-fa.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>>>HOW DID YOU KNOW IF THE COPY WAS *CORRECT?*
>>
>>Lennie:
>>
>>Don't look now, but I wasn't copying for the sake of *having* correct
>>copy in-hand, although I was able to recognize the fact that I was
>>copying correctly after a while. Of course, all I had were neat little
>>5-by-5 character groups on my paper, but so what? The fact that
>>what I copied meant nothing to me didn't matter, I was just copying
>>it for the sake of doing so, not to gather Intel.
>
>Geez us all. Let me ask a third time...
>
>HOW IN THE HELL DID YOU KNOW IF WHAT YOU "COPIED"
>WAS "CORRECT?"

Lennie:

For at least the second time, I didn't *have* to know if I copied
correctly. I was just copying for the sake of copying something --
anything -- strictly for the practice. Verification of the correctness
of my copy was unnecessary. However, I will state that I did, in
fact, know that I WAS copying correctly. If I hear "dadadit" and
write down the letter "G" -- I don't have to have someone tell me
I did it right. Morse code isn't that hard; however, I guess I can't
expect you to understand that concept.

>Cut all this bullshit, radio whiz-bang. All you are doing is piling the
>merde higher.

Whatever.

>With random character groups you wouldn't know if something was
>"correct copy" just by "writing it down."

Sez who?

>>Having said that, I
>>do believe that a couple of times I may have hit on the decoding
>>key -- and I did "unscramble" a few "messages."
>
>"Unscramble?!?!?" More bullshit. You couldn't handle a simple
>mono-key alphabetic substitution cipher or a beginner's Playfair.

Really? How do you know?

>>BTW -- the messages I did "unscramble" were handed over to the
>>XO of the base comm squadron. I never asked what they meant,
>>and he never told me, but he did try to talk me into cross-training!
>
>...probably to get you the hell out of the wing...if we can believe
>that little imaginary story.

Again, whatever. The XO just happened to be my MARS boss at
the time. That's Military Affiliate Radio System, Lennie, nothing to
do with SETI.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2645. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 03:33:55 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020327223355.02252.00000251@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 38727

In article <20020327141021.21592.00000065@mb-fa.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>
>>Larry might have a new "Favorite Minority on the Bus" by then. Let's hope
>>anyway. He won't be any farther ahead as an amateur, he's given up
>>self-inflicted SET's.
>
>Larry couldn't understand "SETI"... :-)

Right. It stands for Symptoms of Extreme Testicular Inadequacy --
and Len knows all about it. <BG>

73 de Larry, K3LT

2646. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 03:45:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020327224504.06459.00000080@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 38731

In article <20020327154923.07502.00000419@mb-cc.aol.com>,
Powerful Marine Syndrome (PMS) sufferer (Stebe) writes:

>>Geez us all. Let me ask a third time...
>
> You, "Sir", have NO BUSINESS demanding that someone answer a question.
>You have about a ga-zillion ignorned questions out there. So take a hike,
Punk.

Ah, so it's "that time of the month," is it? :-)

Or is it just "that time of the mouth?!?" :-)

>>With random character groups you wouldn't know if something was
>>"correct copy" just by "writing it down."
>
> Sure he would. Just as I would. It's called proficiency.

"Proficiency" in what, your numbness? "Proficiency" in printing perhaps.

How does one achieve proficiency in "reading code?" Why, by having
the original transmitted characters to CHECK THE COPY, idiot.

Jay-suss, are you really that dense, Stebie, or did you work at it a
long time?!?

Do you think that "numbers stations" repeat in clear-text afterwards so
that agents can "check their morse copy?!?!?" HAAAA!!!!!

How do you KNOW in advance that all those 5-groups are in
encrypted English? Did you think that spies and other nasties
somehow "conform to rules" and use only Interenational Morse
Code?!?!?

Jay-suss, you're even dumber than I thought!!!

> Putz.

Come back when you've learned how to get along with others.

If you need to be a Yiddisher, wear a yarmulke when you post...
and lay off the sacramental wine...Passover is coming, not
Passout.

Shalom

2647. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 04:01:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a7u4jalhk0@208.207.71.170>
Source record: 38732

CAM wrote:

> Val, you either are for or against unnecessary governmental
> requirements. Libertarians are agin' 'em.
>

And of course YOU get to decide what's necessary.

2648. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 04:18:44 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <EQwo8.448$Hm6.22591882@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38733

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a7u4jalhk0@208.207.71.170...
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Val, you either are for or against unnecessary governmental
> > requirements. Libertarians are agin' 'em.
>
> And of course YOU get to decide what's necessary.

It was a no-brainer. Where's your brain?

2649. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 04:23:38 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <eVwo8.450$5t6.22964903@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38734

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a7u26p$g48$2@208.207.71.170...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > That's what happened when some hams tried to equate CW skill with
> > > > technical expertise.
> > >
> > > Yep. we insisted that all hams at least know something about Morse
code.
> > > Now they aren't required to really know anything!
> >
> > What evolved was truly unfortunate. There was the Extra written exam and
> > the Extra code exam. They were given equal weight, i.e. both were
pass/fail
> > and both had to be passed to obtain the Extra license. Thus, someone who
> > hardly knew the bare essentials about radio and electronics could gain
the
> > highest level in ham radio while another who knew volumes about radio
and
> > electronics might not gain that highest level because of the 20wpm Morse
> > code skill exam.
>
>
> I certainly agree, it was a real travesty when the Extra class license
> exam was relaxed to the point where it required no real knowledge, and
> actually not very much Morse code skill either, to achieve as the code
> tests could be passed by mostly guessing at multiple choice questions
> which were often constructed poorly. It really did destroy the validity
> of the entire license class as something Extra, and from that day on it
> never has been able to live up to its original intent and its name.
>
A license is a license. If there were only one it would be suffiient.
You merely want layers of licensing to perpetuate your "pecking" order, like
a pack of wolves.

2650. Re: Spark & CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 04:25:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA29B3A.E1940306@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38735

Brian P Burke wrote:
> Welp, with Cecil in the mix we're likely to get at least three different
> answers!

Spark was N5AQM's dog and my friend.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2651. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 04:26:46 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <aYwo8.453$xx6.23230818@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38736

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3ca2866b$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> news:ua0v0bkmjb9ne7@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > >Val is one of the few who clearly would learn it even if not required.
> >
> > This is correct, for two reasons:
> >
> > 1) For me, code is simply a part of my received wisdom about
> > amateur radio, from many years ago. So, I just wouldn't "feel
> > right" unless I learned how to operate CW.
> >
> > 2) I've seen it in operation, close up, for some time, and have
> > seen how efficient it is. A couple of times a year I head out to
> > a semi-remote place for what is called a "star party." In fact,
> > several hundred other amateur astronomers go to the same
> > relatively remote place, all at once, and set up telescopes, swap
> > stories, observe the sky, you name it. The idea of stetting up a
> > station at such an event, and communicating back here to
> > Columbia, on only a few watts, and maybe off a handfull of
> > AA batteries, really and truly appeals to me!
> >
> > Val
> >
>
> Val, I have one question for you: will you judge other hams based on their
> feelings about CW? If one simply said, "I don't think CW should be a part
> of the testing strategy for an amateur radio license" would you then
pounce
> upon the person as though they had just committed sin? *That* is where
the
> difference is between people, as you seem, of reasonable nature, and
people
> like Dick/Larry, et al.
>
> Kim W5TIT

They act like a pack of wolves and if we don't respect their pecking order,
we'll be torn apart.

So much for the fraternity.

2652. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 04:35:03 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <X3xo8.468$oH6.23814430@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38737

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020327223354.02252.00000249@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article <FVbo8.364$G67.20650053@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> BTW -- the messages I did "unscramble" were handed over to the
> >> XO of the base comm squadron. I never asked what they meant,
> >> and he never told me, but he did try to talk me into cross-training!
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >"The older I get, The greater I was."
>
> Brian:
>
> What makes you say that? The "message" I "decoded" could have
> been 100% wrong. I'll be the first to admit that.

I accept your second version of your story, then.

The comm sq. XO
> was just impressed with my ingenuity, and felt that I may be a good
> candidate for some kind of crypto-duty.

Passing out STU-III keys?

> However, I already had a job
> I liked, and was getting promoted regularly. Cross-training is career
> death in a lot of cases, especially that one.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

There was no cross-training for weather. You either got out, or went to
detox and then got out. No early retirements either. But since the comm
community couldn't satisfy our required throughput in either fixed or
tactical arenas, we had to develop our own systems, so there were limited
opportunities for weather to play "commo guy."

2653. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 04:41:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA29F10.1BC07405@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38738

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > You were not using the same equipment for CW and PSK31 so your
> > observation is apples and oranges. In a similar case, 1000w
> > SSB will beat one watt CW. So what?
>
> I suppose you realize how stupid it sounds to insist that the most
> efficient mode that won't work is better for the intended use than the
> lesser in efficiecy that works just fine.

If you think I said that, you are not comprehending. There are many times when one mode gets through and another mode doesn't. To compare the modes, bandwidth, throughput, and power need to at least be normalized. We know that 1000w CW gets through when one watt PSK31 doesn't. So what?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2654. Re: OT - Plug Needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 04:43:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CA29F80.B409D647@earthlink.net>
Source record: 38739

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20020326230645.21793.00000156@mb-ch.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >>Roll is a technical moron,
> >
> >Len:
> >
> >NOW there is something that is certainly true, at least in comparison
> >to others in this newsgripe like Ed Hare, Hansl, Jim Miccolis, Cecil,
> >and even your own good self! However, as a strictly AMATEUR radio
> >operator, I can usually hold my own in purely practical matters of a
> >technical nature.
>
> More bullshit, total AMATEUR. All you are is an OPERATOR of
> ready-built equipment, a functional illiterate as far as anything
> that goes on behind the front panel.

I see our sidewalk superintendent is back on the job in his "happy old
man" persona. Yep, there are so many grumpy old men about and he
doesn't associate with them. He told our newcomer Val (and our newest
ham) that he avoids 'em.

> The only thing "you can hold your own" is a CD version of the
> ARRL Handbook...it is lighter than the paper print version.
>
> You are totally LOST on the theory presented within the
> covers.

Just how would you know that, Len?

> >Well, as it happens, I did a lot of kitbuilding a quarter century ago,
> >including a Heathkit color TV, an HW-101, HW-8 (2 ea.), Heathkit
> >SW RX, Heathkit ï¿½-Matic keyer, and numerous non-kit homebrew projects.
> >So, I've inhaled my share of rosin-core solder fumes [twitch].
>
> Oh, my, you ASSEMBLED kits according to instructions that
> came with the kits! Oh, wow, that makes you a "building expert!"
>
> I am so impressed. Not.
>
> Oh, my, soldered a lot of joints did you? Or smoke more of them?
>
> I knew about two dozen older ladies in Pasadena and nearby (at

> least two of them grandmothers) who soldered far more joints
> than you could have, to much greater quality, for spacecraft
> electronics. [Electro-Optical Systems, Pasadena, CA, a division
> of Xerox]

Are they hams too?

> They didn't go into all this "let's pretend" crap about being "experts"
> in spacecraft or electronics. But you do in a radio hobby. Yeah,
> I do believe you've inhaled too much of something...
>
> Now go off in a corner and copy some more of those "spy
> station" five-groups and pretend you're Bill Friedman. We can
> put the nearest mental ward on alert for you...

How do you do at copying them, Len? Up to 5 wpm yet, old timer?
Keep at it and you'll have it whipped one of these days.

Dave K8MN

2655. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 04:46:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA2A008.42D88D04@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38740

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Thus a "King of the Hill" mentality evolved in ham radio where Morse
> > code was given the importance of everything else in ham radio combined.
>
> Really? Wonder where I missed that.

Dick, even you can understand that two tests, both of which must be passed
in order to obtain a license, are of equal importance.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2656. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 04:48:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CA2A09B.7A2B95B7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 38741

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <doao8.300$hn6.18126945@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> <K0HB@earthlink.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
> >> >
> >> >> Is this an unusual problem? Are there any solutions?
> >> >
> >> >It's a common problem. When training Navy radio ops it was called "word
> >> >anticipation", and we solved it by training the ops with completely random
> >> >"nonsense" practice tapes. The character sequences ("words") were of
> random
> >> >length and contained no recognizable words. Hard copy thus became a
> >> >completely automaton-ic connection between the eardrums and the fingertips,
> >> >with no intervening conscious mental processing of any kind.
> >>
> >> Hmmm...that's right up there with knot-tying and sail-handling.
> >> Will the Navy ever get to iron hulls and steam power?
> >>
> >> How many Navy "radio ops" have had to train at being automatic
> >> morse decoders in the last 30 years?
> >
> >The few required to sit in the Black Sea or along the 38th parallel and
> >listen to the occasional 3rd world traffic. There is no other reason.
>
> Really? :-)
>
> Gosh, Brian, I thought all those seasoned old salts sat around and
> copied "Fox Skeds" to keep all the Old Navy ship captains informed
> about How It Is and What They Should Do!

I thought you were a grizzled veteran of the Korean rear echelon RTTY
sorties, Len. As uninvited and unlicensed champion of whatever cause,
you've often appeared here to tell licensed amateurs about how it is and
what they should do.

> [apparently my "Discovery (or History) Channel" is out of order... :-)]
>
> Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service members arise...out of your wheel-
> chairs! Let's beep one for the Gipper!

More "happy old man" stuff?

Dave K8MN

2657. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 04:49:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA2A0C6.3180D3EB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38742

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Based on what was said, I'm guessing at the nature of your "monsters
> > from the ID". You remind me of Walter Pidgeon in "Forbidden Planet",
> > not accepting responsibility for the destruction you are causing.
>
> Not only are you fundamentally dishonest, you have no clue to that
> fact, and can't see it in your own responses. It means nothing to you to
> totally misrepresent the words of someone with whom you disagree, and
> you seem to be obvlious to the fact that you're even doing it.

You apparently didn't read what I said. "Based on what was said, I'm guessing at the nature of your 'monsters from the ID'..." It's an honest guess, Dick. How can a guess be dishonest?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2658. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 04:51:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA2A169.24A3B362@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38743

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Val, you either are for or against unnecessary governmental
> > requirements. Libertarians are agin' 'em.
>
> And of course YOU get to decide what's necessary.

Of course not! The FCC gets to decide.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2659. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 04:55:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CA2A250.845A7278@earthlink.net>
Source record: 38744

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <QX4o8.3138$Ya2.131017@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
> <K0HB@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >Sorry Mr. Nonpar Ticipant, but you asked a question about
> >Navy radio ops decoding Morse. I answered your question
> >accurately.
>
> Yeah..."accurately." Straight out of the Old Navy Hymn Book
> about on par with Gregorian Chants sung on dockside.

> I can find the same answer in a public library...it's packed away
> on a dusty shelf along with other fantasy such as Nostradamus
> Predicts "Now You're Talking" content and the Hardy Boys
> Discover Secrets of Morse.

I assume that'd be next to "How To Become A Radio Amateur In Only Four
Decades" by Leonard H. Anderson.

> >Now you wish to divert attention from your
> >question dumbass question with some reference to what
> >you watched and didn't understand on the history channel.
>
> Poor baby. Got your sleeve insignia all ruffled? Nobody
> saluted all your hash marks? Somebody say boo about
> BuShips' yellowed softbounds from 1943?

Poor baby. Always seems to know more about someone else's job than the
person who did it for years. Sort of like how you know more about
amateur radio than hams.

> FWIW, I made part of my income on working on replacements
> for what was stolen off the USS Pueblo...only to have those
> stolen by an active-duty USN CWO surnamed Walker years
> later. No problem...those were replaced later, work supervised
> by NSA types who didn't wear bell-bottoms. Very little of that
> made "Discovery Channel documentaries" on TeeVee.

...and yet another war story from the master.

> You hang in there with those Old Navy tales about sparkies
> Saving The Day With Morse back when steam finally huffed
> and puffed as much as the tale-tellers and spell singers do
> now.

Leonard, you've done enough huffing and puffing here to sail 'round the horn.

> >Good luck on this one now!
>
> Not a problem. "We've only just begun to fight..." - J. Paul Jones
> or somebody after he saw the whites of somebody's eyes?
>
> I think a sea-going CD would be nice playing in the background
> to the rhythmic beeping of salty morse. Some selections on the
> CD could be "Barnacle Bill The Sailor" to a full-on brassy band
> (with Annapolis Chorus) of "Anchors Away/Aweigh."

You've run into a number of fellows here who have used morse professionally and on the ham bands. It is obvious that it torques your jaws.

Dave K8MN

2660. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 05:02:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CA2A3F1.2C4EA258@earthlink.net>
Source record: 38745

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3CA10D81.B779267A@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
> > Here is where I have an issue. We have many modes that are not tested
> >for, yet they thrive, or at least have enough people using them that you
> >can try them out, and find someone to communicate with. I've been having
> >fun with many different modes since getting my ticket.
> >
> > Yet here we have a mode which many of it's supporters believe will
> >disappear or die out if prospective hams do not learn the mode as a part
> >of the licensing requirement.
> >
> > If this were truly the case, it isn't a mode worth keeping.
> >
> > Not that I personally believe that, but that is surely the impression I
> >get from reading these threads.
>
> I get the impression that all this furor over Keep Morse Tests Forever
> is solely to keep up the self-esteem (or steam) of those that
> managed to do it. They NEED the personal perquisites to show how
> BIG they are in radio, "expert" and all that puffery. Pfui.

...and you need this newsgroup to show how BIG you once were in some
sort of radio. You do it often and you do it with the puffery you
accuse others of adopting. Get back to us when you hold an amateur
license.

> It's an ARRL-sponsored maintenance of manufactured self-importance
> for amateurs, government welfare program for the feel-goodies who
> think they are warm merde in radio.

Another slap at the League for its perceived wrong to you all those
years ago over one of your articles? If I had the distaste for amateur
radio you've exhibited, I'll bet I could find another newsgroup to
haunt. Your stuff might find more acceptance in a group where you
aren't yet known.

Dave K8MN

2661. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 05:09:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CA2A5A7.B157CB21@earthlink.net>
Source record: 38746

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3CA25EE8.8D04203E@IEEE.org...
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > That's what happened when some hams tried to equate CW skill with
> > > > technical expertise.
> > >
> > > Yep. we insisted that all hams at least know something about Morse code.
> > > Now they aren't required to really know anything!
> >
> > What evolved was truly unfortunate. There was the Extra written exam and
> > the Extra code exam. They were given equal weight, i.e. both were
> pass/fail
> > and both had to be passed to obtain the Extra license. Thus, someone who
> > hardly knew the bare essentials about radio and electronics could gain the
> > highest level in ham radio while another who knew volumes about radio and
> > electronics might not gain that highest level because of the 20wpm Morse
> > code skill exam.
> >
> > Thus a "King of the Hill" mentality evolved in ham radio where Morse
> > code was given the importance of everything else in ham radio combined.
> > Morse code had the almost supernatural power to elevate basically ignorant
> > people to the highest level in ham radio above much more competent and
> > knowledgeable hams. That religious-like structure was bad for ham radio,
> > has backfired, and is in the process of being remedied. Hams who based
> > their self esteem and importance primarily on Morse code are having their
> > rugs pulled out from under them.
> >
> > I'm not saying that all hams bought into the above scenario but enough did
> > (and do) to cause the present mess in which we find our hobby. We can
> > recognize those hams today as the ones who hang on to their fantasy
> > by calling present day Extras, "dumbed-down". IMO, having different
> > permanent class levels within ham radio is a bad idea.
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> The former military and commercial ditty-boppers who were paid to learn code
> then come on here and proceed to tell the rest of us why its so great really
> frost my ass. Its imperative that the government keep their welfare QSO
> system going so that we can revere their greatness. Well, I'm not
> impressed.

>
> Brian

So you're just some geek with a cold ass, huh? I have to confess that I learned my morse while in uniform, Brian. Of course it was a Cub Scout uniform and the pay was awful.

I don't give a hoot if you're impressed or not.

Dave K8MN

2662. Re: Germany DARC votes to support keep code Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 05:14:11 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <29CBC5573D00004A.26EF67808BFAB6BB.877DBB2E6A2CB71F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 38747

On Sat, 16 Mar 2002 12:13:19 -0500, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:

>17455 DARC members (which is 33.8 % of all DARC members)
>took part in a vote for or against keeping the CW test
>for HF.
>
>Of these, 1144 votes were invalid.

I didn't know Florida was in Germany...

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

2663. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 05:16:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CA2A74B.A2F22105@earthlink.net>
Source record: 38748

Brian P Burke wrote:

> Several months later a friend came over with a six pack and a pair of > dykes and my 40M loop becamwe a 10M dipole. I've never looked back.

There's a joke in there somewhere just dying to be articulated.

Dave K8MN

2664. Re: Conditions, Covenants and Cue-Ess-Tee!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 05:20:12 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh-r.r.a.p@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <C4E0F2DE5488EEC4.AC56CB2C92B0913A.125E995366F75AB9@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 38749

On Sat, 23 Mar 2002 12:47:18 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Val, would you learn Morse code if you didn't have to?

Maybe for the same reason I have the 10-15WPM CDs. I don't have to
learn code at all.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
http://www.kd5nrh.net

2665. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 05:24:22 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a7v8lj22fij@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 38673

And all of the bitching you and similar types have about ham radio's present situation are guilty of the problems you are bitching about.

It is your generations that are responsible for molding the future (the future as it was to you in the past which is the now present time) and making ham radio exactly what you wanted it to be as opposed to what it is now.

Ya got what you asked for, either by actions or inactions!!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

> That's what happened when some hams tried to equate CW skill with
> > technical expertise.
>
>
>
> Yep. we insisted that all hams at least know something about Morse code.
> Now they aren't required to really know anything!

2666. Re: Remotely Controlled HF for New Upgrades?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 05:35:26 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a7v8lk32fij@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 38674

If morse code is so all-fired important and that great of value, there should be re-testing at least when the license is due for re-licensure like it is every ten years.

This way we will see how important the code is, but all of these "chicken littles" that claim that people like me have been "dumbed down" and just memorized the tests.. Actually, if someone has utilized and grown within this hobby, there is no reason why after ten years a person shouldn't be able to "ace" those tests since they have exposed themselves to much, much more within a ten year period of time, than any length of time they might have spent preparing for the initial tests.

They do this similar activity with drivers licenses and other licensure. Specifically related to me, firefighters are constantly tested and retested on a regular basis, and expected to pursue more training and education as their career progresses. Would you want anything less?? (as a citizen)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

> >
> >
> > I don't think any test is a barrier. Barriers are placed to
> > keep people out.
>
> Hey Hans, good answer. But what if a test is meant to be a barrier - to
> keep people out, like "riffraff" kind of people?
>
>

2667. Re: Morse Code Remembered

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 05:54:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328005451.17929.00000090@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 38651

In article <5f4fe4c2.0203271803.7cf2344a@posting.google.com>,
horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) writes:

>Ancient tribes developed rhythmic codes which were subsequently
>pounded out upon hollow logs, signaling fellow tribesmen from a
>distance.
>
>-- ENCYCLOPEDIA GALACTICA, 117th Edition, 1026 FE

Hey Stew, welcome back to the funny farm.

What next, exerpts from the Orange Catholic Bible and
quotes from Irulan? :-)

2668. Re: OT - Plug Needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 05:54:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328005451.17929.00000091@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 38652

In article <20020327223353.02252.00000248@mb-fc.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>>> So, I've inhaled my share of rosin-core solder fumes [twitch].
>>
>>And chewed on the solder?
>
>No, but it looks like Lennie has...

No, you technical moron. I solder my joints worthy of NASA NPC-200. You smoke them.

You come back when you've LEARNED something about theory, instead of exhaling exhalted emperor's breath.

Better yet, go crank up the gain on a receiver and copy 5-groups from the front-end noise. That's about as meaningful as you get with any arguments you try in here.

2669. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 05:54:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328005452.17929.00000092@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 38654

In article <7Ruo8.312$xU3.13344994@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke"
<bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> Nowhere, repeat NOWHERE in Parts 1, 2, or 97 of Title 47 CFR are
>> there ANY specifications defining WORD RATE. None.
>>
>> VEs could send characters at 20 or 30 "WPM" and say that is "15
>> WPM" and it could not be proven "illegal" unless the inter-symbol
>> spacing was not according to the old CCITT spec on telegrams.
>>
>> You can trot out the old "PARIS" arguments and say "everybody
>> accepts that" but that has no real binding in the law. The resident
>> legal beagle will bark about that, of course, and probably Bill
>> everyone for it too.
>
>I have a colleague who is a foreign national. His immigration attorney
>billed him for his Christmas Card. And the guy is a Hindu.

Doesn't surprise me... :-)

>>There is just NO definition for "word rate" with
>> International Morse Code in Part 97.
>
>Yep. This is where I exited RRAP about a year ago. Did our comm attorney
>friend ever come up with a copy of the CCITT spec?

Nah. I had to get it myself...and send you a copy. He put on
his best Baa Association accent and said fuggedabotit, the big
shoots at fox-charlie shouldn't be boddadaboutit. Blah, blah, blah.

Something about a "common knowledge" situation, "everybody
does it" and so forth. :-)

The funny thing is that in the technical standards part of Part 97
the terms are defined, pinned down, no wiggle room about
"doing it like it has always been done," (nudge, wink, wink).
Morris goad is something else.

The VEs Control with a capital C. :-)

2670. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 05:54:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328005453.17929.00000093@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 38653

In article <20020327223354.02252.00000250@mb-fc.aol.com>, Mr.
Wonderful@aol.comnospam (Larrie Rollypoly) writes:

>For at least the second time, I didn't *have* to know if I copied
>correctly. I was just copying for the sake of copying something --
>anything -- strictly for the practice. Verification of the correctness
>of my copy was unnecessary.

HAR! Of course, Mr.Wonderful, you DON'T NEED TO VERIFY!

Whatever you do, you claim it is PERFECT.

>However, I will state that I did, in
>fact, know that I WAS copying correctly. If I hear "dadadit" and
>write down the letter "G" -- I don't have to have someone tell me
>I did it right.

Sure, sure, sure, everything you do is PERFECT. Uh huh.

>Again, whatever. The XO just happened to be my MARS boss at
>the time. That's Military Affiliate Radio System, Lennie, nothing to
>do with SETI.

Damn, boy, you been inhaling that MJ again. You had to have been
on Mars the planet to do PERFECT COPY WITHOUT VERIFICATION.

As I said before, just go crank up full gain on your receiver (assuming
you need one...questionable) and copy 5-groups all night from front-
end noise. With some practice you can get whatever you want on
the hardcopy. All PERFECT, of course...

2671. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 05:55:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a7ub84$8gq$0@208.206.142.114>
Source record: 38750

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:a7u26p$g48$2@208.207.71.170...
> >
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > That's what happened when some hams tried to equate CW skill with
> > > > > technical expertise.
> > > >
> > > > Yep. we insisted that all hams at least know something about Morse
> code.
> > > > Now they aren't required to really know anything!
> > >
> > > What evolved was truly unfortunate. There was the Extra written exam and
> > > the Extra code exam. They were given equal weight, i.e. both were
> pass/fail
> > > and both had to be passed to obtain the Extra license. Thus, someone who
> > > hardly knew the bare essentials about radio and electronics could gain
> the
> > > highest level in ham radio while another who knew volumes about radio
> and
> > > electronics might not gain that highest level because of the 20wpm Morse
> > > code skill exam.
> >
> >
> > I certainly agree, it was a real travesty when the Extra class license
> > exam was relaxed to the point where it required no real knowledge, and
> > actually not very much Morse code skill either, to achieve as the code
> > tests could be passed by mostly guessing at multiple choice questions
> > which were often constructed poorly. It really did destroy the validity
> > of the entire license class as something Extra, and from that day on it
> > never has been able to live up to its original intent and its name.
> >
> A license is a license. If there were only one it would be suffiient.
> You merely want layers of licensing to perpetuate your "pecking" order, like
> a pack of wolves.

An Idiot is an Idiot, and that describes you exactly. If there were
nothing required of you for licensing you would still bitch that it was

just too much of not necessary.

2672. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 05:56:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a7ubap$8gq$1@208.206.142.114>
Source record: 38655

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > You were not using the same equipment for CW and PSK31 so your
> > > observation is apples and oranges. In a similar case, 1000w
> > > SSB will beat one watt CW. So what?
> >
> > I suppose you realize how stupid it sounds to insist that the most
> > efficient mode that won't work is better for the intended use than the
> > lesser in efficiecy that works just fine.
>
> If you think I said that, you are not comprehending. There are many times
> when one mode gets through and another mode doesn't. To compare the modes,
> bandwidth, throughput, and power need to at least be normalized. We know
> that 1000w CW gets through when one watt PSK31 doesn't. So what?
>

So as an engineer and a ham of 51 years you are still too stupid to
understand that a communicator uses what works when he needs it to work.

2673. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 06:00:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a7ubhb$8gq$2@208.206.142.114>
Source record: 38656

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > Several months later a friend came over with a six pack and a pair of > dykes and my 40M loop becamwe a 10M dipole. I've never looked back.
>
> There's a joke in there somewhere just dying to be articulated.
>

Oh it wasn't hard to find. It was the teller.

2674. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 06:29:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328012939.17929.00000095@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 38657

In article <3CA2A74B.A2F22105@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>There's a joke in there somewhere just dying to be articulated.

Your sense of humor was DOA years ago. RIP.

Dumb tacit Clamato.

2675. Re: OT - Plug Needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 06:29:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328012939.17929.00000094@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 38658

In article <3CA29F80.B409D647@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <20020326230645.21793.00000156@mb-ch.aol.com>,
>yodoc@aol.comnospam
>> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>>
>> >>Roll is a technical moron,
>> >
>> >Len:
>> >
>> >NOW there is something that is certainly true, at least in comparison
>> >to others in this newsgripe like Ed Hare, Hansl, Jim Miccolis, Cecil,
>> >and even your own good self! However, as a strictly AMATEUR radio
>> >operator, I can usually hold my own in purely practical matters of a
>> >technical nature.
>>
>> More bullshit, total AMATEUR. All you are is an OPERATOR of
>> ready-built equipment, a functional illiterate as far as anything
>> that goes on behind the front panel.
>
>I see our sidewalk superintendent is back on the job in his "happy old
>man" persona. Yep, there are so many grumpy old men about and he
>doesn't associate with them. He told our newcomer Val (and our newest
>ham) that he avoids 'em.

Poor baby, you feel some primal urge for retribution? :-)

All you seem to be able to do is pick on "little old men."

>> You are totally LOST on the theory presented within the
>> covers.
>
>Just how would you know that, Len?

Oh, dear, another gubmint retiree heard from, ten kinds of
certificates and only three neurons associating.

>Are they hams too?

No, they assembled WORKING spacecraft electronics.
That's a bit out of your league, old-timer. You, like
Larrie, are, by your own definition, PERFECT, so you
don't know much about anything but can sure talk down

to anyone who doesn't share your viewpoints.

>How do you do at copying them, Len? Up to 5 wpm yet, old timer?
>Keep at it and you'll have it whipped one of these days.

I'm not into your kind of sado-masochism.

You insist on that get-a-#$%^!!-license-before-allowed-to-exist, all because you don't have ONE good, civil response to give in debate. You CANNOT debate, only shout orders, crack that whip. Pfaugh. Not a good image, not even with a billboard-size wall to hang all those certificates.

Now YOU tell us why all this traditionalist amateur radio attitude is so damn good and proper and The Only Way To Go. Without putting on that uniform. Bet you can't do it.

2676. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 06:29:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328012940.17929.00000096@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 38659

In article <3CA2A3F1.2C4EA258@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Another slap at the League for its perceived wrong to you all those
>years ago over one of your articles?

Nah. Never tried to submit one to the ARRL...they don't pay enough
and you have to sign over all rights if they get it first.

>If I had the distaste for amateur
>radio you've exhibited, I'll bet I could find another newsgroup to
>haunt.

What "distaste for amateur radio?" I have a strong distaste for
the pushy, neo-youknowwhat, dumshits who want to control
everyone "under" them. Dave Heil fits in that profile about as
exact as one can get. Stereotypical Prussian Feldwebel with
just one ear.

>Your stuff might find more acceptance in a group where you
>aren't yet known.

Oh, my, Dr. Signal Freud is at it again, playing coy with another
variation of "be nice or nobody will 'like' you!" in here.

Idiot. That sort of thing IS for amateurs. Amateur psychos.

Why don't you regale us with more cashew-crunching stories
of being "the only ham" in an African country or "scampering
up and down towers." Those are almost as good as "Little
Billy Beeper" reruns or Larrie copying random code groups
"perfectly" and without verification.

Set a standard for all the newcomers to follow. You DID want
them to follow you, didn't you? I mean, that's the only way
you will get any order in your bund, cracking whips and all
that. SM all the way and you LIKE it. Go figger.

2677. test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 10:39:11 UTC
From: technician@ag-sch.org.uk
Message-ID: <5322eea1.0203280239.20c5a197@posting.google.com>
Source record: 38660

test

2678. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 10:45:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328054545.16830.00000458@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38661

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> There's a joke in there somewhere just dying to be articulated.
>>
>
>
> Oh it wasn't hard to find. It was the teller.

Do you solve all of your problems with a gratuitous insult?

In what way did Brian attack you in his post? You once said you only insult people to defend yourself. Do you somehow see his choice not to use and enjoy CW as an attack?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2679. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 10:47:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328054733.16830.00000459@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38662

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>> That is what I have perceived the effect of your statements to be, too,
>> Dick. Do you believe that I am an idiot and that Amateur Radio would have
been
>> better off had I not become a ham?

>Ed, this is a real cliffhanger. I'm on the edge of my seat waiting for his
>reply.

Perhaps he will do better than telling me to go soak my head.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2680. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 10:52:51 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328055251.16830.00000462@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38663

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>> I think it would be even more valid if a CW op counted CW QSOs and an SSB
>> op counted SSB QSOs in progress.

>> You game?

>Nope. Have a staffer do it.

??? With one exception, ARRL staff do not really give a rat's behind about a discussion on rrap. Don't tell Larry, though; he believes with all his heart that I am ARRL's rrap representative. :-)

>> I find it hard to understand why someone would choose to have different
>> views based upon where he is.

>Why not? I've learned from the PCTA that it's OK to be a complete jerk at
>anything other than making an RF emmision in the amateur bands, then its
>back to the "Amateur's Code" where everything is sticky sweet.

Interesting. I wouldn't have thought you to be the sort who lives his life based on the actions of others. If I chose to learn from others how to be a jerk, I don't think I would admit it. An interesting choice, indeed.

I think, however, if you rely on the Amateur code to justify your decision about acting differently on rrap than you do elsewhere, it will be a real stretch. What part of the Amateur Code do you feel justifies that?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2681. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 10:54:38 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328055438.16830.00000463@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38664

From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net

>Oh yeh, the "letter." The one that said "hold the phone, we're trying to
>come up with something, but it'll be too late for the NPRM."

Uh, no... the letter didn't reference that at all. ARRL had plenty of time to
Comment on the NPRM, and did.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2682. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 10:56:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328055614.16830.00000464@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38665

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>You apparently didn't read what I said. "Based on what was said, I'm
>guessing at the nature of your 'monsters from the ID'..." It's an
>honest guess, Dick. How can a guess be dishonest?

Did he misrepresent what you said?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2683. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 11:02:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328060228.16830.00000465@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38666

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> Val, you either are for or against unnecessary governmental
>> requirements. Libertarians are agin' 'em.

> And of course YOU get to decide what's necessary.

Uh, no, Dick. In the case of Amateur Radio, the FCC gets to decide what is
necessary. They have done so on numerous occasions.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2684. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 11:13:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328061327.16830.00000466@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38667

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

>I tell you, I think those minutes have an important function, and
>if it were me in charge they would stay in the magazine. No doubt
>most people don't read them and think they are a waste of space
>but, well, er, I don't! Like that means anything! Anyway, isn't there
>something in the bylaws about this, about keeping the rank and file
>informed? I'm not trying to be difficult but it seems to me that as a
>501c corporation one of the few things that might be mandated IS
>providing important organizational information to the members.

I believe the members are informed. The magazine still will contain a writeup of the highlights of Board and major committee meetings. The minutes are all published on the ARRL web page, and the above articles will probably mention that the minutes are available in paper form for the asking.

You can easily see the minutes from Board meetings, as well as the various committee reports at:

http://www.arrl.org/announce/board.html

By the time the actual minutes would be published in QST, for the few that want to read them, they are already old hat.

>But I guess the thing is done.

The Board has been known to reverse its decisions on the basis of substantive member input. Although I don't think that there will be a loud public outcry that the minutes are going to be published only on the web or made available for the asking, if you still feel that way, make your views known to your ARRL Division Director. This is especially important in the New England Division, because I have already told Tom what I think, so if you disagree, cancel my input with your own. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2685. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 11:17:38 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328061738.16830.00000467@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38668

From: "W5TIT - Kim" seventythree@eightyeight.net

>At the risk of sounding flippant: don't buy into the "demise of amateur
>radio" drumming that the ARRL does so well. It is the "threat" to amateur
>radio that is really the only way the ARRL knows how to "keep interest."

Kim, I challenge you to show me even one place where ARRL has drummed that the end is near. Go to http://www.arrl.org/news/bandthreat/ and tell me if you believe that any of the problems cited are presented out of proportion to what you believe the impact on Amateur Radio to be.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2686. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 13:31:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328083140.27454.00000575@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 38669

>Subject: Re: 15wpm hump
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/27/02 22:45 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020327224504.06459.00000080@mb-mo.aol.com>

>How does one achieve proficiency in "reading code?" Why, by having
>the original transmitted characters to CHECK THE COPY, idiot.

I don't have to have the original in front of me, Lennie.

How did millions of messages get sent during WW2 without FedEx being able to carry the "original" copy to be verified, Your Limpness?

>Jay-suss, are you really that dense, Stebie, or did you work at it a
>long time?!?

I am not the one with a code copying problem, Your Licenselessness...you are.

>Jay-suss, you're even dumber than I thought

I am sure you think so, but then you would no matter what, so your exclamation is moot.

>Come back when you've learned how to get along with others

I get along with others fine. Cowardly liars such as yourself are the only one's I have serious interaction problems with.

>If you need to be a Yiddisher, wear a yarmulke when you post...

Anti-Semitism will get you no where...Ooops...I forgot...you alread ARE "nowhere"...Sorry...

>and lay off the sacramental wine...Passover is coming, not
>Passout.

That's what I like about you, Your Insultingness...you can be offensive in any number of religions.

2687. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 13:32:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328083257.27454.00000576@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 38670

>Subject: Re: 15wpm hump
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/28/02 00:54 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020328005453.17929.00000093@mb-fk.aol.com>
>
>In article <20020327223354.02252.00000250@mb-fc.aol.com>, Mr.
>Wonderful@aol.comnospam (Larrie Rollypoly) writes:

I see all those years of night school are starting to bear fruit for ya,
Lennie.

SR

2688. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 13:50:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328085035.27429.00000479@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 38672

>Subject: Re: Question Pools and Such!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/28/02 01:29 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020328012940.17929.00000096@mb-fk.aol.com>

>>Another slap at the League for its perceived wrong to you all those
>>years ago over one of your articles?
>
>Nah. Never tried to submit one to the ARRL...they don't pay enough
>and you have to sign over all rights if they get it first.

Perhaps it was because they knew what a self appreciating punk you are,
Lennie...

And we see where your TRUE values about Amateur Radio are...Others submit
articles to QST because they want to share something with other Amateurs.

YOU are focused on that "pecuniary" interest thing...Not enough "tribute"
for your inflated ego, no doubt.

Of course, it COULD have been an act of self-preservation...Since QST is
still in business and "Ham Radio" is...well...it's NOT in business...

>What "distaste for amateur radio?" I have a strong distaste for
>the pushy, neo-youknowwhat, dumshits who want to control
>everyone "under" them

With THAT criteria I bet you have a hard time shaving. How can you stand
to LOOK at yourself, Lennie?

>>Your stuff might find more acceptance in a group where you
>>aren't yet known.
>
>Oh, my, Dr. Signal Freud is at it again, playing coy with another
>variation of "be nice or nobody will 'like' you!" in here.

Truth is truth.

>Idiot. That sort of thing IS for amateurs. Amateur psychos.

At least it's ONE "amateur" status you don't need a license for, Lennie,
and no one contests your credentials to lay claim to!

>Why don't you regale us with more cashew-crunching stories
>of being "the only ham" in an African country or "scampering
>up and down towers." Those are almost as good as "Little
>Billy Beeper" reruns or Larrie copying random code groups
>"perfectly" and without verification.

....or Lennie's stories of sending/relaying 1.2 million messages as an army comm center clerk.

>Set a standard for all the newcomers to follow.

Yep...Just like Lennie has set for folks considering a career in "professional" radio, Dave.

Makes ME want to run right on down and sign up for 14 years of night school!

2689. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 13:52:38 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca47424_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38926

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a80q6mhml1@208.206.142.79...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Valentine Germann wrote:
> > > But what will come next, since the REAL reasons for the anti-code
jealousies
> > > remain?
> >
> > As long as amateur radio is organized onto an "incentive", i.e. caste
> > system, the problems will continue. That's why I advocate a single
permanent
> > class of amateur radio license along with one temporary learner's
license.
>
>
>
> You continue to be beyond amazing. Claiming genius you exhibit the
> worst sort of damfoolery. You are not a fool, yet deliberately misuse
> the term "caste". Check your Websters on that one. ANYONE who can (and
> is willing to) pass the required tests can qualify for any ham radio
> license of any level.
>
> You are just intellectually dishonest, and you damn well know it.
>
>

ROFLMAO...he's "ignoring" so many others that he needs to keep just one
viewable so he can still spew...isn't that so desperate? Cecil, you should
be honored...LOL

Kim W5TIT

2690. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 13:54:42 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ua673fls1v70ec@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38671

Brian P Burke wrote

>Hey, lots of us like to talk "arms" on here. I'm currently
>using a Mini-14 and a junky SKS, but have plans for a
>CMP AR-15.

In the 1970s and '80s I was big into target pistol shooting, on an informal level. In a couple of weeks I'll be attending a camp for pistol instructors for the Missouri 4-H program. However, I now shoot AIR pistols! Twenty years ago Boone County, where Columbia is located, had plenty of places where you could just "go and shoot" -- if you had a clue and were responsible. But the population here has about doubled since the late 1970s and so the shooting I have always done has become very hard to do.

Now the case of my ex-Navy brother, who lives on the edge of what is becoming a free-fire zone in Kansas City, MO, he has plenty of opportunity there. In fact, he just had to work on his roof because of bullet holes shot into it from several blocks away! Needless to say, he won't be there much longer, as his neighborhood has disintegrated over just the last few years. That is, the percentage of people who are armed, and mean it, in a very strange and threatening way, continues to steadily climb. Ugly.

Val

2691. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 13:56:53 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca47523_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38927

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a80q7bhml2@208.206.142.79...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Richard McCollum wrote:
> > > There was, is now but to a far lesser extent, and more than likely
always
> > > will be a caste system in the ARS as to some extent as there is in
every
> > > human activity.
> >
> > The caste system based on competition has its place in a free
> > market, profit-driven, economy and may the best competitors win.
> > But in an elective hobby, what is the purpose of putting individuals
> > into competition, dividing them into classes, and grinding the "lower"
> > classes into the dirt? This hobby is NOT about dog eat dog competition,
> > at least, it shouldn't be. Every member and potential member of the ARS
> > should be welcomed with open arms.
>
>
>
> There's only one fly in your ointment, jerk. ANYONE can, if they wish,
> get ANY ham radio license. It is entirely up to them. No caste involved
> and you know it.
>

Well...you're right. There isn't a "caste" system to the ARS. There are
only those like yourself who try to make it one. How else should the term
"dumbed-down" be intended by you (and others)?

No, there's no official caste system. That's probably the most frustrating
to those of you who choose to *attempt* (attempt being the operative word,
there) to degrade, humiliate and shame those of us who really, really do
enjoy the hobby--just not to your standards.

>
> Newcomers will still be newcomers, whatever or wherever. It just shows,
> and they can't help it any more than oldtimers can.
>

That's your schtick...not the schtick of most "newcomers," Dick. I daresay
that most people who would encounter you on the air or here in this
newsgroup would sigh, roll their eyes, and glaze right over your affiliation

with the hobby. You hardly represent anyone worthy of being called friendly.

Kim W5TIT

2692. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 14:00:01 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca475df_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38928

```
"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a80q8h$hml$7@208.206.142.79...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:a7ubap$8gq$1@208.206.142.114...
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > > You were not using the same equipment for CW and PSK31 so your
> > > > > > observation is apples and oranges. In a similar case, 1000w
> > > > > > SSB will beat one watt CW. So what?
> > > > >
> > > > > I suppose you realize how stupid it sounds to insist that the
most
> > > > > efficient mode that won't work is better for the intended use than
the
> > > > > lesser in efficiecy that works just fine.
> > > >
> > > > If you think I said that, you are not comprehending. There are many
> > times
> > > > when one mode gets through and another mode doesn't. To compare the
> > modes,
> > > > bandwidth, throughput, and power need to at least be normalized. We
know
> > > > that 1000w CW gets through when one watt PSK31 doesn't. So what?
> > >
> > > So as an engineer and a ham of 51 years you are still too stupid to
> > > understand that a communicator uses what works when he needs it
> > > to work.
> >
> > Under the instant condition of getting a message through you
> > can use whatever works for you...BUT the outcome and lesson
> > learned should be what else can be done in the future to allow
> > continued use of the preffered mode. Perhaps increasing power,
> > running a slower PSK rate, developing more robust coding schemes,
> > etc.
> >
>
```

> So the "preferred" mode is the mode that doesn't work under the instant
> circumstances. In your world, maybe.
>
>

Dick, get with the program, would ya?! The preferred mode in ham radio is phone. Er, that's the ham radio world to you.

Kim W5TIT

2693. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 14:20:11 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca47bae_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38932

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a80q8shmlb@208.206.142.79...
>
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Richard McCollum wrote:
> > > > There was, is now but to a far lesser extent, and more than likely
always
> > > > will be a caste system in the ARS as to some extent as there is in
every
> > > > human activity.
> > >
> > > The caste system based on competition has its place in a free
> > > market, profit-driven, economy and may the best competitors win.
> > >

Yeah, uh huh...that is until you play the game as successfully as someone such as, say, Bill Gates; or until ya get so good at it that you have a "competitive advantage" (what a joke). The free-market system that you herald has its limits of acceptance, and you know it. Maybe you personally believe what you said above (and it is a nice concept that we citizens cling to). However, our government's voracity for quashing successful competition speaks for itself...one can do until they reach "a limit."

> > >
> > > But in an elective hobby, what is the purpose of putting individuals
> > > into competition, dividing them into classes, and grinding the "lower"
> > > classes into the dirt? This hobby is NOT about dog eat dog
competition,
> > > at least, it shouldn't be. Every member and potential member of the
ARS
> > > should be welcomed with open arms.
> >
> > Let me see if I get this: You believe in a free market of modes ("live
> > and let live") but not in a free market of licenses (no more "live and
> > let live"). You believe that if I pass an Extra exam and you don't,
> > that is somehow associated with dogs eating one another. You believe
> > that if I pass the Extra and you don't, that you are being ground into
> > the dirt?
> >

I think that one's defense of the philosophy of free market, i.e., live and let live, in the competitive business environment vs. in the environment of a hobby is well placed. If you who like to be all male hormonal and "go out and get 'em" during your workaday routines (a respectable attitude to have in the work environment) bring that same attitude to your hobby, I think that's pitiful.

It will never cease to amaze me when someone is a seriuos "contester" in ham radio. It's a hobby--you win nothing for it other than paper to plaster on a wall or place in some box somewhere. Most of your non-ham friends will sigh at best and yawn at worst if they see you walking toward them with that 3-ring binder or box of cards. Remember, the first thing they are thinking is "how much money did you get for that?" The moment you say "none" you've placed yourself on the edge of their insanity list and they begin wondering about your values in life.

That aside, contesting also does have its way of eaking into the psyche of an otherwise great hobby. Most contesters I've heard on the air are arrogant, bull-hardy, greater-than-thou kinds of people. I cannot think of one I've heard that I'd even care to be curious about in terms of meeting them as a personality. Their actions on the air pretty much sum it up. Now, the two I know in person are great people--but they are also probably not "as into" the contesting as many are.

Is contesting a bad aspect of ham radio? Hell no. It's a great aspect, for a lot of reasons. It's probably been the area where the most experimentation has taken place, it gets those competitive-minded people into the hobby (possibly--as I said, most competitive-minded people aren't that way for the benefit of the type of "reward" you get in ham radio contesting), it keeps them out of "our" hair (those of us who don't enjoy that type of personality :), and so much more.

All that said, I'll really twist now and say that most contesters/DXers that I hear--while unfriendly sounding at best--are quite OK. They aren't bothering me, they aren't bothering anyone else and only engage those who wish to contact them. But the spirit of competiveness? Well, it ruins the hobby in terms of people like the Carrolls and the Rolls, and even the Heils (he's eccentrically arrogant).

> >
> > Gee, all this time and I thought I was only competing with me.
> >
>

Whether they believe it or not...most ham radio contesters/DXers *are* competing only with themselves. Well, maybe with other ham radio operators who think like them--but certainly not the mainstream populace or amateurs who aren't "into" that world. When I hear someone say "I have 342 countries confirmed" it does no more to me than hearing someone say they are on their way to work.

>
> You were. Those who have no luck at all in competing with themselves

> attempt to destroy those who do.
>
>

I think that's Little Dickie poo that said the above line. That's hilarious. Now he's feeling like "they're gonna destroy" him. Hey, Little Dick, paranoia will destroy ya.

Kim W5TIT

2694. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 14:24:48 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca47baf$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38931

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA40050.68EE0895@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > It's not their hobby they feel bad about, rather they feel bad about
> > themselves for their shortcomings in achievment therein.
>
> Is that why you are always in such a foul mood?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>

^^^^5 EXACTLY!!!!!! ROFLMAO... People like Dick personify misery...yet he
can't see it he's so miserable!

Kim W5TIT

2695. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 14:26:42 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca47c20_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38933

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a814npfku0@208.206.142.79...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> > >
> > > From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> > > >There's just no good reason
> > > >for a hobby to have an institutionalized class system.
> > >
> > > Then you have failed to read the basis and Purpose of the Amateur
Radio
> > > Service as codified in Part 97.
> >
> > Part 97 doesn't make it a good thing.
> >
>
>
> Well, well. When the FCC does something you like, it's a great thing.
> When they do something else, they suck. We see.

Yeah, it's kind of that same dichotomy where when you scream that every ham
should know CW and it said back that it's not in Part 97 and you scream back
that just because it's not doesn't make it right... Ya know? That
dichotomy.

Kim W5TIT

2696. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 14:28:36 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca47c91$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38934

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a815tc$ht6$4@208.206.142.79...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > It's not their hobby they feel bad about, rather they feel bad about
> > > themselves for their shortcomings in achievment therein.
> >
> > Is that why you are always in such a foul mood?
>
>
>
> Pretty good joke, OM. I am very sure I'm far more of a success in every
> way than you, despite your selfpromoted genius.

I think Dick resents your intelligence, Cecil...

Kim W5TIT

2697. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 14:35:40 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca47e3a_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38935

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CA46894.315CAC30@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > You believe
> > > that if I pass the Extra and you don't, that you are being ground into
> > > the dirt?
> >
> > I wasn't talking about me, Dave. I was talking about the nocode techs
> > who are remembered by "The St. Valentine's Day Massacre" of ham radio
> > and who must endure an endless stream of insults, e.g. lazy, knuckle-
> > dragging, whining, cheating, stupid, ignorant, dumbed-down, ...
>
> Ahhhh! So in what you've incorrectly described as a caste system, we
> aren't talking about you or me but only of others. Can you produce one
> individual who has been "ground into the dirt" by a meritocracy-based
> system of amateur radio licensing? Can you produce proof for your claim
> that incentive licensing was "designed" to make hams "feel bad"?
>
> Tell us more about the ham radio St. Valentine's Day massacre. How many
> dead and injured? Where did it take place?
>
> Any response to my comments that you would have a "free market of modes"
> but not a "free market of licensing"?
>
> I'd say you're shooting blanks on this latest of your numerous tangents.
>
> Dave K8MN

Uh, speak of shooting blanks....

Kim W5TIT

2698. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 14:46:10 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca480b0_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38936

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a81p46$k7h$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3ca3d766_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> > news:ua6dk1r67nj667@corp.supernews.com...
> > > ...What * I * have been reading, since 1998
> > > on this newsgroup, from the anti-code folks, almost to a person, is
> > > a viciousness that goes WAY beyond any opposition to CW.
> >
> > I submit that, if you see that only from the anti-code folks, then you
are
> > very narrow sighted. It comes from both sides, Val, and has since I
have
> > been reading this newsgroup.
>
> And I would submit that "viciousness" is a word that goes far beyond
> the truth of what anyone has said. I ask Val to offer up any of
> my alleged "viciousness" or that of others on the no-code test side.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

As I've said many times, yet it chosen to be ignored and Val will ignore it also--the reactions of people who are on the no-CW-*TEST* issue (I *hate* referring to as "code" because that terminology is part of the problem), i.e., those reactions of disdain, disapproval, and downright heels-dug-in comments are more toward the *ATTITUDE* of those on the pro-CW issue.

I don't mind at all that someone feels pro or con to the test. The problem is that most pro-CW folks aren't arguing from the perspective of the test. They have taken it upon themselves to believe that people who are opposed to CW testing also "hate" CW--a ridiculous belief at best. The basis on the con side is the test; the basis on the pro side is CW in general.

The absolute funny thing, and it is funny to me, is that CW *TESTING* is going to go a way. There's no two ways about and it would have gone away with or without NCI and groups like it. CW *TESTING* became an issue when the military and other entities began decreasing its reliance upon the mode a few years back.

I have no problem with CW, and I don't believe it will "fade into the sunset" just because people don't have to have it to get a ham radio license. I think there are too many people who enjoy the mode...it's all

over on the air and it always will be. I have a problem with the government requiring it for a ham radio license--*for the purposes it is said to test.* CW knowledge *DOES NOT* prove technical merit.

However, back to the grounded statement that most of us who have regaled against a pro-CW argument are reacting to the attitude of those pro-CW folks who are just so miserable with life in general that the only thing they have left is to hate.

Kim W5TIT

2699. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 15:27:55 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a7vd45$h3f$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38678

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020327063857.01924.00000475@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> > The only thing holding you back is your own impatience. Getting good
> >> > at it takes time.
> >>
> >> I've been at it for 51 years. Exactly how much time are you talking
about?
> >
> > You've been making the same mistakes for 51 years? And you're a genuis?
>
> He asked for your help, and this is how you respond? For shame!
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

And ol' Dick wonders why we tell him the perception HE creates
is that he is NOT supportive of morse code learning.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2700. Re: Remotely Controlled HF for New Upgrades?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 15:28:38 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ua6cji4v3nqb5b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38675

KC8PMX wrote:

>They do this similar activity with drivers licenses and other
>licensure. Specifically related to me, firefighters are constantly
>tested and retested on a regular basis, and expected to pursue
>more training and education as their career progresses.
>Would you want anything less?? (as a citizen)

This is EXACTLY what "incentive licensing" was supposed
to produce. But you can see what it DID produce, divisions
within amateur radio, big time. These divisions are said to
be about the code but, well, I don't think so, not the deepest
of them. There's a viciousness about the whole thing that
is quite startling. Why, there's even a massive poster to this
newsgroup (who is not even a licensed amateur operator of
ANY kind) who insists on bombarding the group with endless
lines of whining b*llsh*t . . . about something he's not even
participating in! Once the Green Goddess gets aholt of you,
none can save you, and you're on your way off a cliff.

Val

2701. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 15:43:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a7vdnn$g4b$0@208.207.71.160>
Source record: 38679

KC8PMX wrote:
>
> And all of the bitching you and similar types have about ham radio's present
> situation are guilty of the problems you are bitching about.
>
> It is your generations that are responsible for molding the future (the
> future as it was to you in the past which is the now present time) and
> making ham radio exactly what you wanted it to be as opposed to what it is
> now.
>
> Ya got what you asked for, either by actions or inactions!!

Ya know, you might have accidently stumbled onto a point. (Hope it
didn't hurt too much). When the VE system was begun lots of us who had
concerns were advised to shun it like that plague it was sure to become.
Instead, lots of us put on a happy face and helped with years of
service. For nothing but the thanks of the likes of you. Seems like the
'advisers' might have been right.

>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
>
> www.qsl.net/w8kea
>
> > That's what happened when some hams tried to equate CW skill with
> > > technical expertise.
> >
> >
> >
> > Yep. we insisted that all hams at least know something about Morse code.
> > Now they aren't required to really know anything!

2702. QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 15:45:57 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ua6dk1r67nj667@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38676

W5TIT - Kim wrote:

>Val, I have one question for you: will you judge other hams based
>on their feelings about CW? If one simply said, "I don't think CW
>should be a part of the testing strategy for an amateur radio license"
>would you then pounce upon the person as though they had just
>committed sin? *That* is where the difference is between people,
>as you seem, of reasonable nature, and people like Dick/Larry, et al.

I judge other PEOPLE on how they seem to be conducting them-
selves in civil society. What * I * have been reading, since 1998
on this newsgroup, from the anti-code folks, almost to a person, is
a viciousness that goes WAY beyond any opposition to CW. There
is something about the whole "incentive licensing" procedure, and
the creation of an official Ham Hierarchy, that has brought out the
worst in a lot of people. They say it's about the code, and maybe
some of it is, but it runs a LOT deeper than that, in my view. Now,
one might expect this kind of thing on _alt.rec.knavesAND fools_
but I was startled four years ago to see it on THIS group. And I am
still startled today. For a while I got caught up in it again but now,
after only a few weeks "back" on this group, I am simply appalled
at the abounding bad faith.

For me personally CW is part and parcel of amateur radio and
always will be. Now, with its commercial demise, it's UNIQUE to
amateur radio, which is, for me, a PLUS, since I am of a historical
bent AND like to BE a little "unique", in some harmless ways!
Add to this the idea that CW can be done on little power, with very
simple equipment, and is understood around the world, and, well,
it's hard for me NOT to advocate some testing here, especially for
the very top of the tree, the EXTRA class. I don't see one thing
wrong with it, for many reasons, NONE of which have anything to
do with "hazing" or any crap like that. In my view, "arguments"
like that have brought on the lowering of intellectual content of the
whole debate, which I think was their original intent. That is, to me
the whole "anti-code" crowd has seized on code as a stalking
dog for a bad-faith attack on incentive licensing based on what
amounts to jealousy. That's my view.

Val

2703. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 15:51:14 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ua6dtuan2c6obd@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38677

Brian P Burke wrote:

>They act like a pack of wolves and if we don't respect their
>pecking order, we'll be torn apart.
>
>So much for the fraternity.

What in hell are you talking about? Code is HISTORY, or soon
will be, and the battle has gone the way the anti-coders have
advocated. BUT, was the code REALLY what it was about?
I don't think so. I think it was (and IS) about the whole incentive
licensing system, and about the fact that the ARRL has set
up all of these contests and awards and DXCC programs, etc.,
thus making some hams "better than others."

There's a name for that for I won't write it here.

Val

2704. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 15:55:35 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <X1Ho8.1414$BT6.136556@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38681

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote

> At the risk of sounding flippant: don't buy into the "demise of amateur
> radio" drumming that the ARRL does so well.

I've never heard that drum beat from ARRL.

I -have- heard ARRL warn (rightly) of threats to various and
sundry segments of our frequency allocations.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2705. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 16:03:18 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ua6ekjlvaoojb5@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38680

Following this coment from someone who calls himself "Len":

>>If you need to be a Yiddisher, wear a yarmulke when you post..

Steve Robeson wrote:

>That's what I like about you, Your Insultingness...you can be
>offensive in any number of religions.

There comes a time to simply stop responding to people who
are worthless individuals and are on the net soley to perform
as absolute asswipes -- and have been doing so for YEARS.
In my view, the time to stop responding to this poster ["Len"]
was even before the InterNet was created, but that wasn't
possible, unfortunately. Please, let's all stop responding to
this "Len", who has shown what he truly is. Please, no more.

Val

2706. Re: Remotely Controlled HF for New Upgrades?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 16:04:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a7veuc$k51$0@208.207.71.160>
Source record: 38682

KC8PMX wrote:
>
> If morse code is so all-fired important and that great of value, there
> should be re-testing at least when the license is due for re-licensure like
> it is every ten years.
>
> This way we will see how important the code is

You don't know? The code isn't important at all. FCC and NCI, now ARRL and IARU have spoken.
Were you not listening? Of course anyone who thinks something as archiac as Morse code could ever be important would be those who are really concerned about being able to communicate under the most diverse conditions. Since you won't live where you can get on HF for years, I suppose that leaves you out.

2707. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 16:19:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a7vfremlk0@208.207.71.160>
Source record: 38684

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
> >Val, I have one question for you: will you judge other hams based
> >on their feelings about CW? If one simply said, "I don't think CW
> >should be a part of the testing strategy for an amateur radio license"
> >would you then pounce upon the person as though they had just
> >committed sin? *That* is where the difference is between people,
> >as you seem, of reasonable nature, and people like Dick/Larry, et al.
>
> I judge other PEOPLE on how they seem to be conducting them-
> selves in civil society. What * I * have been reading, since 1998
> on this newsgroup, from the anti-code folks, almost to a person, is
> a viciousness that goes WAY beyond any opposition to CW. There
> is something about the whole "incentive licensing" procedure, and
> the creation of an official Ham Hierarchy, that has brought out the
> worst in a lot of people. They say it's about the code, and maybe
> some of it is, but it runs a LOT deeper than that, in my view. Now,
> one might expect this kind of thing on _alt.rec.knavesAND fools_
> but I was startled four years ago to see it on THIS group. And I am
> still startled today. For a while I got caught up in it again but now,
> after only a few weeks "back" on this group, I am simply appalled
> at the abounding bad faith.
>
> For me personally CW is part and parcel of amateur radio and
> always will be. Now, with its commercial demise, it's UNIQUE to
> amateur radio, which is, for me, a PLUS, since I am of a historical
> bent AND like to BE a little "unique", in some harmless ways!
> Add to this the idea that CW can be done on little power, with very
> simple equipment, and is understood around the world, and, well,
> it's hard for me NOT to advocate some testing here, especially for
> the very top of the tree, the EXTRA class. I don't see one thing
> wrong with it, for many reasons, NONE of which have anything to
> do with "hazing" or any crap like that. In my view, "arguments"
> like that have brought on the lowering of intellectual content of the
> whole debate, which I think was their original intent. That is, to me
> the whole "anti-code" crowd has seized on code as a stalking
> dog for a bad-faith attack on incentive licensing based on what
> amounts to jealousy. That's my view.

And Val, your view is right on target, as the longterm evidence
gleaned by anyone reading this NG will soon show.
For myself, I really regret ever making the first post here. but once

the battle was engaged- and make no mistake it IS a battle- there has not been a point at which I felt I could engage on even terms. The slander and outright untruths shoveled so liberally by the nocoders has been too intense.

The argument has nothing to do with the advance of technology or its socalled rejection by hams, as is so often alleged by the code haters. It has to do with the overall communications potential of the ARS, and what will be lost with the dropping oif all code testing. If the promise of a full service license is not enough to persuade new hams to learn code to the minimal level of today, there is simply no way that most will ever be moved to do it without. Sure some will, numbers far too small to ever defend the mode from those who would keep painting it into such a small corner that eventually even the most avid CW user will quit in total disgust.

Dick

2708. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 16:23:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a7vg2bnja0@208.207.71.160>
Source record: 38685

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020327063857.01924.00000475@mb-df.aol.com...
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > >> > The only thing holding you back is your own impatience. Getting good
> > >> > at it takes time.
> > >>
> > >> I've been at it for 51 years. Exactly how much time are you talking
> about?
> > >
> > > You've been making the same mistakes for 51 years? And you're a genuis?
> >
> > He asked for your help, and this is how you respond? For shame!
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> And ol' Dick wonders why we tell him the perception HE creates
> is that he is NOT supportive of morse code learning.

You bunch of touchy-feelies have no clue. If Cecil has been making the
same mistakes for 51 years, and still can't see it, what do you think it
might take to wake him up?

2709. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 16:26:00 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ua6fv73nlgd8a0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38683

Brian P Burke wrote:

A lot of smart-ass stuff, and I think we have now said about all we have to say to each other. You can wail away on my future messages all you want but I won't respond. Boo Hoo.

Val

2710. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 16:30:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a7vged$op5$0@208.207.71.160>
Source record: 38686

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> Following this coment from someone who calls himself "Len":
>
> >>If you need to be a Yiddisher, wear a yarmulke when you post..
>
> Steve Robeson wrote:
>
> >That's what I like about you, Your Insultingness...you can be
> >offensive in any number of religions.
>
> There comes a time to simply stop responding to people who
> are worthless individuals and are on the net soley to perform
> as absolute asswipes -- and have been doing so for YEARS.
> In my view, the time to stop responding to this poster ["Len"]
> was even before the InterNet was created, but that wasn't
> possible, unfortunately. Please, let's all stop responding to
> this "Len", who has shown what he truly is. Please, no more.

There are a few posters whose posts I never open. He has long been one. The others are added slowly over time, and I just very recently added The Gadfly, B.Burke also.

When one has nothing constructive whatever to add to the conversation, and instead only adds to the the QRM and QRN on a band, it's time to tune on.

2711. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 16:31:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA34571.A2DCD222@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38687

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > You were not using the same equipment for CW and PSK31 so your
> > > > observation is apples and oranges. In a similar case, 1000w
> > > > SSB will beat one watt CW. So what?
> > >
> > > I suppose you realize how stupid it sounds to insist that the most
> > > efficient mode that won't work is better for the intended use than the
> > > lesser in efficiecy that works just fine.
> >
> > If you think I said that, you are not comprehending. There are many times
> > when one mode gets through and another mode doesn't. To compare the modes,
> > bandwidth, throughput, and power need to at least be normalized. We know
> > that 1000w CW gets through when one watt PSK31 doesn't. So what?
>
> So as an engineer and a ham of 51 years you are still too stupid to
> understand that a communicator uses what works when he needs it to work.

We are not discussing using what works. We are discussing comparison of
modes. There are standards for mode comparison. You are violating those
standards. Nobody doubts your anecdotal tales. But that's all they are.
You are reporting that apples work better than oranges.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2712. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 16:33:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA345EF.25386B56@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38688

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >You apparently didn't read what I said. "Based on what was said, I'm
> >guessing at the nature of your 'monsters from the ID'..." It's an
> >honest guess, Dick. How can a guess be dishonest?
>
> Did he misrepresent what you said?

Yes, he said it was dishonest.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2713. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 16:37:30 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3CA346B3.16E9F397@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38689

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>
>
>
> What used to be possible to fund solely from membership dues is not possible in
> today's regulatory environment. Part of that development is the creation of
> special funds to which one can contribute. Over the past couple of years, I
> have either kicked in my own $$$, or sold off the various junque "donated" to
> ARRL and kicked in OPM, to the Fund for the Defense of Amateur Spectrum, the
> Big Project and the ARRL Lab Test Equipment Fund.
>
Why doesn't the Newington bunch declare W1AW "junque" and
sell it off. That would be a win-win situation. Newington
could get rid of a non-money-maker. FCC could then go after
K1MAN without fear of ancillary damage to ARRL. You would
probably need to float a survey that concludes that the
majority of US ARS amateurs no longer listen to W1AW but get
all necessary news, code practice, etc. from the Internet
eg. to show that "...it was WAY down the list of respondents
to a recent survey."

> >10) QST pages to be limited, Web Site improved, to cut costs.
> > Minutes of the Board meetings will be eliminated from the magazine and sent
> >to the Web page. Also, ARRL section notes and contest results were nearly
> >moved as well, all in the interest of cutting pages out of the magazine.
> >What should be or could be "cut" from QST is obviously on the front burner.
> >I wonder what the general feeling is about this in that while membership
> >information seems very important to ME it was WAY down the list of
> >respondents to a recent survey, I believe. Product reviews were Number One,
> >naturally.
>
> Actually, Val, the ARRL has been doing a better job than ever before at telling
> members

[those with Inernet connection and interests in frequent
use of it]

> what is doing. The question is whether QST is the best vehicle to
> publish those very boring minutes, or whether they are better made available on
> the Web, freeing up page space for something else.

IMHO, the only reason those minutes would be "very boring"
is if they were intended to be so or that the activities of

the BoD, ARRL HQ, the Newington Crowd, or the "League" were very boring. Personally, I think the last minute attempt by two Directors to add "data" to the phone band allocation proposal was very exciting, not boring at all. By the way, just for reference, cutting the minutes from QST would be a 0.58% cost savings if $/page is linear. Who do they think they are kidding?

73,
Clay N4AOX

73,
Clay N4AOX

2714. Re: Remotely Controlled HF for New Upgrades?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 16:40:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA34771.AD00E885@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38690

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Of course anyone who thinks something as
> archiac as Morse code could ever be important would be those who are
> really concerned about being able to communicate under the most diverse
> conditions.

The FCC doesn't require skill in any other mode, Dick. Any ham who
is really concerned about being able to communicate using CW is
perfectly free to learn Morse code to whatever skill level he
chooses. That situation is not going to change.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2715. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 16:44:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA34857.E3D1100A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38691

Dick Carroll wrote:
> For myself, I really regret ever making the first post here. but once
> the battle was engaged- and make no mistake it IS a battle- there has
> not been a point at which I felt I could engage on even terms.

That's what happens when one brings a knife to a gunfight. :-)

> ... eventually even the most avid CW user will quit in total disgust.

Once again, you paint the negative picture of CW as a mode that doesn't
have enough merits to survive on its own and CW users as yellow bellied
cowards.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2716. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 16:44:15 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CA3485F.B3DE3B32@psu.edu>
Source record: 38693

Indeed, Val. In the interim, you could alwys excercise the filtering capabilities of your newsreader. I don't like to use filters, but since it is pointless to try to argue with that one, a simple trip to the trash for his messages makes for newsgroup harmony.

- Mike -

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> Following this coment from someone who calls himself "Len":
>
> >>If you need to be a Yiddisher, wear a yarmulke when you post..
>
> Steve Robeson wrote:
>
> >That's what I like about you, Your Insultingness...you can be
> >offensive in any number of religions.
>
> There comes a time to simply stop responding to people who
> are worthless individuals and are on the net soley to perform
> as absolute asswipes -- and have been doing so for YEARS.
> In my view, the time to stop responding to this poster ["Len"]
> was even before the InterNet was created, but that wasn't
> possible, unfortunately. Please, let's all stop responding to
> this "Len", who has shown what he truly is. Please, no more.
>
> Val

2717. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 16:44:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA3488A.3B03E9BD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38692

Dick Carroll wrote:
> If Cecil has been making the
> same mistakes for 51 years, and still can't see it, what do you think it
> might take to wake him up?

A helpful posting?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2718. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 17:19:18 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CA35096.65D6FE73@psu.edu>
Source record: 38694

Aye Carumba! I hope you thanked your friend! Must have been quite the party. Surprising you found the time to modify the antennna. ;^)

- Mike -

Brian P Burke wrote:

> Several months later a friend came over with a six pack and a pair of dykes
> and my 40M loop becamwe a 10M dipole. I've never looked back.

2719. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 17:31:42 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca4a770$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38812

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020329101414.11779.00001534@mb-mq.aol.com...
> >Every
> >time you use the term "nocoder", you are referring to the lowest
> >class of social distinctions within ham radio.
>
> Well its true, you cant handle that, lets face it, they are only 1 step
up
> from being a CBer, and not a very Big Step at that.

"CBer." Hmmmm....OH, you mean the group of people with whom the worst you
personify so well. Got it!

Kim W5TIT

2720. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 17:38:03 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca4a8ea_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 38814

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a825nmkpl0@208.207.71.137...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > You believe
> > > that if I pass the Extra and you don't, that you are being ground into
> > > the dirt?
> >
> > I wasn't talking about me, Dave. I was talking about the nocode techs
> > who are remembered by "The St. Valentine's Day Massacre" of ham radio
> > and who must endure an endless stream of insults, e.g. lazy, knuckle-
> > dragging, whining, cheating, stupid, ignorant, dumbed-down, ...
> >
>
> Gee, you don't seem to understand that wasn't for the nocode techs at
> all, rather was for guys like you, Carl and Bill, and The Gadfly, who
> would rather sit and whine about the requirements until the sole ham
> making rules at the FCC got tired of hearing it and capitulated,
> allowing your Extra Lite.
>
>

Well. Then where were the voices of the pro-CW folks who could have done
just the same? Or, is it that the opinion of no-CW TEST folks is actually a
majority? It's either that the pro-CW folks didn't care enough then to make
their opinions known--in which case they are doing nothing but whining now;
or, it is that there is a spoken majority that cared enough to make their
opinions known...

If the FCC capitulated, it is the responsibility of all, not just one side.

Kim W5TIT

2721. Re: Slowest loading ham pages on the net?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 17:47:00 UTC
From: Randy <Anonymous@Anon.com>
Message-ID: <a7vktbirt0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 38695
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3CA1510B.E20491A@ix.netcom.com...
> Well, it's a nice collection of reasonably exotic QSL cards. But
> he could have done a better job of scanning them. Lots of
> aliasing from the beat of halftone printed cards and scanner
> resolution. What he needs to do is first set the scanner to
> a higher resolution, 2nd do a 2 dimensional low pass filter,
> and 3rd shrink the images to a size appropriate for the
> amount of resolution the cards had originally.
>
> The alias products in the images is eating up internet bandwidth
> and is a reason for it being slow to load.

You'd better explain that again, but in layman's terms. You see, the 93K a year computer engineer that put that atrocious page together doesn't understand your post. Make it real S I M P L E for him and her.

2722. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 17:50:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203280950.1ec988a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 38696

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20020327064313.01924.00000477@mb-df.aol.com>...
> From: "K0HB" K0HB@earthlink.net
>
> >> Whats wrong with a code reader and a printer?
>
> >They don't work in most real world HF environments.
>
> The ones that are commercially available right now, perhaps, but that certainly
> could be improved.

Of course.
>
> I have been searching for the URL, but a few years back, there was a bit of a
> contest going on in the EME crowd where they were challenged to use a computer
> to decode an EME signal. I listened to the .wav file and could not hear the
> signal, and I am pretty good at knowing that a signal is present. (In the lab,
> I have used the signal generator keyed on and off and could tell a signal was
> present about 10-12 dB below the noise in 500 Hz.) Someone decoded it and won
> the 'test.

How much EME work is done on HF? Hans' comment was about HF
environments.

The fact that something can be automated does not mean that it must
be, or even should be.

It is now possible to buy chess-playing software that can defeat most
human chess players. "Deep Blue" demonstrated its ability to defeat
all but the very best human players, and even those human players
cannot defeat Deep Blue
with any consistency. It is probably possible to develop an automated
chess-playing system that no human player can defeat.

But what's the point of doing so?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2723. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 17:59:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203280959.36fe7530@posting.google.com>
Source record: 38697

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CA2A008.42D88D04@IEEE.org>...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Thus a "King of the Hill" mentality evolved in ham radio where Morse
> > > code was given the importance of everything else in ham radio combined.
> >
> > Really? Wonder where I missed that.
>
> Dick, even you can understand that two tests, both of which must be passed
> in order to obtain a license, are of equal importance.

Yet both tests did not have to be passed to get the license. Since
1990 it has been possible to get the 13 and 20 wpm code tests waived.

Consider this simple fact, as well:

The high school and colleges I attended required passing grades in all
required courses in order to get a diploma. Failures and incompletes
had to be replaced with passing grades before a diploma would be
granted. Does this mean all of the required courses were of equal
importance? Of course not.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2724. Re: Spark & CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 18:17:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203281017.47040847@posting.google.com>
Source record: 38699

"Jim Weir" <jim@rst-engr.com> wrote in message news:<ua18h081rul23a@corp.supernews.com>...
> I'm just wondering, and really not to start the same old fight all over
> again...
>
> When spark was on its way out, was there as much dissention in the
> literature of the day as there appears to be with CW today?

From what I have read, there was more. CW is not "on the way out",
btw. The test for it may be, though.

> Arguments that
> if the kids don't learn spark, they will never be "real" hams? That spark
> can be done with an automotive coil and a battery in an emergency, while
> other modes require circuitry? That spark needs to be a permanent part of
> the spectrum to preserve history?

There were some who proclaimed "Spark Forever". As N0BK notes, the
spark coil stories are mostly mythology.

The reign of King Spark was actually quite short - perhaps 25 years in
ham radio, if we count 1900 as the starting date. The use of spark by
hams was not banned until 1927, long after practically all hams had
abandoned it.

What happened was quite simple: The superior results obtained from the
use of
"CW" transmission caused a voluntary, widespread shift away from spark
by hams. At about the same time the superior results obtained by hams
on the "short waves" resulted in hams' migrating to those wavelengths.

"CW" (in this context meaning tube transmission, and encompassing all
sorts of things like raw AC oscillator transmitters as well as
stabilized PDC rigs) simply gave more bang for the buck. Hams did not
have to be forced by law to
use it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2725. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 18:23:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA35FA0.DCCF4264@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38700

N2EY wrote:
> It is probably possible to develop an automated
> chess-playing system that no human player can defeat.

That reminded me of something funny. When I upgraded from
an original 4.7 MHz IBM PC to a 33 MHz 386, I installed
my daughter's games on it. She was about ten years old
at the time. She tried the new computer and then came
into the den with tears in her eyes. "Frogger" was her
favorite game until the software timing loops were
speeded up eight times. The frog always died before she
could even blink.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2726. What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 18:24:43 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ua6mtnj2dbifa3@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38698

Hello, all,

Well, the viciousness of several recent messages, contained in threads below, has finally pushed my BS detector to the limit and the needle has bent around the post.

What * I * have been reading from the anti-code folks, almost to a person, and since 1997, is a latent viciousness that goes WAY beyond any opposition to CW. There is something about the whole "incentive licensing" procedure, and the creation of an official Ham Hierarchy, that has obviously brought out the worst in a lot of people. They say it's about the code, and maybe some of it is, but it runs a LOT deeper than that, in my view, for most of them. I think that many of the anti-code people just wanted to destroy something that hacked them off, for morally base reasons (that could never actually be stated), and because their secret desires corresponded with larger forces they have had their dream come true. But the end of code testing will not do away with the license hierarchy, or with contesting, or with the DXCC business, or with the fact that some people have a lot of time and money to put into Ham Radio, and others do not, or that some people will devise means to make their devotion to Ham Radio evident, and others will not. No, none of that will be going away, not now and not ever. So, I am NOT expecting to see any reduction in venom from some, and perhaps many, of the no-code types, once they realize that their "victory" was in many ways hollow and was not delivered on the terms they secretly desire. The battles will thus likely continue.

Now, one might expect this kind of thing among the lower-rent types one sees a lot on UseNet, but I was startled five years ago to see it on THIS newsgroup, and I am still startled today. For a while I again got caught up in the free-for-all but now, after only a few weeks "back" on this group, I am simply appalled at the abounding bad faith, and so will not respond anymore to most of those who spew on this board about the horrors of CW. I know SO many will be SO disappointed -- NOT!

For me personally CW is part and parcel of amateur radio and always will be. Now, with its commercial demise, it is UNIQUE to amateur radio, which is, for me a PLUS, since I am of a historical bent and, like many people, prefer to BE "unique", if only in a small way. Add to this the idea that CW can be done on little power, with very simple equipment, and is understood around the world, and, well, it's hard for me NOT to advocate some testing here, especially for the very top of the tree, the EXTRA class. The historical legacy of a group like Ham Radio IS important. It's part of the identity of the group. In light of this I can only view the viciousness of the anti-code types as a true psychological problem, one existing within THEIR heads. Like so many in our society today, jealousy has taken over their

minds in this area and they have thus ceased to speak and act in a rational way, much of the time, where this issue is concerned.

I don't see one thing wrong with code testing, and incentive licensing, for many reasons, NONE of which have anything to do with "hazing" or any crap like that. In my view, "arguments" like the "hazing" dodge have lowered the intellectual content of the whole debate, which I think was the actual intent. That is, to me the whole "anti-code" crowd has seized on code as a stalking dog for a bad-faith attack on incentive licensing based on what amounts to jealousy. That's my view. And because so much of the anti-code effort has been driven by this jealousy and bad faith, the debate has been marked by the viciousness we see, now on both sides, to a disturbing extent.

So today, in the spring of 2002, the code battle is over, or soon will be. But what will come next, since the REAL reasons for the anti-code jealousies remain?

I don't think we'll have to wait long to find out.

Val

2727. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 18:34:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA36250.F1DEE4E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38601

N2EY wrote:
> Yet both tests did not have to be passed to get the license. Since
> 1990 it has been possible to get the 13 and 20 wpm code tests waived.

Seems to me, only a small minority of hams obtained the waiver. What about the majority? For the majority of hams, the 20wpm Morse code test was considered equal in logical weight to everything else combined on the Extra written exam. And, because of that, a lot of hams started believing that Morse code was actually as important as everything else in ham radio combined. A lot of hams still believe that.

> The high school and colleges I attended required passing grades in all
> required courses in order to get a diploma. Failures and incompletes
> had to be replaced with passing grades before a diploma would be
> granted. Does this mean all of the required courses were of equal
> importance?

If each had to be passed to get a diploma, then by definition, they were of equal weight in getting a diploma. All the inputs to the 'AND' gate had to be a '1' for the diploma output to go to a '1'. A logical 'AND' gate doesn't care if a particular '1' is harder to achieve than the other inputs. Each logical '1' carries the same weight.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2728. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 18:42:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA36418.3F238275@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38602

Valentine Germann wrote:
> But what will come next, since the REAL reasons for the anti-code jealousies
> remain?

As long as amateur radio is organized onto an "incentive", i.e. caste
system, the problems will continue. That's why I advocate a single permanent
class of amateur radio license along with one temporary learner's license.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2729. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 19:14:11 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ua6pqgk9pl2de1@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38603

N2EY wrote:

>The fact that something can be automated does not mean
>that it must be, or even should be.

Absolutely!

>It is now possible to buy chess-playing software that can
>defeat most human chess players.

Yes, and we all might think about what this software truly
represents, when you "play" it.

>"Deep Blue" demonstrated its ability to defeat all but the very
>best human players, and even those human players cannot
>defeat Deep Blue with any consistency.

The grandmasters who _played_ "Deep Blue" were actually
"playing" other grandmasters who were being assisted by the
computer! This is the fact! Not only that, when the human op-
ponet of the computer began to get the upper hand, in that
last match, the handlers of Blue were allowed to adjust the
programming, during the series of games, showing up the
whole thing for what it was!

>It is probably possible to develop an automated
>chess-playing system that no human player can defeat.
>But what's the point of doing so?

Why, to sell computers, that's why, and to show off!
But, seriously, everyone knows that computers have
a deep seated need to play chess!

Val

2730. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 19:16:51 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ua6pvf3uk7lg10@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38604

mike coslo wrote, about a certain vicious poster:

>Indeed, Val. In the interim, you could alwys excercise the
>filtering capabilities of your newsreader. I don't like to use
>filters, but since it is pointless to try to argue with that one,
>a simple trip to the trash for his messages makes for
>newsgroup harmony.

This is true. But it will give me pleasure NOT to open any
more messages from him, or about him, ever again.

Val

2731. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 19:28:59 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <%9Ko8.10757$Eb5.965493@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38605

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA36418.3F238275@IEEE.org...
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > But what will come next, since the REAL reasons for the anti-code
jealousies
> > remain?
>
> As long as amateur radio is organized onto an "incentive", i.e. caste
> system, the problems will continue. That's why I advocate a single
permanent
> class of amateur radio license along with one temporary learner's
license.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>

All Incentive Licensing did was replace one caste system with another that to some extent at least was more merit-based. I got into this when there was one class and a learner's permit but callsigns were strictly sequential. Get used to being patted on the head, rookie.

When we got the 1x2s the first question was what was your old call. I finally took up replying that I had sprung from the head of Zeus Extra in hand.

There was, is now but to a far lesser extent, and more than likely always will be a caste system in the ARS as to some extent as there is in every human activity.

Ever seen two lawyers in a locker room? You'd swear they carry tape measures in their jockstraps.

Dick N BK

2732. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 19:55:15 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <b50043675a87121316c27f93b90dea62.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 38606

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C9D0725.785096D5@IEEE.org...

> No matter how hard I try or how many hours I practice, I just can't
> seem to get past 15wpm hard copy. I cannot seem to buffer more than
> four characters <snip>

Cecil, you might simply want to try code you think is too fast. It prevents you from trying to read and understand the message. For what it is worth, I had a similar experience in RM 'A' school in Bainbridge, MD, while in the Navy. I was a newbie in the service and had to pass 16 words per minute to graduate (a simple task back then as I had my commercial
telegraph ticket as well as my extra). However, one had to pass each test in succession, no jumping to 16 or more. The bets were going down as it became apparent that I could copy Morse as well as a 3rd class radioman from the fleet. We both passed 22 words per minute cyper text and plain text. At 24, he failed the cypher text (but passed the plain text) while I passed the cypher text but failed the plain text test. A moment's reflection on my part revealed why; I was daydreaming about where
I wanted to work part time using my 1st class radiotelephone ticket (the armed forces paid very poorly at the time) and was trying to copy the meaning of the message in my head whilst I was attempting to put it on paper with a typewriter. I asked the chief for a sample test, not to count, at a higher speed to prepare. He agreed and asked what speed. I asked what they had. Hmmm ... 24, 26, 28, 30 and 40. Ok, gimme 40. At that speed, I didn't have the time to daydream or copy in my head. The letters came, I simply hit keys. A good page full of text. 100% solid copy. I was excused from the class. Point? Go for something that will push you - where you don't try and anticipate the next letter. A bit of a pause? Hit the space bar. Try it.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2733. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 20:08:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA37853.A537FAF8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38607

Richard McCollum wrote:
> There was, is now but to a far lesser extent, and more than likely always
> will be a caste system in the ARS as to some extent as there is in every
> human activity.

The caste system based on competition has its place in a free
market, profit-driven, economy and may the best competitors win.
But in an elective hobby, what is the purpose of putting individuals
into competition, dividing them into classes, and grinding the "lower"
classes into the dirt? This hobby is NOT about dog eat dog competition,
at least, it shouldn't be. Every member and potential member of the ARS
should be welcomed with open arms.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2734. Re: Slowest loading ham pages on the net?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 20:19:22 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <dbedfcf2cfe9f13852f477c87e3316b5.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 38609
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Thank heavens I got rid of that 56k dial-up modem. Your reply got me to thinking. I think everyone who wants DXCC should have to scan all qsl cards in 32 bit true color with a minimum 4 megapixel resolution and have
to forward all of them to 100 different organizations for verification. Upon verification, all 100 organizations would have to submit their findings,
along with all of the 4 megapixel 32 bit true color - oh, all of these scans would have to be UNCOMPRESSED - to each of the other 99 organization.
Once all organizations had received all qsls in the aforementioned uncompressed true color 4 megapixel format, they would agree to each send
their findings, along with the others' findings, along with all copies from all of the organizations, along with all of the scans, the verification
back to the applicant. If nothing else, internet users would learn to love and appreciate DXCC the way some of us amateurs have. Yes, the ISP providers would gain a nice appreciation for DXCC also.

;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA
ps - I hate to see Guam as anything but KG6 ... sigh ... I wonder if the former KG6AAY is still alive and kicking and what its' new call sign is.

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message news:3CA1510B.E20491A@ix.netcom.com...

> Well, it's a nice collection of reasonably exotic QSL cards. But
> he could have done a better job of scanning them. Lots of
> aliasing from the beat of halftone printed cards and scanner
> resolution. What he needs to do is first set the scanner to
> a higher resolution, 2nd do a 2 dimensional low pass filter,
> and 3rd shrink the images to a size appropriate for the
> amount of resolution the cards had originally.
>
> The alias products in the images is eating up internet bandwidth
> and is a reason for it being slow to load.
>

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2735. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 20:32:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA37DF3.89C1C447@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38611

Valentine Germann wrote:
> Well, I tell you what, I've seen enough this time around to let me know
> for sure that most of these folks are not on the level, at all, and are on
> this group only to spew nonsense . . . in very bad faith indeed.

Val, do you believe, as Dick has implied, that Shannon's Theorem
has a "crack" in it?

> But the real goal, in my view, has not been met,
> that goal being the destruction of anything in Ham Radio bigger than
> the lowest of the low no-coders.

A very vocal minority of hams have wanted to bring about the destruction
of no-coders for many years. Can you blame some of them for being pissed?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2736. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 20:35:46 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ua6ujl88oep519@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38608

Dick Carroll wrote:

> . . . your view is right on target, as the longterm evidence
>gleaned by anyone reading this NG will soon show.
> For myself, I really regret ever making the first post here. but once
>the battle was engaged- and make no mistake it IS a battle- there
>has not been a point at which I felt I could engage on even terms.
>The slander and outright untruths shoveled so liberally by the no-
>coders has been too intense.

Well, I tell you what, I've seen enough this time around to let me know
for sure that most of these folks are not on the level, at all, and are on
this group only to spew nonsense . . . in very bad faith indeed.

>The argument has nothing to do with the advance of technology
>or its socalled rejection by hams, as is so often alleged by the
>code haters. It has to do with the overall communications potential
>of the ARS, and what will be lost with the dropping of all code testing.
>If the promise of a full service license is not enough to persuade new
>hams to learn code to the minimal level of today, there is simply no
>way that most will ever be moved to do it without. Sure some will,
>numbers far too small to ever defend the mode from those who would
>keep painting it into such a small corner that eventually even the most
>avid CW user will quit in total disgust.

Yes, that is no doubt the hope of the NCI crowd. And maybe it will
happen that way. But the real goal, in my view, has not been met,
that goal being the destruction of anything in Ham Radio bigger than
the lowest of the low no-coders. That's the REAL goal, and that implies
the bringing down of the licensing system, the ARRL, and, if it could
be done, ALL testing. Now, never mind that these things would very
soon destroy Ham Radio. No, that's not important, not compared to
the high-holiness of my libertarian equality to anyone and everyone
who even BEGINS to think they're "better than me" or "higher than me"
or anything else than me.

There, that about sums it up. We're in for a VERY rough ride.

Val

2737. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 20:35:46 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ua6v7e4jh005ed@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38610

Dick Carroll wrote:

> . . . your view is right on target, as the longterm evidence
>gleaned by anyone reading this NG will soon show.
> For myself, I really regret ever making the first post here. but once
>the battle was engaged- and make no mistake it IS a battle- there
>has not been a point at which I felt I could engage on even terms.
>The slander and outright untruths shoveled so liberally by the no-
>coders has been too intense.

Well, I tell you what, I've seen enough this time around to let me know
for sure that most of these folks are not on the level, at all, and are on
this group only to spew nonsense . . . in very bad faith indeed.

>The argument has nothing to do with the advance of technology
>or its socalled rejection by hams, as is so often alleged by the
>code haters. It has to do with the overall communications potential
>of the ARS, and what will be lost with the dropping of all code testing.
>If the promise of a full service license is not enough to persuade new
>hams to learn code to the minimal level of today, there is simply no
>way that most will ever be moved to do it without. Sure some will,
>numbers far too small to ever defend the mode from those who would
>keep painting it into such a small corner that eventually even the most
>avid CW user will quit in total disgust.

Yes, that is no doubt the hope of the NCI crowd. And maybe it will
happen that way. But the real goal, in my view, has not been met,
that goal being the destruction of anything in Ham Radio bigger than
the lowest of the low no-coders. That's the REAL goal, and that implies
the bringing down of the licensing system, the ARRL, and, if it could
be done, ALL testing. Now, never mind that these things would very
soon destroy Ham Radio. No, that's not important, not compared to
the high-holiness of my libertarian equality to anyone and everyone
who even BEGINS to think they're "better than me" or "higher than me"
or anything else than me.

There, that about sums it up. We're in for a VERY rough ride.

Val

2738. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 20:55:45 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CA38351.2390E697@psu.edu>
Source record: 38612

Yahh, sometimes the only way I know he is still around is Steve's postings back to him. But Steve has certain strong feelings on *that* matter! 8^)

Still would be nice tho'

- Mike -

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> mike coslo wrote, about a certain vicious poster:
>
> >Indeed, Val. In the interim, you could alwys excercise the
> >filtering capabilities of your newsreader. I don't like to use
> >filters, but since it is pointless to try to argue with that one,
> >a simple trip to the trash for his messages makes for
> >newsgroup harmony.
>
> This is true. But it will give me pleasure NOT to open any
> more messages from him, or about him, ever again.
>
> Val

2739. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 21:14:37 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CA387BD.28FC51@psu.edu>
Source record: 38613

To be fair Val, there is plenty of blame to go around on both sides of the argument. But the issue is so polarized that the parties are deliberately "misunderstanding" each other, trying to dismiss entire arguments on typos, extrapolating incredible amounts of insinuation from simple statements, and just general cussedness.

Plus there is one not so endearing quality from some of the Procode crowd. That is the concept that "Extra Lites" such as myself are considered second class citizens by so many of them. I'm pro-code, but my inferior status in their eyes turns me right off to thier cause.

I would tell a prospective ham that learning Morse code is a worthwhile thing, they just need to buckle down and do it, and once they learned it, they could be proud of the accomplishment.

But I wouldn't send them into this fray, for sure 8^)

- mike -

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> > . . . your view is right on target, as the longterm evidence
> >gleaned by anyone reading this NG will soon show.
> > For myself, I really regret ever making the first post here. but once
> >the battle was engaged- and make no mistake it IS a battle- there
> >has not been a point at which I felt I could engage on even terms.
> >The slander and outright untruths shoveled so liberally by the no-
> >coders has been too intense.
>
> Well, I tell you what, I've seen enough this time around to let me know
> for sure that most of these folks are not on the level, at all, and are on
> this group only to spew nonsense . . . in very bad faith indeed.

2740. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 21:30:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA38B8B.F6F49D1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38614

mike coslo wrote:
>
> To be fair Val, there is plenty of blame to go around on both sides of
> the argument. But the issue is so polarized that the parties are
> deliberately "misunderstanding" each other, trying to dismiss entire
> arguments on typos, extrapolating incredible amounts of insinuation from
> simple statements, and just general cussedness.

Don't forget trolling and leg-pulling. :-)
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2741. ADV: Learn how to survive in a hard world

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 21:47:10 UTC
From: msm@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <63cdaaa4.bc51e14c@hotmail.com>
Source record: 38642

misc_survivalism_moderated • Survivalism and Preparedness.
---

http://groups.yahoo.com/group/misc_survivalism_moderated

Subscribe: misc_survivalism_moderated-subscribe@yahoogroups.com

This mailing-list is for those who want themselves and their loved ones to survive and prosper during hard times.

War, riots, famine, crime, drought, flooding, fire, contaminated water supplies, inflation, job loss, and many more.

Are you ready to deal with any situation?

Join us as we learn from each other how to survive in this increasingly hard world.

This group is moderated.

-Membership must be approved.

-If you can't use respect and common sense in posting to this group, you will be banned.

-Posts must be on-topic.

On-topic: Food storage, firearms, canning, gardening, self-sustaining communities, back to basics, water purification, alternative power, conservation, homesteading, first aid and more.

Off-topic: Politics, religion, current affairs, philosophy, conspiracy theories, New World Order, racism.

Disclaimer:

I am not a member of this group and am posting this without their permission and knowledge. I thought it was a neat group when I WAS a member and thought I'd let everyone know about it. So don't bitch to them about this ad.

Hardly any upper pathetic films will regularly join the kettles.
What does Jonas dye so wrongly, whenever Pilar solves the light
sauce very partly? How did Pamela promise at all the walnuts? We can't
believe sauces unless Waleed will wistfully cook afterwards.
It can waste easily if Moammar's raindrop isn't filthy. Saad, still
changing, wanders almost freely, as the cup orders inside their
enigma.

Tell Alhadin it's clever sowing in front of a porter. I was nibbling to arrive you some of my urban elbows. We care once, recollect wastefully, then expect before the car under the road.

He might hate biweekly, unless Abu dreams candles for Mohammar's dog.

We help them, then we steadily depart Neil and Bob's quiet ulcer.

It can dine shallow yogis on the hot difficult stadium, whilst Khalid unbelievably opens them too. My ugly card won't smell before I laugh it. Basksh seeks, then Gilbert quietly creeps a easy carpenter in back of Blanche's night. While lentils eerily pour printers, the buckets often tease in back of the cold grocers. The pumpkin behind the sweet structure is the weaver that fears partially. He might absolutely pull weak and attempts our elder, good pitchers for a mountain. What Elisabeth's raw jacket learns, Aslan rejects against stupid, sick lights.

It can comb active coffees, do you walk them? He'll be irrigating towards think Said until his pear lifts weekly. She wants to fill younger tyrants beneath Ali's stable. Lots of abysmal wrinkle or drawer, and she'll hatefully improve everybody. We measure the heavy cloud. Fucking don't move usably while you're recommending beside a closed bandage. Where doesn't Abduljalil attack slowly? Ronnie, beneath trees healthy and worthwhile, covers in it, playing truly.

Don't try to grasp a teacher!

Little by little, go live a frame! They explain the empty plate and answer it among its lane. Who will we jump after Raoul kicks the glad summer's painter? How did Ghassan look the poultice in front of the open fig?

I am annually full, so I talk you. Almost no solid pens are sad and other lazy ointments are inner, but will Steve love that?

Just now, Joaquim never climbs until Marion judges the rural can surprisingly. They are irritating about hollow, about dry, before polite units. I was receiving frogs to smart Moammar, who's calling among the boat's corner. For Ella the dryer's durable, alongside me it's strange, whereas on you it's tasting fresh.

The drapers, onions, and codes are all pretty and old.

Try moulding the sign's strong pickle and Hamid will kill you! If you'll like Bernadette's field with bushs, it'll strongly behave the jug. Lots of young wide oranges neatly clean as the long hats shout. Will you excuse through the winter, if Karen deeply converses the coconut? Both scolding now, Terrance and Hamid burned the bitter streets within dull cap. Plenty of stickers crudely clean the rich shore. Plenty of bowls will be short brave books. Sometimes, hens scold among clean stores, unless they're bizarre.

2742. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 21:59:58 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ynMo8.2305$BT6.188720@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38615

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote

> There is something about the whole "incentive licensing" procedure,
> and the creation of an official Ham Hierarchy, that has obviously brought
> out the worst in a lot of people.

Understandably and predictably so.

When I got my extra (before dis-incentive licensing) there were
beginner HF privileges for Novices and full HF privileges for
Conditional/General/Advance/Extra. Hams got along, and what
class of license you held was not something anyone cared about
very much.

The testing criteria for a "full" license should simply determine if the
operator is qualified to build and maintain a station, and operate
it in a manner that is safe to themselves and passersby, and does
not interfere with other users of the spectrum. The notion of an
"official Ham Hierarchy" has no place in our avocation. Period.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2743. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 22:06:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203281406.2955b5cf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 38616

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CA36250.F1DEE4E@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > Yet both tests did not have to be passed to get the license. Since
> > 1990 it has been possible to get the 13 and 20 wpm code tests waived.
>
> Seems to me, only a small minority of hams obtained the waiver.

Only the FCC knows for sure. I have seen estimates by VEs that the
waiver rate was between 10 and 20%. If you have other data, I'd like
to see it.

> What
> about the majority?

What about 'em?

> For the majority of hams, the 20wpm Morse code test
> was considered equal in logical weight to everything else combined on the
> Extra written exam.

Ah, no.

In the previous post you used "importance", now you are substituting
"logical weight". They are not the same thing.

Nice try but no cookie.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2744. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 22:14:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203281414.22d2ca4b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 38617

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:<ua6pqgk9pl2de1@corp.supernews.com>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >The fact that something can be automated does not mean
> >that it must be, or even should be.
>
> Absolutely!
>
One of the problems in American society is poor health caused by too
little exercise, caused in part by too much "automation".
>
> >It is now possible to buy chess-playing software that can
> >defeat most human chess players.
>
> Yes, and we all might think about what this software truly
> represents, when you "play" it.
>
It's good as a training simulator, for one thing. Also permits play
when no opponent is available.

> >"Deep Blue" demonstrated its ability to defeat all but the very
> >best human players, and even those human players cannot
> >defeat Deep Blue with any consistency.
>
> The grandmasters who _played_ "Deep Blue" were actually
> "playing" other grandmasters who were being assisted by the
> computer! This is the fact!

My understanding is that the computer decided the moves alone - based
on
software that was the result of the expertise of many grandmasters.

The software also had the ability to research an enormous database of
recorded games, looking for the same or similar game situations and
the techniques used to win.

> Not only that, when the human op-
> ponet of the computer began to get the upper hand, in that
> last match, the handlers of Blue were allowed to adjust the
> programming, during the series of games, showing up the
> whole thing for what it was!

Wouldn't this be analagous to a human player reading books on chess
and having practice games during a tournament?
>

> >It is probably possible to develop an automated
> >chess-playing system that no human player can defeat.
> >But what's the point of doing so?
>
> Why, to sell computers, that's why, and to show off!
> But, seriously, everyone knows that computers have
> a deep seated need to play chess!

HAW! Those a are good ones!

But the question is a serious one: what's the point of automating such things?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2745. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 22:14:52 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <wBMo8.2329$BT6.192686@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38618

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

> The caste system based on competition has its place in a free
> market, profit-driven, economy and may the best competitors win.

I don't believe that our current sliced-and-diced license structure
makes any good regulatory sense, I didn't compete with anyone
to gain my license.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2746. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 22:22:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203281422.6cd8f62@posting.google.com>
Source record: 38619

"Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message news:<3ca28e51_1@newsa.ev1.net>...
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> news:ua50hqc7qtlq33@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> > K0HB wrote, about the "Big Project" and my comment that it
> > had to do with ARRL's efforts to get the FCC to interpose for
> > amateur radio operators where local covenants are concerned.
> >
> >
> > >Nothing of the sort. The "big project" is related to young people
> > >and education.
> >
> > Well, yes, it involves "education," and I'm all for it. However, it is
> > explained in an article that begins on p. 94 of the March issue that
> > the "meta-purpose" behind the project is the advancement of ARRL
> > efforts to influence the Congress, and others, concerning things like
> > the CC&R problem. It is much more than "education for education's
> > sake" since "the future of amateur radio is at stake" right now.
> >
> > Val
> >
>
> At the risk of sounding flippant: don't buy into the "demise of amateur
> radio" drumming that the ARRL does so well. It is the "threat" to amateur
> radio that is really the only way the ARRL knows how to "keep interest."
> Much like churches keep your interest and keep you coming by threatening the
> end of the world as though it will happen tomorrow. It's the only
> "business" they know.

I think you are confusing "defense" of amateur radio with "demise",
Kim.

Fact is, there have always been threats to the future of amateur
radio. For example, other services want to use spectrum allocated to
hams, various organizations want to restrict antennas or even the use
of radio transmitting devices, RFI issues, RF exposure issues, and
many more. A strong national organization is needed to counter these
threats.

>
> The ARRL is a great organization that needs to learn how to pique the
> interest of folks to join by using other methodologies--not the same 'ol
> "threat-to-this-or-that" stuff that they've used for so long.

Most of the ARRL literature I've seen stresses the FUN of amateur
radio. And I'm talking current as well as historic stuff.

> While it's
> important business to keep abreast of issues that could threaten the hobby;
> I feel a lot of opportunities are missed due to this being the largest part
> of the ARRL's "business."

Take a look at the ARRL website, and all the publications and info
there. I see plenty of stuff emphasizing the fun.
>
> The future of amateur radio is in no worse shape now than it ever has been.

How do you know?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2747. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 22:24:34 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <CKMo8.1353$1K2.66896387@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38620

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ua6mtnj2dbifa3@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all,
>
> Well, the viciousness of several recent messages, contained in threads
> below, has finally pushed my BS detector to the limit and the needle has
> bent around the post.
>
> What * I * have been reading from the anti-code folks,

Anti-code TEST folks.

almost to a person,
> and since 1997, is a latent viciousness that goes WAY beyond any
opposition
> to CW. There is something about the whole "incentive licensing"
procedure,
> and the creation of an official Ham Hierarchy, that has obviously brought
> out the worst in a lot of people. They say it's about the code, and
maybe
> some of it is, but it runs a LOT deeper than that, in my view, for most of
> them. I think that many of the anti-code people

Anti-code TEST people

just wanted to destroy
> something that hacked them off, for morally base reasons (that could never
> actually be stated), and because their secret desires corresponded with
> larger forces they have had their dream come true. But the end of code
> testing

Yes, yes, TESTing!

will not do away with the license hierarchy, or with contesting, or
> with the DXCC business, or with the fact that some people have a lot of
time
> and money to put into Ham Radio, and others do not, or that some people
will
> devise means to make their devotion to Ham Radio evident, and others will
> not. No, none of that will be going away, not now and not ever. So, I am
> NOT expecting to see any reduction in venom from some, and perhaps many,
of
> the no-code types

no-code TEST types

, once they realize that their "victory" was in many ways
> hollow and was not delivered on the terms they secretly desire. The
battles
> will thus likely continue.
>
> Now, one might expect this kind of thing among the lower-rent types

lower-rent TEST types

one sees
> a lot on UseNet, but I was startled five years ago to see it on THIS
> newsgroup, and I am still startled today. For a while I again got caught
up
> in the free-for-all but now, after only a few weeks "back" on this group,
I
> am simply appalled at the abounding bad faith, and so will not respond
> anymore to most of those who spew on this board about the horrors of CW.
I
> know SO many will be SO disappointed -- NOT!

NOT!

> For me personally CW is part and parcel of amateur radio and always will
be.

For me personally the Code TEST is part and parcel of amateur radio and
always will be.

> Now, with its commercial demise, it is UNIQUE to amateur radio, which is,
> for me a PLUS, since I am of a historical bent and, like many people,
prefer
> to BE "unique", if only in a small way. Add to this the idea that CW can
be
> done on little power, with very simple equipment, and is understood around
> the world, and, well, it's hard for me NOT to advocate some testing here,
> especially for the very top of the tree, the EXTRA class. The historical
> legacy of a group like Ham Radio IS important. It's part of the identity
of
> the group.

Go to the QPC and have them insert history questions in the pool.

In light of this I can only view the viciousness of the
> anti-code types

anti-code TEST types

as a true psychological problem, one existing within THEIR
> heads. Like so many in our society today, jealousy has taken over their
> minds in this area and they have thus ceased to speak and act in a
rational
> way, much of the time, where this issue is concerned.
>
> I don't see one thing wrong with code testing, and incentive licensing,

for
> many reasons, NONE of which have anything to do with "hazing" or any crap
> like that. In my view, "arguments" like the "hazing" dodge have lowered
the
> intellectual content of the whole debate, which I think was the actual
> intent.

Is this what your neighbor told you to say?

> That is, to me the whole "anti-code" crowd

anti-code TEST crowd

has seized on code as a
> stalking dog for a bad-faith attack on incentive licensing based on what
> amounts to jealousy. That's my view. And because so much of the
anti-code
> effort

anti-code TEST effort

> has been driven by this jealousy and bad faith, the debate has been
> marked by the viciousness we see, now on both sides, to a disturbing
extent.
>
> So today, in the spring of 2002, the code battle is over, or soon will be.

the code TEST battle

> But what will come next, since the REAL reasons for the anti-code

anti-code TEST

> jealousies remain?

> I don't think we'll have to wait long to find out.
>
> Val

Val, I don't lobby the FCC to make you take a RTTY practical test.

Use the mode of your choice. It matters not to me, but I'll fight you every
step of the way for trying to make me take an irrelevant and unnecessary
exam.

73, Brian

2748. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 22:41:23 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <n_Mo8.2366$BT6.196122@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38622

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote

> That is, to me the whole "anti-code" crowd has seized on code as a
> stalking dog for a bad-faith attack on incentive licensing based on what
> amounts to jealousy.

I think you meant stalking _horse_, but I won't niggle over such
detail. I have a "good faith" opposition to the current license
structure, and since I've had full HF privileges since my first
Conditional license grant, and was an Extra several years before
dis-incentive licensing, your "jealousy" card doesn't play with
me.

Perform this experiment, if you will. Turn on your HF rig and
tune it to 14.150MHz when 20M has a lot of US signals
at your location. Put on a blindfold and slowly increment
the receive frequency. Based on the operator skill, the
technical content of the conversation, and signal quality
see if you can detect when you have tuned to 14.175 (the
end of the Extra exclusive portion). Then blindfold yourself
again and see if you can tell when you have tuned to the
top end of the Advanced portion.

If incentive licensing has been a success, the boundaries
on the band between license classes ought to be apparent
to the most casual observer. Unfortunately, they are
undetectable by the criteria I mention, therefore we must
conclude that incentive licensing is a failure.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2749. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 22:45:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0203281445.6c4f1c6e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 38623

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3CA36418.3F238275@IEEE.org>...
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > But what will come next, since the REAL reasons for the anti-code jealousies
> > remain?
>
> As long as amateur radio is organized onto an "incentive", i.e. caste
> system, the problems will continue.

An incentive system and a caste system are polar opposites.

An incentive system rewards achievement. It's a meritocracy. In the case of license exams, demonstrating more knowledge and skills is rewarded by more privileges.

A caste system rewards who or what a person is, regardless of achievements. It's based on things a person is, not what they have done. The best known caste system is/was in India, where people were born into castes ranging from Brahmins to untouchables, based solely on who their parents were. There is no analogy in American amateur radio licensing.

A "caste system" in licensing would exist if, say, privileges depended on things like eye color rather than passing tests.

> That's why I advocate a single permanent
> class of amateur radio license along with one temporary learner's license.

Such a system would be very discriminatory.

I think the best workable system would have at least three levels of license, with the privileges earned related to the knowledge/skills demonstrated.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2750. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 22:51:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a807hh$m7d$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38626

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ua6pqgk9pl2de1@corp.supernews.com...
>
> N2EY wrote:
> >It is now possible to buy chess-playing software that can
> >defeat most human chess players.
>
> Yes, and we all might think about what this software truly
> represents, when you "play" it.

I'm listening. Of what does it represent?

> >"Deep Blue" demonstrated its ability to defeat all but the very
> >best human players, and even those human players cannot
> >defeat Deep Blue with any consistency.
>
> The grandmasters who _played_ "Deep Blue" were actually
> "playing" other grandmasters who were being assisted by the
> computer! This is the fact! Not only that, when the human op-
> ponet of the computer began to get the upper hand, in that
> last match, the handlers of Blue were allowed to adjust the
> programming, during the series of games, showing up the
> whole thing for what it was!

Once "adjusted" was it defeatable by thos masters?
Software is often "tweaked" as the application undergoes
field trials.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2751. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 22:52:07 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ua76j34mtksoff@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38621

N2EY wrote, about Deep Blue and chess:

>My understanding is that the computer decided the
>moves alone - based on software that was the result
>of the expertise of many grandmasters.

What does it mean "decided" when the total input
is external to the machine and has no meaning to
the machine . . . which is a machine. The great
scandal of that last match was that Deep Blue was
said to "learn" and somehow integrate new information,
including surprise moves by the opponent. However,
when things began to go bad for the machine, due to
surprise moves by its human opponent, Deep Blue's
owners and handlers cheated, by cramming in new
HUMAN information, from the "advisor" grandmasters,
and not really telling anyone exactly what was going on
until the whole thing was over. The guy playing the
machine knew the score but he was getting so much
money that he didn't say "boo" -- until it was over and
he had received his check!

Disgusting, really.

As for the point of automating chess, well, as you
say, it's a great training aid. But the real deal is,
I think, the fact that it IS able to be simulated, due
to the design of the game, and there is a built-in
cachet to somehow "beating" a human with a machine
at this "supreme intellectual game."

I'm waiting for the first Great American novel, written
by a computer, on spec, and without any prompting.
Now THAT would be interesting!

Val

2752. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 23:02:04 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a807hi$m7d$2@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38625

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3C996099.1D697780@worldnet.att.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > When the channel I occupy allows CW to make it through when PSK31
> > > cannot, for whatever reason, polar phase shifting in that particular
case, then
> > > Cecil's misapplication of Shannon is not only invalid and misdirected
but
> > > misinforming to newcomers.l.
> >
> > I have explained a dozen times or more that your CW and PSK31 did NOT
occupy
> > the same channel since you were trying to use a computer to copy PSK31
> > but not CW. What is it about that simple concept that you cannot
comprehend?
> > You were NOT using the same equipment for both modes so your observation
> > is relatively meaningless.
> >
> > There are three values in Shannon's theorem: Power, bandwidth, and
throughput.
> > If these three values are not the same for two modes, a valid comparison
> > is not being made. An observation akin to yours is that 1000 watt SSB
gets
> > through when one watt CW fails. So what?
>
> Then there's the crack in Shannon for real world communications where
the user has
> no control over the situation.

Dick...are you at all serious. Shannon's Law has no more cracks in it than
any other theorem. The fact that you think there is a defect (crack)
because morse
be copieable (for any of the reasons... greater power, slower "baud" rate)
when
a PSK can't be copied is the epitome of unscientific thought.

> Keep your scientific comparisons for the lab, they
> simply were of no use whatever in that situation.

Yet you have NOT proved anything.

> In the channel in use at the time, the CW signal was readable where the
PSK31 was

> not. That's the only valid comparison that can be made. Anything else
falls under the
> Yogi Berra theorem.

Bunk...the channels weren't identical so the comparison is invalid.
If anything, you are arguing for more robust coding schemes, better
FEC and possibly a "slower" PSK rate for certain emergency
situations.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2753. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 23:08:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a807tm$i4t$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38627

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a7ubap$8gq$1@208.206.142.114...
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > You were not using the same equipment for CW and PSK31 so your
> > > > observation is apples and oranges. In a similar case, 1000w
> > > > SSB will beat one watt CW. So what?
> > >
> > > I suppose you realize how stupid it sounds to insist that the most
> > > efficient mode that won't work is better for the intended use than the
> > > lesser in efficiecy that works just fine.
> > >
> > If you think I said that, you are not comprehending. There are many
times
> > when one mode gets through and another mode doesn't. To compare the
modes,
> > bandwidth, throughput, and power need to at least be normalized. We know
> > that 1000w CW gets through when one watt PSK31 doesn't. So what?
>
> So as an engineer and a ham of 51 years you are still too stupid to
> understand that a communicator uses what works when he needs it
> to work.

Under the instant condition of getting a message through you
can use whatever works for you...BUT the outcome and lesson
learned should be what else can be done in the future to allow
continued use of the preffered mode. Perhaps increasing power,
running a slower PSK rate, developing more robust coding schemes,
etc.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2754. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 23:11:13 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <lqNo8.2406$BT6.201862@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38628

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote

> The former military and commercial ditty-boppers who were paid to learn
code
> then come on here and proceed to tell the rest of us why its so great
really
> frost my ass.

Hey Brian,

Which participants here on rrap (if any) were paid to learn Morse code?
I don't know of a single one. (Doncha just hate it when someone spoils
your rant?)

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2755. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 23:11:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CA3A328.D05C4BF8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 38629

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3CA2A74B.A2F22105@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >There's a joke in there somewhere just dying to be articulated.
>
> Your sense of humor was DOA years ago. RIP.
>
> Dumb tacit Clamato.

Leonardo eruptibus.

Dave K8MN

2756. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 23:11:55 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a80840nrp1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38630

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA263B8.36AF0C6C@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > In the channel in use at the time, the CW signal was readable
where the PSK31 was
> > > > not.
> > >
> > > That's false, Dick. The computer was in the PSK31 channel and was NOT
in
> > > the CW channel. You know that and I know that you know that.
> >
> > That's incorrect and YOU know that. The computer was receiving the same
> > IF bandwidth the receiver was using to play the CW.
>
> The computer was used to process PSK31. The computer was NOT used
> to process CW. You were used to process CW. You were NOT used to process
> PSK21. THEREFORE, the same equipment was ***NOT*** used for both. It is
> similar to comparing 1000w SSB to one watt CW. The comparison conditions
> must be the same (or compensated for) or you are comparing apples and
oranges.
>
> That you could receive CW while the computer couldn't receive PSK31
> is virtually irrelevant. I can run around my house and my computer
> cannot do that. The computer is not equipped for running. I am. Your
> computer was not equipped for CW. You were. Apples and oranges.

The other unstated variable here is "throughput"...i.e. what was the CW
character rate vs PSK31. Unless they were the same you are still
comparing aples and oranges.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2757. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 23:12:38 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ua77phb42gmq71@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38624

mike coslo wrote:

> To be fair Val, there is plenty of blame to go around
>on both sides of the argument. But the issue is so
>polarized that the parties are deliberately "misunderstanding"
>each other, trying to dismiss entire arguments on typos,
>extrapolating incredible amounts of insinuation from
>simple statements, and just general cussedness.

There is truth in what you say. However, I learned a long time
ago that certain people are not worthy of respect. Once that
fact has been demonstrated then, ah, there is no purpose
in giving even a single inch, once one has sullied oneself
by mixing it up with them. For this reason I won't be replying
to them very damned often in the future. They are not worth it.

>Plus there is one not so endearing quality from some of the
>Procode crowd. That is the concept that "Extra Lites" such
>as myself are considered second class citizens by so many
>of them. I'm pro-code, but my inferior status in their eyes turns
>me right off to thier cause.

Well, what else can you expect from the people who have
been in the field for many years and have had this system
forced on them from above! They played the FCC game
by the rules and climbed the tree fair and square, most of
them, and then saw the whole thing trivialized, first by the
"waivers" and then by the other changes. It does not matter
whether these changes are "better" or "worse" for Ham
Radio or World Peace, or whatever, the particpants in the
old system, many of them, are going to be disgruntled.

> I would tell a prospective ham that learning Morse code is
>a worthwhile thing, they just need to buckle down and do it,
>and once they learned it, they could be proud of the
>accomplishment. But I wouldn't send them into this fray,
>for sure 8^)

Now THIS I can totally agree with!! :-)

Val

2758. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 23:17:55 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a808oebpb1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38631

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a7u272$g48$3@208.207.71.170...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > With the phasing out of the Morse code exams, Morse code has
essentially let
> > > > him down so he unconsciously hates it? Some hams have said they
would rather
> > > > see ham radio die than change radically.
> > >
> > > I'm coming to believe that you are a fundamentally dishonest person.
> > > You know that is NOT what was said.
> >
> > Based on what was said, I'm guessing at the nature of your "monsters
> > from the ID". You remind me of Walter Pidgeon in "Forbidden Planet",
> > not accepting responsibility for the destruction you are causing.
>
> Not only are you fundamentally dishonest, you have no clue to that
> fact, and can't see it in your own responses. It means nothing to you to
> totally misrepresent the words of someone with whom you disagree, and
> you seem to be obvlious to the fact that you're even doing it.

Actually, I think Cecil is on to something. The
"Forbidden Planet" analogy is outstanding.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2759. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 23:20:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA3A547.A1427AEB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38632

N2EY wrote:
> In the previous post you used "importance", now you are substituting
> "logical weight". They are not the same thing.

I was explaining what I meant by "importance". They are the same
if one is talking logically, which I was. Someday you are going to
have to familiarize yourself with black and white thinking.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2760. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 23:23:18 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a808pe$74i$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38634

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020327081907.27413.00000332@mb-mr.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Question Pools and Such!
> >From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
> >Date: 03/26/02 21:10 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <a7r9r6$5bs$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
>
>
> >Because there is NO reason for "EVERY" ham to know CW.
>
> Why not?

No need to say why not...the burden of proof
is on those that want it so.
That's because,
for regulatory requirements to exist they
MUST be defendable by the government.
The NPRM asked for input from all as to pro/con
of morse testing. The results, published in R&O
showed NO credible and/or compelling reasons
to retain morse testing...other than on a minimus
5 wpm basis to satisfy current ITU treaty
agreements.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2761. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 23:23:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA3A5F9.4942C963@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38633

N2EY wrote:
> But the question is a serious one: what's the point of automating such
> things?

Just as it has always been - the challenge. What was the point
in discovering America while failing to find an Atlantic trade
route to Asia?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2762. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 23:25:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA3A65C.60050953@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38635

K0HB wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
> > The caste system based on competition has its place in a free
> > market, profit-driven, economy and may the best competitors win.
>
> I don't believe that our current sliced-and-diced license structure
> makes any good regulatory sense, I didn't compete with anyone
> to gain my license.

Yep, nobody had more frequency privileges than I did
as a Conditional in 1952.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2763. Re: OT - Plug Needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 23:27:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CA3A6BC.942AA540@earthlink.net>
Source record: 38636

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3CA29F80.B409D647@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <20020326230645.21793.00000156@mb-ch.aol.com>,
> >yodoc@aol.comnospam
> >> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
> >>
> >> >>Roll is a technical moron,
> >> >
> >> >Len:
> >> >
> >> >NOW there is something that is certainly true, at least in comparison
> >> >to others in this newsgripe like Ed Hare, Hansl, Jim Miccolis, Cecil,
> >> >and even your own good self! However, as a strictly AMATEUR radio
> >> >operator, I can usually hold my own in purely practical matters of a
> >> >technical nature.
> >>
> >> More bullshit, total AMATEUR. All you are is an OPERATOR of
> >> ready-built equipment, a functional illiterate as far as anything
> >> that goes on behind the front panel.
> >
> >I see our sidewalk superintendent is back on the job in his "happy old
> >man" persona. Yep, there are so many grumpy old men about and he
> >doesn't associate with them. He told our newcomer Val (and our newest
> >ham) that he avoids 'em.
>
> Poor baby, you feel some primal urge for retribution? :-)

Len, you are the sourpuss who seems to have some need validate your
existence by putting mere radio amateurs in "their place". You made
your statement regarding happy old men. It has now come back to bite
you in the ass.

> All you seem to be able to do is pick on "little old men."

A singular grumpy little old man with no amateur license is in evidence.
Do you feel picked upon? Do you have any feelings that you have picked
on others?

> >> You are totally LOST on the theory presented within the
> >> covers.

> >
> >Just how would you know that, Len?
>
> Oh, dear, another gubmint retiree heard from, ten kinds of
> certificates and only three neurons associating.

Yet you didn't bother to answer the question. How would you know just
how much Larry knows?

> >Are they hams too?
>
> No, they assembled WORKING spacecraft electronics.
> That's a bit out of your league, old-timer. You, like
> Larrie, are, by your own definition, PERFECT, so you
> don't know much about anything but can sure talk down
> to anyone who doesn't share your viewpoints.

Ahhh, you must have missed the part about this being an amateur radio
newsgroup. One would expect to find radio amateurs here. We don't see
many lady factory workers. Your last sentence was a hoot after I mused
on its source.

> >How do you do at copying them, Len? Up to 5 wpm yet, old timer?
> >Keep at it and you'll have it whipped one of these days.
>
> I'm not into your kind of sado-masochism.

No, and you aren't into amateur radio yet either.

> You insist on that get-a-#$%^!!-license-before-allowed-to-exist,
> all because you don't have ONE good, civil response to give in
> debate. You CANNOT debate, only shout orders, crack that
> whip. Pfaugh. Not a good image, not even with a billboard-
> size wall to hang all those certificates.

You post. Therefore we know you exist. Your comments to Larry are
certainly not debate. Now you've gotten yourself into capitalization so
we know you are worked into a lather.

> Now YOU tell us why all this traditionalist amateur radio attitude
> is so damn good and proper and The Only Way To Go. Without
> putting on that uniform. Bet you can't do it.

I'm not wearing a uniform, Len. In the past, I've told you the whys.
You seem to have a problem with tradition, with the ARRL, with radio
amateurs in general (despite your frequent denials). You aren't a ham.
Your words aren't likely to carry much weight with hams or with those
who regulate them. You're a newsgroup Harold Pransky. All of your
writing is on the outside of the envelope.

Dave K8MN

2764. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 23:34:31 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a809ee$u7f$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38637

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ua6dtuan2c6obd@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> >They act like a pack of wolves and if we don't respect their
> >pecking order, we'll be torn apart.
> >
> >So much for the fraternity.
>
> What in hell are you talking about? Code is HISTORY, or soon
> will be,

That you believe that reflects no understanding
of the many hundreds of pursuits that people "voluntarily"
do. People "keep alive" use of manual gearbox autos,
they hunt with bow and arrow, they play golf, not
because anyone mandates that they do so...rather they
do it simply because they enjoy it. Morse will
live on with its following of users for that reason alone...
inspite of the "doom and gloom" negativity spouted by
the Dick and Larrys of the world.

> and the battle has gone the way the anti-coders have
> advocated.

The only battle is over code testing. that's it!

> BUT, was the code REALLY what it was about?

Conspiracy theory alert....

> I don't think so. I think it was (and IS) about the whole incentive
> licensing system, and about the fact that the ARRL has set
> up all of these contests and awards and DXCC programs, etc.,
> thus making some hams "better than others."

Nothing in the new regulations, licensing, now or in
the future has anything to do with ARRL contests, DXCC, etc.
Those that wish to follow those paths are free to follow it.

As for the incentives, they still exist...there are still
three levels of test. The reality, however, has nothing to
do with licence class as the license is just a gateway.
I judge you and all other hams by what they do...not by
the license they hold. I know many outstanding hams
that are techs, generals and extras. Likewise, I have

met hams that are class A idiots who are also techs,
generals and extras. Is the idiot Extra to be more respected
than the excellent tech?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

> There's a name for that for I won't write it here.
>
> Val
>
>
>
>

2765. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 23:36:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328183639.09495.00000534@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 38638

>Subject: Re: What's It All About, Alfie?
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 03/28/02 13:42 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <3CA36418.3F238275@IEEE.org>

>
>As long as amateur radio is organized onto an "incentive", i.e. caste
>system, the problems will continue.

Bravo Sierra, Sir Cecil.

The Red Chinese and the Rooskies have found out that they fare better with competiton and incentive rather than "one size fits all".

Socialism is a failure. "One Size Fit's All" never does.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2766. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 23:40:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CA3AA04.60BF583D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 38639

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3CA2A3F1.2C4EA258@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Another slap at the League for its perceived wrong to you all those
> >years ago over one of your articles?
>
> Nah. Never tried to submit one to the ARRL...they don't pay enough
> and you have to sign over all rights if they get it first.

Okay. What was the motivation behind your sniping at the League?

> >If I had the distaste for amateur
> >radio you've exhibited, I'll bet I could find another newsgroup to
> >haunt.
>
> What "distaste for amateur radio?" I have a strong distaste for
> the pushy, neo-youknowwhat, dumshits who want to control
> everyone "under" them. Dave Heil fits in that profile about as
> exact as one can get. Stereotypical Prussian Feldwebel with
> just one ear.

The distaste you frequently exhibit here was the distaste referred to.
I note you're back to the Nazi thing again. It seems to fascinate you.

> >Your stuff might find more acceptance in a group where you
> >aren't yet known.
>
> Oh, my, Dr. Signal Freud is at it again, playing coy with another
> variation of "be nice or nobody will 'like' you!" in here.
>
> Idiot. That sort of thing IS for amateurs. Amateur psychos.

Nobody likes you here already. My suggestion would be to start over in
a new group nobody knows you well enough to have built up an opinion.

> Why don't you regale us with more cashew-crunching stories
> of being "the only ham" in an African country or "scampering
> up and down towers." Those are almost as good as "Little
> Billy Beeper" reruns or Larrie copying random code groups
> "perfectly" and without verification.

My yarns are true. They relate to amateur radio. Do you have true
amateur radio stories involving yourself to tell us?

> Set a standard for all the newcomers to follow. You DID want
> them to follow you, didn't you? I mean, that's the only way
> you will get any order in your bund, cracking whips and all
> that. SM all the way and you LIKE it. Go figger.

Er, I don't have a bund or a whip, Len. It is interesting to see what directions your fanstasies take you though. Newcomers needn't follow me. They can find plenty of folks willing to help them. It is a cinch that newcomers to amateur radio won't be following you. You don't have a story in amateur radio. You don't have a history. You're a dead end.

You're one happy old man.

Dave K8MN

2767. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 23:45:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a80a3u$15s$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38640

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0203280959.36fe7530@posting.google.com...
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:<3CA2A008.42D88D04@IEEE.org>...
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > Thus a "King of the Hill" mentality evolved in ham radio where Morse
> > > > code was given the importance of everything else in ham radio
combined.
> > >
> > > Really? Wonder where I missed that.
> >
> > Dick, even you can understand that two tests, both of which must be
passed
> > in order to obtain a license, are of equal importance.
>
> Yet both tests did not have to be passed to get the license. Since
> 1990 it has been possible to get the 13 and 20 wpm code tests waived.
>
> Consider this simple fact, as well:
>
> The high school and colleges I attended required passing grades in all
> required courses in order to get a diploma. Failures and incompletes
> had to be replaced with passing grades before a diploma would be
> granted.

Wrong. It was often possible to take another subject (i.e. electives)
depending on the actual program.

> Does this mean all of the required courses were of equal
> importance? Of course not.

If one had to pass two differnet classes, then they certainly
served as equivalents under that criteria.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2768. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 23:49:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328184952.09495.00000538@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 38641

>Subject: Re: Question Pools and Such!
>From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>Date: 03/28/02 18:23 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <a808pe$74i$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>

>No need to say why not...the burden of proof
>is on those that want it so.

Those who try to displace the "burden of proof" usually have no argument to make. This is another case in point.

>The results, published in R&O
>showed NO credible and/or compelling reasons
>to retain morse testing...other than on a minimus
>5 wpm basis to satisfy current ITU treaty
>agreements.

The results, when tallied, all add up to "because I don't want to"...nothing else.

Morse Code continues to be a viable, basic, uncomplicated mode of communication. It DOES continue to allow communications when most other modes went packing.

It does not require a degree in porgramming to use, nor does it require hundreds of dollars in ancilliary equipment to make it viable. basic communications can be had for a handful of parts.

It continues to allow international communications where voice communications due to a lack of common language or other dialect-realted anomolies make it difficult to communicate.

That a majority of people want to do away with it has nothing to do with it's viability or usefulness. It has EVERYTHING to do with a lack of initiative and individual skill.

Unless you can prove otherwise?

Steve

2769. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 23:52:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA3ACCE.A09A040@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38644

N2EY wrote:
> An incentive system and a caste system are polar opposites.

The level of achievement in an incentive system creates a
pecking order which I am calling a type of caste system.
It is understandable to do that for a profit-making business
but why do that inside a hobby for amateurs? Why set up a
system designed to make some members feel bad about their
hobby?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2770. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 23:54:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CA3AD2C.BE19D131@earthlink.net>
Source record: 38643

CAM wrote:
>
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > There was, is now but to a far lesser extent, and more than likely always
> > will be a caste system in the ARS as to some extent as there is in every
> > human activity.
>
> The caste system based on competition has its place in a free
> market, profit-driven, economy and may the best competitors win.
> But in an elective hobby, what is the purpose of putting individuals
> into competition, dividing them into classes, and grinding the "lower"
> classes into the dirt? This hobby is NOT about dog eat dog competition,
> at least, it shouldn't be. Every member and potential member of the ARS
> should be welcomed with open arms.

Let me see if I get this: You believe in a free market of modes ("live and let live") but not in a free market of licenses (no more "live and let live"). You believe that if I pass an Extra exam and you don't, that is somehow associated with dogs eating one another. You believe that if I pass the Extra and you don't, that you are being ground into the dirt?

Gee, all this time and I thought I was only competing with me.

Dave K8MN

2771. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-28 23:57:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328185721.09495.00000540@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 38645

>Subject: Re: 15wpm hump
>From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
>Date: 03/28/02 11:03 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <ua6ekjlvaoojb5@corp.supernews.com

>Please, let's all stop responding to
>this "Len", who has shown what he truly is. Please, no more.

I almost agree, Val. The purpose of keeping this creep off balance is
that there are always new people who come along who are unaware of what he
"stands" for.

He has an opinion...fine...he's expressed it. Everything after that is
meant to do nothing more than antagonize and denigrate Amateur Radio...So...I
feed it back to him.

I HAVE stopped answering very one...Just the one's that are obvious
attempts to mislead or are obvious overt attempts to distort the truth.

Which are, unfortunately, quite a few....

73

Steve, K4YZ

2772. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 00:01:51 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a80b1lduk1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38646

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:n_Mo8.2366$BT6.196122@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote
>
> > That is, to me the whole "anti-code" crowd has seized on code as a
> > stalking dog for a bad-faith attack on incentive licensing based on what
> > amounts to jealousy.
>
> I think you meant stalking _horse_, but I won't niggle over such
> detail. I have a "good faith" opposition to the current license
> structure, and since I've had full HF privileges since my first
> Conditional license grant, and was an Extra several years before
> dis-incentive licensing, your "jealousy" card doesn't play with
> me.
>
> Perform this experiment, if you will. Turn on your HF rig and
> tune it to 14.150MHz when 20M has a lot of US signals
> at your location. Put on a blindfold and slowly increment
> the receive frequency. Based on the operator skill, the
> technical content of the conversation, and signal quality
> see if you can detect when you have tuned to 14.175 (the
> end of the Extra exclusive portion). Then blindfold yourself
> again and see if you can tell when you have tuned to the
> top end of the Advanced portion.
>
> If incentive licensing has been a success, the boundaries
> on the band between license classes ought to be apparent
> to the most casual observer. Unfortunately, they are
> undetectable by the criteria I mention, therefore we must
> conclude that incentive licensing is a failure.
>
> With all kind wishes,
> de Hans, K0HB

Hans,

Not an unreasonable conclusion as framed.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2773. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 00:04:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA3AFA3.CA000339@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38647

Bill Sohl wrote:
> The other unstated variable here is "throughput"...i.e. what was the CW
> character rate vs PSK31. Unless they were the same you are still
> comparing aples and oranges.

Yep, I have said that bandwidth, throughput, and power must all be
normalized for a fair and valid comparison of modes.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2774. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 00:08:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CA3B064.73B1CFE4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 38762

CAM wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> > An incentive system and a caste system are polar opposites.
>
> The level of achievement in an incentive system creates a
> pecking order which I am calling a type of caste system.

So you'll stick with your mistaken definition then?

> It is understandable to do that for a profit-making business
> but why do that inside a hobby for amateurs? Why set up a
> system designed to make some members feel bad about their
> hobby?

Do you really believe that making some radio amateurs feel bad was the purpose behind incentive licensing? I held a General class license for some years and an Advanced Class license for some years. During those years, I never felt bad even one time that someone else had succeeded in passing a higher class exam. I studied and passed the additional exams because I wanted all the privileges available. Did you study and pass exams because you felt bad? Have you ever known anyone who indicated that he felt bad because another held a higher class license?

It must be this new age we live in. We wouldn't want anyone's self esteem to suffer due to another's success. That wouldn't be politically correct.

Dave K8MN

2775. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 00:09:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328190945.16830.00000559@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38648

From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net

> and so will not respond anymore to most of those who spew on this board
> about the horrors of CW.

Maybe you won't, but if anyone starts downgrading the mode and no one speaks up first, I will respond. OOK CW has value and use in the Amateur Radio Service. You weren't around a number of years ago when WA6VSE and I went more than a few rounds. :-)

>For me personally CW is part and parcel of amateur radio and always will be.
>Now, with its commercial demise, it is UNIQUE to amateur radio, which is,
>for me a PLUS, since I am of a historical bent and, like many people, prefer
>to BE "unique", if only in a small way. Add to this the idea that CW can be
>done on little power, with very simple equipment, and is understood around
>the world, and, well, it's hard for me NOT to advocate some testing here,
>especially for the very top of the tree, the EXTRA class.

It would be more effective to advocate some use of CW here, Val. First, I don't think that testing will survive too many more rounds of revisions to international and then national law. When the time comes with the FCC, you should speak your mind, even if that is contrary to what you believe will be the outcome, because the whole concept of a free society is that each individual gets to petition his or her governement for the law that he or she feels is best. The whole concept says that the lone dissenting voice should be heard.

But even more important than testing is use. I know 20-wpm tested hams that literally had the code-key-burying cermony in their backyard, surrounded by all their friends. Amateur Radio gained nothing by testing them. The same will hold with the 5 wpm hams, and if we old cogers with CW experience and enthusiasm for the mode don't find a way to encourage them to spread their rather slow wings, many will not become CW ops. Some will, just because of the value of the mode, but most hams try new modes after seeing others having fun with them. The things we say about CW right now better sound fun or we are not being very good salesmen.

Fortunately, the negativism about CW by those claiming to be its proponents does not extend across all of amateur radio.

> The historical legacy of a group like Ham Radio IS important. It's part of
the
>identity of the group. In light of this I can only view the viciousness of
the
>anti-code types as a true psychological problem, one existing within THEIR
>heads. Like so many in our society today, jealousy has taken over their

>minds in this area and they have thus ceased to speak and act in a rational
>way, much of the time, where this issue is concerned.

I am not sure I see the visciousness. From whom? Me? I love CW -- I use it all the time. Cecil? He, too, operates about 99% CW. Bill? While not almost exclusive like Cecil and me, he gets on CW from time to time, as does a former rrap denizen, Rick Tannehill. Carl? He could care less, but has repeatedly says that he has absolutely no objection to people who want to use any mode. Brian? I think his big issue is with the test, though he has said a number of things about CW that I have told him I think are not true.

>I don't see one thing wrong with code testing, and incentive licensing, for
>many reasons, NONE of which have anything to do with "hazing" or any crap
>like that. In my view, "arguments" like the "hazing" dodge have lowered the
>intellectual content of the whole debate, which I think was the actual
>intent.

I think they really see it that way, though, so the statement was, IMHO, an honest expression of belief. Frankly, the whole issue of Morse code testing would not make the top 10 major problems facing amateur radio today. RFI, spectrum, CC&Rs, enforcement, youth recruitment ... we can all make up a list and I bet most of us would not put code testing in the first 10.

IMHO, amateur radio will survive just fine with or without code testing. Code will survive just fine with our without code testing, unless many of those say things about the mode in an attempt to save code testing that convince newcomers that it is not worth trying.

>That is, to me the whole "anti-code" crowd has seized on code as a
>stalking dog for a bad-faith attack on incentive licensing based on what
>amounts to jealousy. That's my view.

Many of those who advocate the removal of Morse code testing already hold the Extra. What jealousy? My reasons for believing that Morse code should not be tested center on the fact that Amateur Radio has another long tradition -- of offering value to the radio technology of the day. We still do so, but Morse code is no longer part of that value outside of Amateur Radio.

If the only way to preseve Morse code use in Amateur Radio were by testing, I might feel differently, but I feel that the value of the mode can be promoted and people will learn to use it. Every other operating mode survives in Amateur Radio, and hams put a lot more effort into building their stations than they would put into learning and using code.

> And because so much of the anti-code effort has been driven by this jealousy
> and bad faith, the debate has been marked by the viciousness we see,
> now on both sides, to a disturbing extent.

And over the years, I have been insulted by both sides, but some of those who have insulted me have turned out to be staunch friends. :-)

>So today, in the spring of 2002, the code battle is over, or soon will be.

Of course not. What happens internationally will be only the first stage. The FCC will still have to make a decision, and although the restructuring Report and Order offers some real clues about their thinking, the battle over the FCC rules and the anger will not stop for years to come.

>But what will come next, since the REAL reasons for the anti-code jealousies
>remain?

I don't think that there will be much come next. Of those who are avowed anti-code-test folks, who do you think would want to see any reduction in the content of the written? Not me. I am doing what I can to see more material brought to the Question Pool Committee. I will let the others speak for themselves, but a "No Written International" will not find any acceptance in the Amateur community, IMHO.

>I don't think we'll have to wait long to find out.

2005 is my guess for the earliest we will see any FCC changes in code testing take effect.

Lobster anyone? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2776. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 00:16:50 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a80btn$b9q$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38650

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020328184952.09495.00000538@mb-cs.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Question Pools and Such!
> >From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
> >Date: 03/28/02 18:23 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <a808pe$74i$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
>
> >No need to say why not...the burden of proof
> >is on those that want it so.
>
> Those who try to displace the "burden of proof"
> usually have no argument to make. This is another case in point.

No case in point at all. Merely just a fundamental
reality of government regs. You want code testing to
be retained...YOU gotta justify it. Those that oppose
code testing have no burden of proof to sustain.

> >The results, published in R&O
> >showed NO credible and/or compelling reasons
> >to retain morse testing...other than on a minimus
> >5 wpm basis to satisfy current ITU treaty
> >agreements.
>
> The results, when tallied, all add up to "because I don't want
> to"...nothing else.

Yes Sir, guess them FCC folks are just dumb and stupid for
not seeing what you do in the results.

> Morse Code continues to be a viable, basic, uncomplicated mode of
> communication.

So? The same is true for other mdoes that have NO
mandated "skill" test requirement. Ending morse testing
doesn't change your statement in any way and people
will be free to pursue code or not as they so choose.

> It DOES continue to allow communications when most other modes
> went packing.

Apples and oranges again.

> It does not require a degree in porgramming to use, nor does it
require
> hundreds of dollars in ancilliary equipment to make it viable. basic
> communications can be had for a handful of parts.

So?

> It continues to allow international communications where voice
> communications due to a lack of common language or other dialect-realted
> anomolies make it difficult to communicate.
>
> That a majority of people want to do away with it has nothing to do
with
> it's viability or usefulness. It has EVERYTHING to do with a lack of
> initiative and individual skill.

The issue is code TESTING...not code USE. Same old effort
to deflect the issue of testing by shifting to a USE claim.

> Unless you can prove otherwise?

Once again...I need prove nothing. Reread (above) the reality of
regulatory justification...burden of proof.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2777. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 00:17:51 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328191751.16830.00000561@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38649

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>> I have been searching for the URL, but a few years back, there was a bit of
>a
>> contest going on in the EME crowd where they were challenged to use a
>computer
>> to decode an EME signal. I listened to the .wav file and could not hear the
>> signal, and I am pretty good at knowing that a signal is present. (In the
>lab,
>> I have used the signal generator keyed on and off and could tell a signal
>was
>> present about 10-12 dB below the noise in 500 Hz.) Someone decoded it and
>won
>> the 'test.
>
>How much EME work is done on HF? Hans' comment was about HF
>environments.

I know of no EME work being done on HF, but the fact that this was a recording of an EME echo ~20 dB below the noise is less important to the discussion than the fact that it was a CW signal ~20 dB below the noise. A machine decoded what this reasonably skilled human could not even know was present.

>The fact that something can be automated does not mean that it must
>be, or even should be.

I think we are talking about could be. I certainly would not support a mandate that people were only permitted to decode morse code by machine.

>It is now possible to buy chess-playing software that can defeat most
>human chess players. "Deep Blue" demonstrated its ability to defeat
>all but the very best human players, and even those human players
>cannot defeat Deep Blue
>with any consistency. It is probably possible to develop an automated
>chess-playing system that no human player can defeat.

>But what's the point of doing so?

The point is doing so. And doing so only becomes a problem if humans are prohibited from competing with each other.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2778. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 00:21:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA3B398.887FC3DE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38752

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >As long as amateur radio is organized onto an "incentive", i.e. caste
> >system, the problems will continue.
>
> Bravo Sierra, Sir Cecil.
>
> The Red Chinese and the Rooskies have found out that they fare better with
> competiton and incentive rather than "one size fits all".
>
> Socialism is a failure. "One Size Fit's All" never does.

I'm not talking about economic systems, Steve. I'm talking about
a hobby involving amateur volunteers. There's just no good reason
for a hobby to have an institutionalized class system.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2779. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 00:22:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328192243.16841.00000582@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38751

From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Why set up a
>system designed to make some members feel bad about their
>hobby?

As a Novice in 1963, I did not feel bad about Amateur Radio. Of course, I
didn't have folks on rrap back then to tell me that I should. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2780. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 00:23:32 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a80caa$mi9$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38753

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ua77phb42gmq71@corp.supernews.com...
>
> mike coslo wrote:
>
> > To be fair Val, there is plenty of blame to go around
> >on both sides of the argument. But the issue is so
> >polarized that the parties are deliberately "misunderstanding"
> >each other, trying to dismiss entire arguments on typos,
> >extrapolating incredible amounts of insinuation from
> >simple statements, and just general cussedness.
>
> There is truth in what you say. However, I learned a long time
> ago that certain people are not worthy of respect. Once that
> fact has been demonstrated then, ah, there is no purpose
> in giving even a single inch, once one has sullied oneself
> by mixing it up with them. For this reason I won't be replying
> to them very damned often in the future. They are not worth it.
>
>
> >Plus there is one not so endearing quality from some of the
> >Procode crowd. That is the concept that "Extra Lites" such
> >as myself are considered second class citizens by so many
> >of them. I'm pro-code, but my inferior status in their eyes turns
> >me right off to thier cause.
>
> Well, what else can you expect from the people who have
> been in the field for many years and have had this system
> forced on them from above! They played the FCC game
> by the rules and climbed the tree fair and square, most of
> them, and then saw the whole thing trivialized, first by the
> "waivers" and then by the other changes. It does not matter
> whether these changes are "better" or "worse" for Ham
> Radio or World Peace, or whatever, the particpants in the
> old system, many of them, are going to be disgruntled.

Good grief...the "I did it, so should you argument again."
When they stopped testing people on manual gearbox autos,
did that trivialize the efforts of those that had previously
had to take the test on a manual?

Does today's engineering students being able to use a
calculator trivialize those that went before and had to
learn and use a slide rule?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2781. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 00:26:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328192610.27329.00000138@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 38759

In article <ua6dk1r67nj667@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>W5TIT - Kim wrote:
>
>>Val, I have one question for you: will you judge other hams based
>>on their feelings about CW? If one simply said, "I don't think CW
>>should be a part of the testing strategy for an amateur radio license"
>>would you then pounce upon the person as though they had just
>>committed sin? *That* is where the difference is between people,
>>as you seem, of reasonable nature, and people like Dick/Larry, et al.
>
>I judge other PEOPLE on how they seem to be conducting them-
>selves in civil society. What * I * have been reading, since 1998
>on this newsgroup, from the anti-code folks, almost to a person, is
>a viciousness that goes WAY beyond any opposition to CW.

Ah, so you were predisposed to a point of view before entering?

No, not predisposed, DEDICATED. :-)

I hope you weren't looking for love in this place...

>There
>is something about the whole "incentive licensing" procedure, and
>the creation of an official Ham Hierarchy, that has brought out the
>worst in a lot of people. They say it's about the code, and maybe
>some of it is, but it runs a LOT deeper than that, in my view. Now,
>one might expect this kind of thing on _alt.rec.knavesAND fools_
>but I was startled four years ago to see it on THIS group. And I am
>still startled today. For a while I got caught up in it again but now,
>after only a few weeks "back" on this group, I am simply appalled
>at the abounding bad faith.

Was your viewpoint The Only True Faith?

You wanted to become a proselyte, a servant of the only
true god of radio?

>For me personally CW is part and parcel of amateur radio and
>always will be.

Ah, yes, a Follower of the True Faith of Morse!

>Now, with its commercial demise, it's UNIQUE to
>amateur radio, which is, for me, a PLUS, since I am of a historical
>bent AND like to BE a little "unique", in some harmless ways!

When and IF time machines are invented, I will personally
sponsor your trip back to the 1930s so that you can live
out your desires in radio. :-)

>Add to this the idea that CW can be done on little power, with very
>simple equipment, and is understood around the world, and, well,
>it's hard for me NOT to advocate some testing here, especially for
>the very top of the tree, the EXTRA class.

Wowee, yes. Let's hear it for Rank, Status, Privilege and a
bringing back of a half-dozen tiers in amateurism and that
wonderful Class Distinction business where lesser folks have
to ride in the back of the radio bus!

>I don't see one thing
>wrong with it, for many reasons, NONE of which have anything to
>do with "hazing" or any crap like that. In my view, "arguments"
>like that have brought on the lowering of intellectual content of the
>whole debate, which I think was their original intent.

Ah, yes, the "intellectual" speaks out...and having spoken, demands
that all adhere to His exhalted viewpoint. There shall be no dissent,
no contrary viewpoints, for that "lessens intellectualism." Ho ho.

>That is, to me
>the whole "anti-code" crowd has seized on code as a stalking
>dog for a bad-faith attack on incentive licensing based on what
>amounts to jealousy. That's my view.

Well, we all get the impression that the ONLY "intellectual view"
is Val Germann's and all others are "lesser." :-)

My, my, all that Sturm und Drang about a hobby activity! :-)

2782. Re: Remotely Controlled HF for New Upgrades?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 00:26:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328192612.27329.00000139@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 38760

In article <a7v8lk32fij@enews3.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>If morse code is so all-fired important and that great of value, there
>should be re-testing at least when the license is due for re-licensure like
>it is every ten years.

It's all a state of mind, Ryan. All of the PCTA old-timers have
developed a mindset that idolizes morsemanship above all else
in a hobby activity. It has been glorified beyond reasonableness.
:-)
Someone is sure to jump in and rail about "ham radio isn't a
hobby but a Service (with a capital S)" which falls into another
little myth. That is part of the dreaming and idolization of a
hobby-become-a-lifestyle...with quasi-religious overtones of
worship, piety, and devotion.

The whole point of the messaging in here is NOT about the
subject at all. It's about all the self-professed, self-propelled
morsemen who, having passed a morse test once, insist on
glory, status, privilege, honor, respect for accomplishing
something superhuman. They are extremely important and
do not hesitate to tell everyone how superior they are.

>This way we will see how important the code is, but all of these "chicken
>littles" that claim that people like me have been "dumbed down" and just
>memorized the tests.

Ryan, that "dumbing down syndrome" is just their own insecurity
manifesting itself. From decades of precedent, the PCTA morse-
men know damn well that they will NEVER be re-tested in
anything unless they allow their license-for-life to expire after
grace. They are thus fortified with the impunity to sneer at
everyone else...and do not hesitate to show it. :-)

>Actually, if someone has utilized and grown within
>this hobby, there is no reason why after ten years a person shouldn't be
>able to "ace" those tests since they have exposed themselves to much, much
>more within a ten year period of time, than any length of time they might
>have spent preparing for the initial tests.

That's a perfectly logical, reasonable, and practical observation.

This newsgroup is NOT about the logical, reasonable, or practical.

It is about the puffery of those who have made it and want the
respect, honor, glory they feel they richly deserve. :-)

Nobody, repeat Nobody, can possibly ever accomplish what
these self-styled superbeings have done...and they let every-
one know that by taking out all their frustrations and angst
against those that do not revere them for their god-like status.

>They do this similar activity with drivers licenses and other licensure.
>Specifically related to me, firefighters are constantly tested and retested
>on a regular basis, and expected to pursue more training and education as
>their career progresses. Would you want anything less?? (as a citizen)

Governments require recertification in all areas concerning health
and safety of its citizens. That's only logical and reasonable when
public safety is at issue.

The problem is that a hobby activity is not involved in public safety
anymore than any ordinary citizen is involved in public safety. The
hobby of amateur radio is regulated and certified-as-a-tool-of-the-
regulation-process due to the physics of EM waves. Radio
hobbyists have to obtain a license in order to transmit legally.
This license is then confused with all other "licenses" either
deliberately (for self-importance purposes) or inadvertently (after
decades of bombardment by media-oriented organizations).

Individuals that need something, anything, that puts them above
the "average" human will latch onto most anything that rationalizes
that self-image. Some will dream of the glory and tales of heroism
of bygone times, of saving the Titanic once again through the skill
of morsemanship, thus they project themselves into the "hero"
personna and wear the invisible cloaks of honor to attest to their
inherent wonderfulness. To others it has become a Way Of Life,
an inflexible mindset where "amateur radio is all about CW on
HF working DX;" there is nothing else but that. To approach their
god-like perfection all must Do As They Did or "suffer the
consequences." :-)

The subject of morse testing for an amateur license has never
been the real issue. The real issue has always been what the
PCTAs had to endure to achieve their status, titles, privileges.
All others must do as they did. Period. Full stop. :-)

2783. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 00:26:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328192613.27329.00000140@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 38754

In article <ua6fv73nlgd8a0@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>Brian P Burke wrote:
>
>A lot of smart-ass stuff, and I think we have now
>said about all we have to say to each other. You
>can wail away on my future messages all you want
>but I won't respond. Boo Hoo.

Sure you will. You can't help it. Your self-image is at
stake here! :-)

2784. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 00:26:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328192613.27329.00000141@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 38757

In article <a7vged$op5$0@208.207.71.160>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Valentine Germann wrote:
>>
>> Following this coment from someone who calls himself "Len":
>>
>> >>If you need to be a Yiddisher, wear a yarmulke when you post..
>>
>> Steve Robeson wrote:
>>
>> >That's what I like about you, Your Insultingness...you can be
>> >offensive in any number of religions.
>>
>> There comes a time to simply stop responding to people who
>> are worthless individuals and are on the net soley to perform
>> as absolute asswipes -- and have been doing so for YEARS.
>> In my view, the time to stop responding to this poster ["Len"]
>> was even before the InterNet was created, but that wasn't
>> possible, unfortunately. Please, let's all stop responding to
>> this "Len", who has shown what he truly is. Please, no more.
>
> There are a few posters whose posts I never open. He has long been
>one. The others are added slowly over time, and I just very recently
>added The Gadfly, B.Burke also.
>
> When one has nothing constructive whatever to add to the conversation,
>and instead only adds to the the QRM and QRN on a band, it's time to
>tune on.

Goodbye, Dick. It wasn't nice seeing you here. Have fun wherever
you go... :-)

2785. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 00:26:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328192614.27329.00000143@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 38756

In article <20020328083257.27454.00000576@mb-mr.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

> I see all those years of night school are starting to bear fruit for ya, >Lennie.

Anyone can do it if they apply themselves, take the time, and its available in a local area. Good for accredited college course credit. Good for personal knowledge advancement on new technologies, even if not for credit. There's always self-teaching.

There are hundreds of texts on the market today about electronics and radio. Self-teaching requires discipline and dedication. That can't be obtained by collecting a lot of wallpaper certificates...it has do be done well enough to be able to handle assignments successfully. Big fancy titles and engraved paper don't mean squat to electrons or EM fields...you have to meet them on their terms, not yours.

Some folks just can't hack it and try to dump their frustrations on others. Doesn't matter to me or electrons or EM fields. All three of us have worked together just fine for decades and we continue to do so. :-)

2786. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 00:26:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328192614.27329.00000142@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 38758

In article <ua6ekjlvaoojb5@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>Following this coment from someone who calls himself "Len":
>
>>>If you need to be a Yiddisher, wear a yarmulke when you post..
>
>Steve Robeson wrote:
>
>>That's what I like about you, Your Insultingness...you can be
>>offensive in any number of religions.
>
>There comes a time to simply stop responding to people who
>are worthless individuals and are on the net soley to perform
>as absolute asswipes -- and have been doing so for YEARS.

Ah! That's what's so nice about today's academics...liberal
thought and the free expression of ideas... :-)

>In my view, the time to stop responding to this poster ["Len"]
>was even before the InterNet was created, but that wasn't
>possible, unfortunately.

Not everyone shares your exhalted view, your highness. :-)

>Please, let's all stop responding to
>this "Len", who has shown what he truly is. Please, no more.

Yes, poor Val has been soooo upset. Tsk, tsk.

Let's have ONE viewpoint, ONE position on everything.
Cancel everything else, forbid dissent, quash freedom.
Ein volk, ein welt! (march, march, march, march......)

2787. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 00:26:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328192616.27329.00000144@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 38761

In article <20020328085035.27429.00000479@mb-mr.aol.com>,
Dill Instructor@usmc.com (Tension Hutt!) writes:

>>>Another slap at the League for its perceived wrong to you all those
>>>years ago over one of your articles?
>>
>>Nah. Never tried to submit one to the ARRL...they don't pay enough
>>and you have to sign over all rights if they get it first.
>
> Perhaps it was because they knew what a self appreciating punk you are,
>Lennie...

Heh heh heh...Miss Congeniality she ain't... :-)

> And we see where your TRUE values about Amateur Radio are...Others submit
>articles to QST because they want to share something with other Amateurs.

QST hasn't been regarded as a "technical" periodical in years.

Of course, for those who find Ohm's Law to be a terribly difficult
concept and need coaching in it, it would seem like "rocket
science." :-)

> YOU are focused on that "pecuniary" interest thing...Not enough "tribute"
>for your inflated ego, no doubt.

Every one of us professional freelance writers consider markets
and author's compensation. Why shouldn't we? The word
"professional" indicates pecuniary compensation is done.

> Of course, it COULD have been an act of self-preservation...Since QST is
>still in business and "Ham Radio" is...well...it's NOT in business...

Not sure what that means. QST survives because it is a
membership magazine and has the demographic base of
170 or so thousand ARRL members. It could NOT survive
as an independent unless it turned into CQ or 73.

Ham Radio Magazine and Ham Radio Horizons were both
independents. HR lived through 22 years, starting well
after all the other amateur radio periodicals were in business.

QST should be self-sustaining as a periodical, staff and
all publishing costs borne strictly on advertising revenue.
The ARRL benefits from certain article contents in that
their author agreements permit them to publish anything of
an author's in other periodicals without having to pay a
single dollar in royalties or compensation.

Strictly in terms of dollar income, the percentage of
freelance writers who get their majority income from such
writing is only a single digit. The "income" from articles in
hobby-recreation market periodicals isn't worth minimum
wage rates. Writers for that market do it because they
like to do it. No other reason.

> With THAT criteria I bet you have a hard time shaving. How can you
>stand to LOOK at yourself, Lennie?

Not a problem...haven't cracked a mirror in my life. :-)

> ....or Lennie's stories of sending/relaying 1.2 million messages as an
>army comm center clerk.

No. MOS 281.6, Microwave Radio Relay Operation and Maintenance
Supervisor (the decimal point denoted specialty or supervisory details).

By using the FOIA, anyone can access my military records and
verify the above MOS and other pertinent assignment details.
Search under Army Serial Number RA16408336 and Army Unit
8235 (Far East Command Signal Service Battalion). Note: My
records were not burned in a bad fire at the Army Records Center
a few years ago.

The statement of the number of messages sent per month over
ADA and WAR facilities was in the Pacific Stars and Stripes
weekly in the fall of 1955. ADA handled 220 thousand messages
per month, Washington Army Radio did 1.2 million per month.
Absolutely NO communications were handled by ADA in any
form of OOK CW or morse codings a half century ago.

> Yep...Just like Lennie has set for folks considering a career in
>"professional" radio, Dave.
>
> Makes ME want to run right on down and sign up for 14 years of night
>school!

I would strongly suggest some social behavior counseling before
doing that. Like about two years worth. I doubt you could last the
entire period. :-)

If college credit courses are given in a local area, they are an ideal
solution to furthering one's education, either just for knowledge or
towards obtaining a degree of any kind. That let's one continue with
"day job" income and, again if there are a number of repeated courses
in different semester periods, allows for absences due to temporary
business trips for one's employer. That takes perseverence and
dedication. The end result is a personal confidence in being able to
handle an assigned task successfully.

Everyone has a choice in life in this country.

2788. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 00:26:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328192617.27329.00000145@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 38755

In article <a7vdnn$g4b$0@208.207.71.160>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

> Ya know, you might have accidently stumbled onto a point. (Hope it
>didn't hurt too much). When the VE system was begun lots of us who had
>concerns were advised to shun it like that plague it was sure to become.
>Instead, lots of us put on a happy face and helped with years of
>service. For nothing but the thanks of the likes of you. Seems like the
>'advisers' might have been right.

...you must have known "the job was dangerous when you took it."

:-)

2789. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 00:38:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA3B778.704FDEA7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38764

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> Those who try to displace the "burden of proof" usually have no argument
> to make. This is another case in point.

Are you are saying that governmental regulations shouldn't have
to be justified? Sounds more like Cuba than the US of A.

> That a majority of people want to do away with it has nothing to do with
> it's viability or usefulness.

Virtually no one wants to do away with CW. It's the code *requirement*
that is under fire and must be justified. Any ham is free to learn
Morse code to whatever skill level he/she desires.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2790. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 00:38:36 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328193836.16841.00000585@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 38763

From: Clay N4AOX wyn@worldnet.att.net

>Why doesn't the Newington bunch declare W1AW "junque" and
>sell it off.

That decision would and could not be made by the ARRL HQ staff. The ARRL Board could make that decision. Let your ARRL Director know that you do not want your membership dues dollars spent on W1AW.

I do know that over the years, the bulletin aspect of W1AW has been scaled back, as other, better, means of obtaining information were made available.

>FCC could then go after K1MAN without fear of ancillary damage to ARRL.

I believe that the times the FCC has gone after Mr Baxter, it was over the lack of a control operator for his "bulletins."

>> Actually, Val, the ARRL has been doing a better job than ever before at
>> telling members

>[those with Inernet connection and interests in frequent
>use of it]

Yes, people do have an obligation to read news and information if they expect to know news and information. My statement applies to the articles and information in QST, too. Though a bit less than can be done on the web, most of what is put on the web is also put into QST, the ARRL Letter and, in condensed format -- gasp -- on the W1AW bulletins...

>IMHO, the only reason those minutes would be "very boring"
>is if they were intended to be so or that the activities of
>the BoD, ARRL HQ, the Newington Crowd, or the "League" were
>very boring.

I have been at a few Board meetings, and heard tales about those that I didn't attend. "Boring" is not a word I would use. And be real, Clay -- minutes are, by their nature, boring, in my experience. They are meant to be a formal recording of what transpired at a meeting.

>Personally, I think the last minute attempt by
>two Directors to add "data" to the phone band allocation
>proposal was very exciting, not boring at all. By the way,
>just for reference, cutting the minutes from QST would be a
>0.58% cost savings if $/page is linear. Who do they think
>they are kidding?

I agree; that was a pretty exciting deal.

0.58% * $12,000,000 = $69,600.00. I could buy a lot of new test equipment for the ARRL Lab with that, or attend a few important industry meetings. And I don't see it as a cost-savings issue at all, Clay. The number of pages in QST are going to be determined by the amount of advertising, just like every other magazine in the world. What would you want to see in QST? Minutes that you have already read on the ARRL Web site, or 3-4 additional feature articles a year instead?

73,
Ed Hare,W1RFI

2791. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 00:40:38 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a80dadbfr1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38765

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020328190945.16830.00000559@mb-fx.aol.com...
> 2005 is my guess for the earliest we will see any FCC changes in code
testing
> take effect.
>
> Lobster anyone? :-)

I'm game!
My timetable sez 2004.
There's no need for a lengthy NPRM
as was done for restructuring.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2792. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 00:45:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA3B90F.990181E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38766

Dave Heil wrote:
> You believe
> that if I pass the Extra and you don't, that you are being ground into
> the dirt?

I wasn't talking about me, Dave. I was talking about the nocode techs
who are remembered by "The St. Valentine's Day Massacre" of ham radio
and who must endure an endless stream of insults, e.g. lazy, knuckle-
dragging, whining, cheating, stupid, ignorant, dumbed-down, ...
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2793. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 01:12:12 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <MbPo8.2625$BT6.221964@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38767

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

> My timetable sez 2004.

You are not a regulator so your timetable has no influence.

Good luck anyhow.

de Hans, K0HB

2794. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 01:28:15 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <PqPo8.1520$fa5.75316685@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38768

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA36418.3F238275@IEEE.org...
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > But what will come next, since the REAL reasons for the anti-code
jealousies
> > remain?
>
> As long as amateur radio is organized onto an "incentive", i.e. caste
> system, the problems will continue. That's why I advocate a single
permanent
> class of amateur radio license along with one temporary learner's license.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

That's precisely the correct number of license classes: 1 (one). Anything
more is superflous.

2795. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 01:38:44 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <EAPo8.1532$Fe5.75572546@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38769

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ua673fls1v70ec@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Brian P Burke wrote
>
> >Hey, lots of us like to talk "arms" on here. I'm currently
> >using a Mini-14 and a junky SKS, but have plans for a
> >CMP AR-15.
>
> In the 1970s and '80s I was big into target pistol shooting,
> on an informal level. In a couple of weeks I'll be attending
> a camp for pistol instructors for the Missouri 4-H program.

We need to keep our youth as involved as we can with responsible use of
firearms.

> However, I now shoot AIR pistols!

I've got a Daisy 717 and its really nice. Great sights for a relatively
cheap pistol.

Twenty years ago
> Boone County, where Columbia is located, had plenty of
> places where you could just "go and shoot" -- if you had
> a clue and were responsible. But the population here has
> about doubled since the late 1970s and so the shooting
> I have always done has become very hard to do.

I've had to use public ranges and joined a private one.

> Now the case of my ex-Navy brother, who lives on the edge
> of what is becoming a free-fire zone in Kansas City, MO, he
> has plenty of opportunity there. In fact, he just had to work
> on his roof because of bullet holes shot into it from several
> blocks away! Needless to say, he won't be there much
> longer, as his neighborhood has disintegrated over just the
> last few years. That is, the percentage of people who are
> armed, and mean it, in a very strange and threatening way,
> continues to steadily climb. Ugly.

We need to take back our neighborhoods. Instead we leapfrog across the
countryside from one antenna restricted neighborhood to the next. The
prices of homes keep rising because there's constant demand to get away from
bad elements. The commute gets longer. The congestion grows.

2796. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 01:40:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA3C60C.D0434370@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38770

Dave Heil wrote:
> Do you really believe that making some radio amateurs feel bad was the
> purpose behind incentive licensing?

Nope, the intentions were good. The results were predictably bad.
Incentive licensing set up a structure that allowed the upper class
to heap abuse upon the lower class. It's not a new phenomenon. It's
human nature and therefore was entirely predictable. There is
absolutely no reason for a ham radio licensing hierarchy to exist.
Let's have one license so that performance alone determines
hierarchy within ham radio.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2797. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 01:41:54 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <CDPo8.1535$k85.75200802@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38771

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020328055438.16830.00000463@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >Oh yeh, the "letter." The one that said "hold the phone, we're trying to
> >come up with something, but it'll be too late for the NPRM."
>
> Uh, no... the letter didn't reference that at all. ARRL had plenty of
time to
> Comment on the NPRM, and did.

The ARRL did not have plenty of time to comment -before- the NPRM was
released. Why did the ARRL comment at all? The poll was interpreted as "No
Change."

2798. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 01:45:13 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <JGPo8.1539$in5.76082210@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38772

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020328055251.16830.00000462@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >> I think it would be even more valid if a CW op counted CW QSOs and an
SSB
> >> op counted SSB QSOs in progress.
>
> >> You game?
>
> >Nope. Have a staffer do it.
>
> ??? With one exception, ARRL staff do not really give a rat's behind
about a
> discussion on rrap. Don't tell Larry, though; he believes with all his
heart
> that I am ARRL's rrap representative. :-)
>
> >> I find it hard to understand why someone would choose to have different
> >> views based upon where he is.
>
> >Why not? I've learned from the PCTA that it's OK to be a complete jerk
at
> >anything other than making an RF emmision in the amateur bands, then its
> >back to the "Amateur's Code" where everything is sticky sweet.
>
> Interesting. I wouldn't have thought you to be the sort who lives his life
> based on the actions of others. If I chose to learn from others how to be
a
> jerk, I don't think I would admit it. An interesting choice, indeed.

I'm not. It's just typical liberal excuses.

> I think, however, if you rely on the Amateur code to justify your
decision
> about acting differently on rrap than you do elsewhere, it will be a real
> stretch. What part of the Amateur Code do you feel justifies that?

I'm referring to Dick and Larry. I don't think one's behavor should be
different on here vice on the bands.

Brian

2799. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 01:46:23 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <PHPo8.2678$BT6.231522@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38773

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote

> 0.58% * $12,000,000 = $69,600.00. I could buy a lot of new test equipment
for
> the ARRL Lab with that, or attend a few important industry meetings. And
I
> don't see it as a cost-savings issue at all, Clay. The number of pages in
QST
> are going to be determined by the amount of advertising, just like every
other
> magazine in the world. What would you want to see in QST? Minutes that
you
> have already read on the ARRL Web site, or 3-4 additional feature articles
a
> year instead?

Not all members have access to the web, but all members DO get QST.
ARRL is a radio club, and QST is first and foremost the "Official Journal"
of that club. As such, QST should first and foremost contain "news of
the club". Membership issues (BoD minutes, Section News) should not
be crowded out of the Official Journal to devote more pages to pablum
like "The Doctor Is In" or "Chinese Radio Sports Association Officials
Visit ARRL". (I didn't make that one up!) Put that crap on the web.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

PS: Yes, the Dakota division director knows my views.

2800. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 01:51:11 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <jMPo8.1545$Lr5.76339335@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38776

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CA2A5A7.B157CB21@earthlink.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:

> > The former military and commercial ditty-boppers who were paid to learn
code
> > then come on here and proceed to tell the rest of us why its so great
really
> > frost my ass. Its imperative that the government keep their welfare QSO
> > system going so that we can revere their greatness. Well, I'm not
> > impressed.
> >
> > Brian
>
> So you're just some geek with a cold ass, huh?

??? You doing a finger test?

> I have to confess that I
> learned my morse while in uniform, Brian. Of course it was a Cub Scout
> uniform and the pay was awful.

A Cub Scout is neither a military nor a commercial radio operator, but maybe
you didn't know that.

> I don't give a hoot if you're impressed or not.

Good, cause I didn't hear a "Hoot." And I'm still not impressed.

2801. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 01:51:14 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <mMPo8.2686$BT6.232818@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38774

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

> Incentive licensing set up a structure that allowed the upper class
> to heap abuse upon the lower class.

I'm no fan of incentive licensing, but I spend a lot of time on the
air and have not seen a single instance of "abuse" being heaped
on anyone, by anyone. I have to conclude that you have misplaced
all your clues.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2802. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 01:51:51 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <XMPo8.1546$M05.74749153@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38775

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:lqNo8.2406$BT6.201862@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote
>
> > The former military and commercial ditty-boppers who were paid to learn
> code
> > then come on here and proceed to tell the rest of us why its so great
> really
> > frost my ass.
>
> Hey Brian,
>
> Which participants here on rrap (if any) were paid to learn Morse code?
> I don't know of a single one. (Doncha just hate it when someone spoils
> your rant?)

You'd be wrong, then.

2803. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 01:56:17 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <5RPo8.1548$%p5.76244324@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38777

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a7ub84$8gq$0@208.206.142.114...
>
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> > A license is a license. If there were only one it would be suffiient.
> > You merely want layers of licensing to perpetuate your "pecking" order,
like
> > a pack of wolves.
>
> An Idiot is an Idiot, and that describes you exactly. If there were
> nothing required of you for licensing you would still bitch that it was
> just too much of not necessary.

I'm not the one who bases my self-worth on a code exam. As for the rest of
your pounding on the keyboard, it just doesn't make sense, but the howling
is loud and clear.

2804. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 01:57:21 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <5SPo8.2699$BT6.233936@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38778

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> In the previous post you used "importance", now you are substituting
> "logical weight". They are not the same thing.

Perhaps they are not exactly the "same thing", but Cecil is right in
either case.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2805. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 01:59:19 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <XTPo8.1553$pw5.76603659@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38779

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA36250.F1DEE4E@IEEE.org...
> N2EY wrote:
> > Yet both tests did not have to be passed to get the license. Since
> > 1990 it has been possible to get the 13 and 20 wpm code tests waived.
>
> Seems to me, only a small minority of hams obtained the waiver.

And those that did? You should have heard the wolves growling.

2806. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 02:00:59 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <vVPo8.2704$BT6.234564@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38780

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote

>
> And of course YOU get to decide what's necessary.
>

No, I don't. And neither do you.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2807. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 02:04:57 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <dZPo8.1558$Ky5.76727704@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38781

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a7vdnn$g4b$0@208.207.71.160...

> Ya know, you might have accidently stumbled onto a point. (Hope it
> didn't hurt too much). When the VE system was begun lots of us who had
> concerns were advised to shun it like that plague it was sure to become.
> Instead, lots of us put on a happy face and helped with years of
> service. For nothing but the thanks of the likes of you. Seems like the
> 'advisers' might have been right.

Dick with a happy face? I can't imagine it.

You came into this world crying and you'll go out crying. No sense in
stopping now.

2808. Re: Remotely Controlled HF for New Upgrades?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 02:09:43 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <H1Qo8.1564$xy5.76716310@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38782

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ua6cji4v3nqb5b@corp.supernews.com...
>
> KC8PMX wrote:
>
> >They do this similar activity with drivers licenses and other
> >licensure. Specifically related to me, firefighters are constantly
> >tested and retested on a regular basis, and expected to pursue
> >more training and education as their career progresses.
> >Would you want anything less?? (as a citizen)
>
> This is EXACTLY what "incentive licensing" was supposed
> to produce. But you can see what it DID produce, divisions
> within amateur radio, big time. These divisions are said to
> be about the code but, well, I don't think so, not the deepest
> of them. There's a viciousness about the whole thing that
> is quite startling.

Take a gander at Dicks old posts.

2809. Re: Remotely Controlled HF for New Upgrades?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 02:17:59 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <r9Qo8.1570$5J5.77339686@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38786

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a7veuc$k51$0@208.207.71.160...
>
>
> KC8PMX wrote:
> >
> > If morse code is so all-fired important and that great of value, there
> > should be re-testing at least when the license is due for re-licensure
like
> > it is every ten years.
> >
> > This way we will see how important the code is
>
>
> You don't know? The code isn't important at all.

That's NOT what we've been saying, Dick. Pull that big waxy plug out of
your ears.

Morse/CW is AS important as any other mode. Since NO mode is mandated, why
is there a single mode (cw) EXAM? Shouldn't there be other mode exams? Or
couldn't we fold questions on Morse code in with the questions on RTTY,
Packet, AM, SSTV, FSTV, etc?

Of course not. According to you, Morse is more important than all other
modes. Just say it and be done with it. The truth will set you free.

2810. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 02:44:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328214450.17929.00000116@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 38789

In article <20020328190945.16830.00000559@mb-fx.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>2005 is my guess for the earliest we will see any FCC changes in code testing
>take effect.
>
>Lobster anyone? :-)

You are ON, Ed. I predict the NPRM to remove code testing released in the year 2004. :-)

I'll have my roast beef well done, thank you, hold the soup.

2811. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 02:44:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328214451.17929.00000117@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 38788

In article <3CA38B8B.F6F49D1@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>mike coslo wrote:
>>
>> To be fair Val, there is plenty of blame to go around on both sides of
>> the argument. But the issue is so polarized that the parties are
>> deliberately "misunderstanding" each other, trying to dismiss entire
>> arguments on typos, extrapolating incredible amounts of insinuation from
>> simple statements, and just general cussedness.
>
>Don't forget trolling and leg-pulling. :-)

Heh heh heh...and a very definite lack of sense of humor! :-)

2812. re: ot - plug needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 02:44:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328214453.17929.00000118@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 38794

In article <3CA3A6BC.942AA540@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3CA29F80.B409D647@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <20020326230645.21793.00000156@mb-ch.aol.com>,
>> >yodoc@aol.comnospam
>> >> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>> >>
>> >> >>Roll is a technical moron,
>> >> >
>> >> >Len:
>> >> >
>> >> >NOW there is something that is certainly true, at least in comparison
>> >> >to others in this newsgripe like Ed Hare, Hansl, Jim Miccolis, Cecil,
>> >> >and even your own good self! However, as a strictly AMATEUR radio
>> >> >operator, I can usually hold my own in purely practical matters of a
>> >> >technical nature.
>> >>
>> >> More bullshit, total AMATEUR. All you are is an OPERATOR of
>> >> ready-built equipment, a functional illiterate as far as anything
>> >> that goes on behind the front panel.
>> >
>> >I see our sidewalk superintendent is back on the job in his "happy old
>> >man" persona. Yep, there are so many grumpy old men about and he
>> >doesn't associate with them. He told our newcomer Val (and our newest
>> >ham) that he avoids 'em.
>>
>> Poor baby, you feel some primal urge for retribution? :-)
>
>Len, you are the sourpuss who seems to have some need validate your
>existence by putting mere radio amateurs in "their place". You made
>your statement regarding happy old men. It has now come back to bite
>you in the ass.

Poor baby, still hurt are you? You can't see the fun I'm having
all the time in poking little needles into all your pompous
jingoistic balloons? :-) :-) :-)

>A singular grumpy little old man with no amateur license is in evidence.
>Do you feel picked upon? Do you have any feelings that you have picked
>on others?

Poor baby...definitely still hurt. Tsk, tsk. :-)

No amateur license, still the professional license. :-)

>Yet you didn't bother to answer the question. How would you know just
>how much Larry knows?

it's evident. he just can't talk about technical things in radio
unless he's read it as advertising copy. :-)

all that time when larrah was in school, being summa come
loud, bragging about "job placement offers" and then winds
up a bus driver with the fancy title "paratransit operator!" :-)

>Ahhh, you must have missed the part about this being an amateur radio
>newsgroup. One would expect to find radio amateurs here.

no kidding! :-) it always seems to be the same ones, too. :-)

>We don't see many lady factory workers.

one doesn't find many females in this predominently white
male hobby with wayyyy too many male chauvinists, either.

But these weren't "lady factory workers" on a production line,
either. Spacecraft are built in Clean Rooms. Soldering and
micro-welding require NASA certification. Everyone worked
using 10-power stereo microscopes...and inspection was
done the same way by NASA personnel.

Not really "lady factory workers" but you wouldn't know the
difference.

>Your last sentence was a hoot after I mused on its source.

no, what is a "hoot" is imagining you knowing anything about
spacecraft or clean rooms or precision assembly. State
doesn't get into that much. :-)

>No, and you aren't into amateur radio yet either.

...and with herr heil's and others' attitudes, it isn't looking
like a fun hobby, is it?

don't worry, pudgy long-timer, your privileged extra bands
on hf look secure.

>You post. Therefore we know you exist.

Nietzsche is peachy. :-)

>Your comments to Larry are certainly not debate.

the summa come loud bus driver has never attempted debate
in here. he issues mister-sergeant memos and proclamations. :-)

>Now you've gotten yourself into capitalization so
>we know you are worked into a lather.

poor baby. i will write a la e.e.cummings then so your ancient
eyes aren't all a twitchy. :-)

>I'm not wearing a uniform, Len.

davie sure fooled a lot of others, then. sure as hell looked about
as brown a brown-shirt can be! :-)

>In the past, I've told you the whys.

oh? a "word to the whys" is sufficient? :-)

>You seem to have a problem with tradition, with the ARRL, with radio
>amateurs in general (despite your frequent denials).

i have a large problem with "traditions" then keep regulations
static and unchangeable.

i have a problem with the arrl that seems to do the same thing.

i don't have any problems with amateurs "in general." i have
problems with individuals who insist on foisting off their
personal value-sets on the others "for their own good" or the
generally snotty sonsabeepers who want to denigrate others
for not being "as good as they are." i've got a problem with
some of those amateurs who insist that all must have "fun"
only in the way they have fun

for that reason i have this very large needle that is used to
perforate all those pompous balloons of self-importance.
more fun! the noise must be truly deafening on the other
side of the screen! :-) :-) :-)

>You aren't a ham.

i'm a human being. try it sometime, you might like it! :-)

i'm a radio-electronics hobbyist who is also a professional
in that field. both are interesting to me. it's too bad that
some, like heil, insist on their own personal definitions of
hobby activities and seek some elitist status that all must
approach before being granted an audience.

>Your words aren't likely to carry much weight with hams or with those
>who regulate them.

it's true that i don't carry many weighty hams despite this
easter meal tradition of having one for dinner. :-)

maybe davie thinks i have something nasty in general about
having a ham for easter? :-)

last i looked, the fcc accepts input from all citizens on all civil radio regulation matters, any radio service. the fcc doesn't require its staff or commissioners to have amateur radio licenses in order to set amateur regulations. what the fcc does with that "input" is up to them. if they don't do what i think is nice then there are other avenues of petitioning my government within the constitution of the united states of america. i don't need to "write my district director" of the arrl. :-)

>You're a newsgroup Harold Pransky.

no. just a citizen of the usa with a large needle who likes puncturing over-inflated balloons of the joe mccarthy variety. joe mccarthy...old "tailgunner joe" who tried to keep society free of "undesireable elements." the same type of activity engaged in by the control-freak long-timers forbidding any hobby fun not authorized by them. :-)

>All of your writing is on the outside of the envelope.

i've pushed the envelope before, even made new envelopes. you keep on making sure your envelope is securely glued shut so no undesireables creep in. that seems to make you happy. :-)

len anderson

no capital letters were harmed or lathered in writing most of this message. :-)

2813. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 02:44:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328214454.17929.00000120@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 38790

In article <3CA38351.2390E697@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Yahh, sometimes the only way I know he is still around is Steve's
>postings back to him. But Steve has certain strong feelings on *that*
>matter! 8^)

no kidding! really? :-) :-) :-)

>Still would be nice tho'

i'm sure it would be heart-warming all around for a few to have
this totally a "high-five" slapping area all around. stifle all
dissent, nothing contrary to "official" viewpoints, everyone
marching to the same drumbeat in lock-step. ein volk, ein
welt!

len anderson

no capital letters were harmed or lathered in making this
message reply. :-)

2814. Re: Spark & CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 02:44:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328214454.17929.00000119@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 38791

In article <9f4bfe89.0203281017.47040847@posting.google.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>What happened was quite simple: The superior results obtained from the
>use of
>"CW" transmission caused a voluntary, widespread shift away from spark
>by hams. At about the same time the superior results obtained by hams
>on the "short waves" resulted in hams' migrating to those wavelengths.

heh heh heh...they were forced by the gubmint to operate
on wavelengths below 200 meters. forced. banished from
medium frequencies. tossed kicking and screaming into
never-never land of "short waves." :-) :-)

>"CW" (in this context meaning tube transmission, and encompassing all
>sorts of things like raw AC oscillator transmitters as well as
>stabilized PDC rigs) simply gave more bang for the buck. Hams did not
>have to be forced by law to use it.

now, now, jimmie, radio amateurs and everyone else were
forbidden by law to use "damped waves" (spark). forbidden.
no can use. illegal. etc., etc. :-)

2815. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 02:44:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328214456.17929.00000121@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 38792

In article <20020328184952.09495.00000538@mb-cs.aol.com>,
dillsergeant@usmc.com (tension hutt!) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Question Pools and Such!
>>From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>>Date: 03/28/02 18:23 Eastern Standard Time
>>Message-id: <a808pe$74i$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
>
>>No need to say why not...the burden of proof
>>is on those that want it so.
>
> Those who try to displace the "burden of proof" usually have no argument
>to make. This is another case in point.

run that through the sentence-syntax machine again...it got
all garbled. :-)

>>The results, published in R&O
>>showed NO credible and/or compelling reasons
>>to retain morse testing...other than on a minimus
>>5 wpm basis to satisfy current ITU treaty
>>agreements.
>
> The results, when tallied, all add up to "because I don't want
>to"...nothing else.

poor baby. got you all lathered up, did it?

i know it did because you demanded that unlicensed folks
not be permitted to comment to their government. must have
been very, very serious thing on your side of the screen to
exercise such dictatorial demands and abrogation of the
first amendment rights of citizens!

> Morse Code continues to be a viable, basic, uncomplicated mode of
>communication. It DOES continue to allow communications when most other
>modes went packing.

you tellum, mistah radio expert! :-)

> It does not require a degree in porgramming to use, nor does it require
>hundreds of dollars in ancilliary equipment to make it viable. basic
>communications can be had for a handful of parts.

yah, that's why all the other radio services dropped it or never
considered it in the first place. :-)

> It continues to allow international communications where voice
>communications due to a lack of common language or other dialect-realted
>anomolies make it difficult to communicate.

international morse code is a representation of the alphabet,
numbers, and punctuation of the "western" or alphabetic
languages. the majority of the languages of the world are
syllabic or hieroglyphic-symbolic, not using an alphabet.

in order to use international morse code anywhere by a native
of a non-alphabetic language requires that they also learn a
totally different written language. that seems trivial to those
whose native languages are already western and alphabetic,
but it is not trivial to the majority of the world.

the above is indicative of the many variations in on-off keying
codings in the world.

> That a majority of people want to do away with it has nothing to do with
>it's viability or usefulness. It has EVERYTHING to do with a lack of
>initiative and individual skill.
>
> Unless you can prove otherwise?

easily done. one merely has to open up part 97, title 47 code of
federal regulations and look for "intitiative." or any other
regulatory-required "demonstration of worthiness to be demonstrated
to those already licensed (to old regulations)." isn't there, is it? :-)

len anderson

note: no capital letters were harmed or lathered in the writing
of this message. :-)

2816. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 02:44:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328214456.17929.00000122@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 38793

In article <3CA3AA04.60BF583D@earthlink.net>, commandante clinker<k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:

>You're one happy old man.

yup! lots and lots of balloons floating around that can use a good puncturing! pow! bang! oh, my, the sound must be deafening on the other side of the screen! :-)

2817. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 02:48:34 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <6CQo8.11279$Eb5.1018762@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38795

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA3C60C.D0434370@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Do you really believe that making some radio amateurs feel bad was the
> > purpose behind incentive licensing?
>
> Nope, the intentions were good. The results were predictably bad.
> Incentive licensing set up a structure that allowed the upper class
> to heap abuse upon the lower class. It's not a new phenomenon. It's
> human nature and therefore was entirely predictable. There is
> absolutely no reason for a ham radio licensing hierarchy to exist.
> Let's have one license so that performance alone determines
> hierarchy within ham radio.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>

While I do not disagree with this I do think you might have your causes
and effects mixed up a tad.

If Abuse is one of the 1,483 sub-activities in this hobby, it is going to
exist and an excuse for it is going to be found. And historically it has
been. If there is a way to be a 'cut above' it will be taken by some,
stumbled into by many, and abused by a few.

When we got in the licenses were sequentially issued initially so my K$\square$
lacked the status of a W$\square$ and I heard about it. For a short time after a
Nam-era lapse, I had a WB$\square$ and joined a club. When my $25 reclaiming of
the K$\square$ came thru, I moved to third on the club seniority list and pissed
off a lot of grey heads. I was the same lovable Advanced I was the day
before in spite of getting a How to Cure Your Novice Lisp from ARRL with a
big A on the label. Why do you think I did it and the FCC let me?

When the FCC broke up the great Seniority Game, it was indeed a boon to
ARS. But they knew it was going on: the rules at the time required me to
change to a call sign with the proper district code in it but it also gave
me one of similar format. I suspect you got your 1x3 W6 that way.

Hell, some of the knuckle-draggers claim superiority because they are
younger; there is no end to bases, real and stupid, on which to claim
superiority. But like a lot of things in life, you do it to yourself or
allow it to be done. My N came out after W and K, if this is a bother to
me it is only because I let it but try getting a W or K thru vanity
although N calls exist. Must make a diff to someone.

I happen to agree with you on a single class system although I could argue Jim's idea as well but to expect to cure human nature by declaration of equality is simply ridiculous.

Dick N&#65533;BK

2818. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 03:01:08 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <UNQo8.1622$Ue6.79329496@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38797

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ua6dtuan2c6obd@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> >They act like a pack of wolves and if we don't respect their
> >pecking order, we'll be torn apart.
> >
> >So much for the fraternity.
>
> What in hell are you talking about?

I'm talking about the viciousness that you're talking about.

> Code is HISTORY, or soon
> will be, and the battle has gone the way the anti-coders

Anti-code EXAM.

> have advocated. BUT, was the code REALLY what it was about?

A good part of it. It was an "enabler" in a system designed to segregate.

> I don't think so.

OK, what was it about?

> I think it was (and IS) about the whole incentive
> licensing system,

Yes, the Incentive Licensing System gave the code exam equal weight with the
entirety of everything else in amateur radio combined. If incentive
licensing were about gaining new MODE priveleges, that would be one thing,
but examine this comparison and tell me where it makes sense:

Novice: written and code. Priveleges: HF CW, Data, SSB, at 200 watts.
VHF (220 and 900) all modes, 200 watts.
Technician: written only. Priveleges: VHF+ all modes, 1,500watts!!!
1,500watts is a beginners license? 73 Magazine ran a story about converting
a microwave oven to 750 watt transmitter. Mmmm - fried eyeballs.
Technician Plus: written and code. Priveleges: all of the above.
General: written and code. Priveleges: 160m, HF, VHF+ all modes, 1,500
watts.
Advanced: written and code. Priveleges: 160m, HF, VHF+ all modes, 1,500
watts.
Extra: written and code. Priveleges: 160m, HF, VHF+ all modes, 1,500
watts.

If a Novice is considered to have enough knowledge (written exams) and enough CW ability (Morse exam) to operate on HF, doesn't that make all the other HF licenses redundant? Perhaps 160M operation is so unique that it is properly the domain of only Generals and higher. But I doubt it.

Notice that the last 3 licenses are all bands, all modes, and all 1,500 watts. What does higher code speeds have to do with a sliver on the lower end of each band? Why of course, nothing. There's nothing in the exams, nor in the behavior of RF that the lowest license hasn't addressed or satisfied.

Incentive Licensing is a meaningless and arbitrary construct. The intention may have been good, but in practice it has only created numerous divides within the service.

> and about the fact that the ARRL has set
> up all of these contests and awards and DXCC programs, etc.,
> thus making some hams "better than others."

Other than being denied the slivers of spectrum where the DX might be running Q's, the ARRL awards programs have nothing to do with it.

We've said that the Novice license was a gateway to more learning. Is the Extra license the END of learning? Of course not, so why have ever higher "classes" if the learning shouldn't stop. Jim advocates even more licenses that the previous 6. At one time, the General License conveyed ALL priveleges. And hams didn't have to stop learning once they got all priveleges. So one "all priveleges" license and one "learners permit" license will satisfy all needs in amateur radio. Anything more than that is redundant, superflous, and divisive.

> There's a name for that for I won't write it here.

We've been calling it "bigotry" for years.

Val, I've said all of the above many, many times. I'm glad I've taken this opportunity to state it again.

While I'm at it, one other thing I've said again and again, prior to the latest restructuring: "What I fear most about the impending restructuring is a lack of enforcement. And what I fear the most about maintaining the Status Quo is a lack of enforcement."

The Morse/CW exam has allowed some absolutely crazy people into the service. Enforcement is the answer, not arbitrary exams to keep the hordes of unclean CBers out. They've been with us for many, many years.

What's your new call?

73, Brian/N0iMD

2819. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 03:05:59 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca52e0f_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39022

Uh, sorry nitwit...I have been licensed since 1994, am a Tech+ and always have been. Your ignorance is showing. Are you always that way or do you have to work at it?

Kim W5TIT

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message news:20020329154403.00997.00001236@mb-cu.aol.com...
> >CBer." Hmmmm....OH, you mean the group of people with whom the worst you
> >personify so well. Got it!
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
> No, I mean lossers like you who couldnt obtain a License, until the standards
> were lowered.

2820. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 03:06:00 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <sSQo8.1624$W76.78915887@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38800

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a7vfremlk0@208.207.71.160...

> And Val, your view is right on target, as the longterm evidence
> gleaned by anyone reading this NG will soon show.

Val, you might want to get away from that selective reading you've been
doing since 1998 and reread some of Dixie's stuff.

You will be known by the company you keep.

2821. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 03:07:36 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca52e69_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39026

The semicolon is where he had to think about what he was going to say...ppppfffttttt! :)

Kim W5TIT

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message news:20020329155242.02602.00001206@mb-dh.aol.com...
> >Give my regards to your wife.
> >
> >Brian
> >
> >
>
> Not a problem, your Mother will; be glad to hear from you

2822. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 03:09:28 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca52ed8$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39027

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020329170426.11835.00001365@mb-mq.aol.com...
> >For example, only about 48% of NCI's members are not
> >coded hams ... slightly over 52% of NCI's members ARE
> >coded hams ... including a lot of advanceds and extras.
>
> Prove it, lets see the Membership Rooster, or are we just to take your
word
> for it.

Gads, this guy's hilarious.

Kim W5TIT

2823. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 03:10:39 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <PWQo8.2840$BT6.243639@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38852

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:XMPo8.1546$M05.74749153@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:lqNo8.2406$BT6.201862@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote
> >
> > > The former military and commercial ditty-boppers who were paid to
learn
> > code
> > > then come on here and proceed to tell the rest of us why its so great
> > really
> > > frost my ass.
> >
> > Hey Brian,
> >
> > Which participants here on rrap (if any) were paid to learn Morse code?
> > I don't know of a single one. (Doncha just hate it when someone spoils
> > your rant?)
>
> You'd be wrong, then.
>

Non-responsive answer. I'll give you another chance ---

Which participants here on rrap (if any) were paid to learn Morse code?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2824. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 03:13:36 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca52fd0$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39030

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA51FC7.F8A7DF00@IEEE.org...
> WA8ULX wrote:
> >
> > >You realize that you just violated The Amateur's Creed.
> >
> > Who cares, Ham Radio is joke anymore anyway.
>
> Well, I care about my hobby, Bruce. And I should have said,
> "The Amateur's Code". Do you think The Amateur's Code is
> outdated? Do you think we should now be inconsiderate,
> disloyal, unprogressive, unfriendly, unbalanced, and
> unpatriotic?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>

Dick sets the example and...well, Bruce is jumping into it with both feet.

Kim W5TIT

2825. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 03:15:26 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca5303f_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39032

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020329220054.10667.00001178@mb-fo.aol.com...
> > Do you think The Amateur's Code is
> >outdated?
>
> Of course its a JOKE, just like Ham Radio has become. The best thing the
FCC
> could do is sell the Freqs off to some service that could make good use of
> them.

So, who gets your CB amplifier?

Kim W5TIT

2826. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 03:17:08 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <U0Ro8.1638$uk6.79657091@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38853

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a7vfremlk0@208.207.71.160...

> For myself, I really regret ever making the first post here. but once
> the battle was engaged- and make no mistake it IS a battle- there has
> not been a point at which I felt I could engage on even terms. The
> slander and outright untruths shoveled so liberally by the nocoders has
> been too intense.

Scuse me? If you go back and reread you're old stuff you'll be doubly sorry
you ever posted on here. No, don't bother.

> The argument has nothing to do with the advance of technology

It has to do with the government imposing arbitrary requirements on its
citizens.

or its
> socalled rejection by hams,

? What does that mean?

> as is so often alleged by the code haters.

dick I don't hate code and I don't hate people who use code. What I don't
tolerate well is libs who want to get the government to mandate their cause.

> It has to do with the overall communications potential of the ARS, and
> what will be lost with the dropping oif all code testing. If the promise
> of a full service license is not enough to persuade new hams to learn
> code to the minimal level of today, there is simply no way that most
> will ever be moved to do it without. Sure some will, numbers far too
> small to ever defend the mode from those who would keep painting it into
> such a small corner that eventually even the most avid CW user will quit
> in total disgust.

Dick, dick, dick. If all the wonderful attributes of your favorite mode
aren't enough to entice people to learn it, then guess what? Hey, the FAA
still uses AM for critical aviation communications. Why don't you grab the
AM banner and see if the FCC will mandate a separate pass/fail exam...

2827. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 03:19:42 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <i3Ro8.1644$pw6.80367957@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38855

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:ynMo8.2305$BT6.188720@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote
>
> > There is something about the whole "incentive licensing" procedure,
> > and the creation of an official Ham Hierarchy, that has obviously
brought
> > out the worst in a lot of people.
>
> Understandably and predictably so.
>
> When I got my extra (before dis-incentive licensing) there were
> beginner HF privileges for Novices and full HF privileges for
> Conditional/General/Advance/Extra. Hams got along, and what
> class of license you held was not something anyone cared about
> very much.
>
> The testing criteria for a "full" license should simply determine if the
> operator is qualified to build and maintain a station, and operate
> it in a manner that is safe to themselves and passersby, and does
> not interfere with other users of the spectrum. The notion of an
> "official Ham Hierarchy" has no place in our avocation. Period.

Agree on the heirarch, but why so many classes with "all priveleges?"
Should the FCC be in the "gratuitious certificate" program?

2828. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 03:22:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328222202.19127.00000735@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 38856

>Subject: Re: 15wpm hump
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/28/02 19:26 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020328192614.27329.00000142@mb-bd.aol.com>

>Ah! That's what's so nice about today's academics...liberal
>thought and the free expression of ideas.

"Liberal thought and the free expression of ideas" is part and parcel of
"The American Way". Lies, abuse and subtrefuge are not.

>Not everyone shares your exhalted view, your highness.

Nor yours, judging by the number of "Len's a creep" messages that have
permeated the NG lately.

>Yes, poor Val has been soooo upset. Tsk, tsk.

He's just more civil about absorbing your abuse, Your Lyingness.

>Let's have ONE viewpoint, ONE position on everything.
>Cancel everything else, forbid dissent, quash freedom.

I am sure you see it that way...But that's because you have absolutely no
supporters here due to your established history of lying and abuse.

You find it necessary to call people names and analogize THIER opinions
with neo-Nazism, then wonder why you can't find any support, even from those
you alledge to "support".

>Ein volk, ein welt!

Point made.

Steve

2829. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 03:24:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328222428.19127.00000736@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 38857

>Subject: Re: Question Pools and Such!
>From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>Date: 03/28/02 19:16 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <a80btn$b9q$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>

>Once again...I need prove nothing. Reread (above) the reality of
>regulatory justification...burden of proof.

I think you are the one who is reading-deficient Bill...Sorry.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2830. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 03:25:26 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca53297$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39034

D'ya 'spect anything more from a man who professes to "hate" CBers, yet sounds very much like the worst of the CB crop? (not all CBers are bad) D'ya spect him to display anything different, based on the lack of intellect displayed thusfar in his postings?

I mean, the guy can't even communicate without poor use of English, which really isn't all that bad if he had something important to say. But his sentence structure is horrific and, most of all, he attempts to say nothing important. My guess is he sits in the nude (yyyyyyyyuckkkk) in front of his computer with his 6-pack right close by, and probably picked up his welfare check yesterday.

Kim W5TIT

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message news:egap8.2668$F75.127340992@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020329215633.10667.00001175@mb-fo.aol.com...
> > >Hey Bruce, Val just got his licesne and has been reading this newsgroup
> > >since '98. What would you like to say to him?
> >
> > Nothing, if I wanted to I would
>
> Bruse said, "No, I mean lossers like you who couldnt obtain a License, until
> the standards
> were lowered."
>
> Yet Kim has had her license longer than Val, who says he's still waiting on
> his. But Kim is the "losser."
>
> Your double standard is just as wide as Val's.
>
>
>
>

2831. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 03:26:54 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <2aRo8.1654$kD6.80779572@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38858

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020328005452.17929.00000092@mb-fk.aol.com...
> In article <7Ruo8.312$xU3.13344994@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> Nowhere, repeat NOWHERE in Parts 1, 2, or 97 of Title 47 CFR are
> >> there ANY specifications defining WORD RATE. None.
> >>
> >> VEs could send characters at 20 or 30 "WPM" and say that is "15
> >> WPM" and it could not be proven "illegal" unless the inter-symbol
> >> spacing was not according to the old CCITT spec on telegrams.
> >>
> >> You can trot out the old "PARIS" arguments and say "everybody
> >> accepts that" but that has no real binding in the law. The resident
> >> legal beagle will bark about that, of course, and probably Bill
> >> everyone for it too.
> >
> >I have a colleague who is a foreign national. His immigration attorney
> >billed him for his Christmas Card. And the guy is a Hindu.
>
> Doesn't surprise me... :-)
>
> >>There is just NO definition for "word rate" with
> >> International Morse Code in Part 97.
> >
> >Yep. This is where I exited RRAP about a year ago. Did our comm
attorney
> >friend ever come up with a copy of the CCITT spec?
>
> Nah. I had to get it myself...and send you a copy. He put on
> his best Baa Association accent and said fuggedabotit, the big
> shoots at fox-charlie shouldn't be boddadaboutit. Blah, blah, blah.
>
> Something about a "common knowledge" situation, "everybody
> does it" and so forth. :-)
>
> The funny thing is that in the technical standards part of Part 97
> the terms are defined, pinned down, no wiggle room about
> "doing it like it has always been done," (nudge, wink, wink).
> Morris goad is something else.
>
> The VEs Control with a capital C. :-)

Yep, that's where it was heading when I left. Perhaps Val's neighbor could post it. He's got a lot of good info on the code.

Brian

2832. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 03:27:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328222705.19127.00000738@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 38859

>Subject: Re: What's It All About, Alfie?
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 03/28/02 19:21 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <3CA3B398.887FC3DE@IEEE.org>

>I'm not talking about economic systems, Steve. I'm talking about
>a hobby involving amateur volunteers.

Unfortunately you aren't paying attention to content, Cecil. Sorry.

>There's just no good reason
>for a hobby to have an institutionalized class system.

Then you have failed to read the basis and Purpose of the Amateur Radio
Service as codified in Part 97.

Steve

2833. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 03:28:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328222813.19127.00000739@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 38860

>Subject: Re: Question, was Re: CCR's
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/28/02 19:26 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020328192613.27329.00000140@mb-bd.aol.com>

>Sure you will. You can't help it. Your self-image is at
>stake here!

POT~~KETTLE~~BLACK.

Steve

2834. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 03:34:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328223442.19127.00000741@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 38861

>Subject: Re: 15wpm hump
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/28/02 19:26 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020328192614.27329.00000143@mb-bd.aol.com>

>> I see all those years of night school are starting to bear fruit for
>ya,
>>Lennie.
>
>Anyone can do it if they apply themselves, take the time, and its
>available in a local area. Good for accredited college course
>credit. Good for personal knowledge advancement on new
>technologies, even if not for credit. There's always self-teaching.

Then why haven't you been able to pass a 35 question test and acquire an
Amateur Radio license?

I do seriously believe you are simply incapable and sufficiently ignorant
of the material when youa re not able to call it up on-line.

>Some folks just can't hack it and try to dump their frustrations on
>others.

Such as an ex-electronics technician who can't make it past 10 minutes in
a VE session?

>Doesn't matter to me or electrons or EM fields. All three of
>us have worked together just fine for decades and we continue to
>do so.

Not within the hallowed halls of Part 97, you don't. By the way, you ever
send that GROL off for renewal? (*)

Steve

(*) Before those who know that the GROL is a lifetime license jump on me for
that one, Lennie insists that he allowed his to expire. Mr. "I Am A
Professional Radio Engineer" is oft to make such stupid comments and then try
to find some excuse as to why he did it.

This was but one of many.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2835. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 03:52:12 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <MxRo8.2968$BT6.258501@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38862

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote

> > When I got my extra (before dis-incentive licensing) there were
> > beginner HF privileges for Novices and full HF privileges for
> > Conditional/General/Advance/Extra. Hams got along, and what
> > class of license you held was not something anyone cared about
> > very much.

> Agree on the heirarch, but why so many classes with "all priveleges?"

Conditional and General were essentially the same license, but the
Conditional was issued via mail (similar to today's administration by
VE's).

Advanced was in limbo, similar to what it is today. No new Advanced
licenses were being granted, but holders were allowed to renew.

Amateur Extra had one "benefit", and that was that you needed
that license to establish a station in space, but you gained no
HF privileges over Conditional/General/Advanced.

> Should the FCC be in the "gratuitious certificate" program?

I don't care one way or the other, especially since all the work
is done by volunteers. Some folks like to display such
things, so I suppose it does no harm.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2836. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 03:59:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328225955.19127.00000742@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 38863

>Subject: Re: Question Pools and Such!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/28/02 19:26 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020328192616.27329.00000144@mb-bd.aol.com>

>> And we see where your TRUE values about Amateur Radio are...Others
>submit
>>articles to QST because they want to share something with other Amateurs.
>
>QST hasn't been regarded as a "technical" periodical in years.

What does that have to do with YOUR motivations?

The comment was that "Others submit articles to QST because they want to
share something with other Amateurs."

In as much as your only response is that it's "not" a technical
periodical, and since you obviously have nothing else to contribute, we can
reasonably assume that you have no other experiences or knowledge to share
outside the theoretical.

But we already knew that.

>Every one of us professional freelance writers consider markets
>and author's compensation. Why shouldn't we? The word
>"professional" indicates pecuniary compensation is done.

And once again, you are called to task for your obvious lack of awareness
of your situation and surroundings.

This is "rec.radio.AMATEUR.policy" (emphasis mine), and is about the
AMATEUR Radio Service. NOT "professional" radio.

Attempts to draw parallels between the two outside of the physics of
radio wave generation and propagation is foolish. But then you ARE RRAP's
Chief Clown.

>Not sure what that means.

I am sure you don't.

>QST should be self-sustaining as a periodical, staff and
>all publishing costs borne strictly on advertising revenue.

And as a non-voting membership eligible person, your opinion and a couple
bucks will get you an overpriced cup of coffee at Starbucks.

>The ARRL benefits from certain article contents in that
>their author agreements permit them to publish anything of

>an author's in other periodicals without having to pay a
>single dollar in royalties or compensation.

People who submit items to the ARRL do so in order to further the means of Amateur Radio, not "make a buck".

You frequent laments against the ARRL are very transparent. I am sure that you thought your "writings" warranted top dollar for thier obvious genius, and when ARRL didn't meet YOUR criteria, the rants and accusations ensued.

>Everyone has a choice in life in this country.

Including a choice to NOT succeed, which you seem to have exercised liberally.

Not that we are surprised, Lennie.

SR

2837. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 04:02:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328230248.19127.00000743@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 38864

>Subject: Re: 15wpm hump
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/28/02 21:44 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020328214454.17929.00000120@mb-fk.aol.com>

>i'm sure it would be heart-warming all around for a few to have
>this totally a "high-five" slapping area all around. stifle all
>dissent, nothing contrary to "official" viewpoints, everyone
>marching to the same drumbeat in lock-step. ein volk, ein
>welt!

Nope...just an ability to "discuss" matters without having to be lied to or "dissed" by a creep who has no practical experience in Amateur Radio matters.

That would be you, by the way.....

Steve

2838. Re: Spark & CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 04:05:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328230524.19127.00000744@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 38865

>Subject: Re: Spark & CW
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/28/02 21:44 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020328214454.17929.00000119@mb-fk.aol.com>

>heh heh heh...they were forced by the gubmint to operate
>on wavelengths below 200 meters. forced. banished from
>medium frequencies. tossed kicking and screaming into
>never-never land of "short waves."

Yep..."forced" by the "professional radio engineers" who had adamantly
stated taht those wavelengths were useless.

Oooops...YOU were a "professional" radio "engineer"....! Sorry!

>now, now, jimmie, radio amateurs and everyone else were
>forbidden by law to use "damped waves" (spark). forbidden.
>no can use. illegal. etc., etc.

Yep..."forbidden" by "professional" radio engineers.

Steve

2839. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 04:15:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020328231529.19127.00000745@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 38866

>Subject: Re: Question Pools and Such!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/28/02 21:44 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020328214456.17929.00000121@mb-fk.aol.com>

>> Morse Code continues to be a viable, basic, uncomplicated mode of
>>communication. It DOES continue to allow communications when most other
>>modes went packing.
>
>you tellum, mistah radio expert!

I'd ask you to explain what part of that paragraph was not true, but since you and I already know that it IS true, I'll save you the embarrasment.

>> It does not require a degree in porgramming to use, nor does it require
>>hundreds of dollars in ancilliary equipment to make it viable. basic
>>communications can be had for a handful of parts.
>
>yah, that's why all the other radio services dropped it or never
>considered it in the first place.

Money...they save millions in "human resource" funds by not hiring Morse operators.

My earlier premise that Morse is a dependable mode is not in contention by ANYONE who has employed it. It's simply an "expensive" mode in terms of keeping operators on staff.

>> It continues to allow international communications where voice
>>communications due to a lack of common language or other dialect-realted
>>anomolies make it difficult to communicate.

>international morse code is a representation of the alphabet,
>numbers, and punctuation of the "western" or alphabetic
>languages. the majority of the languages of the world are
>syllabic or hieroglyphic-symbolic, not using an alphabet.

Absoluely not germane to what I said.

And in ANY case, ENGLISH is the international radiocommunication language...So now are you going to rant and rave against IT'S use, too?

>in order to use international morse code anywhere by a native
>of a non-alphabetic language requires that they also learn a
>totally different written language.

More evidence of lack of experience.

>that seems trivial to those
>whose native languages are already western and alphabetic,
>but it is not trivial to the majority of the world.

Better discuss that with the hundreds-of-thousands of kanjii operators in
Japan.

>len anderson

Who?

2840. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 04:22:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a80q67hml0@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 38867

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > You were not using the same equipment for CW and PSK31 so your
> > > > > observation is apples and oranges. In a similar case, 1000w
> > > > > SSB will beat one watt CW. So what?
> > > > >
> > > > I suppose you realize how stupid it sounds to insist that the most
> > > > efficient mode that won't work is better for the intended use than the
> > > > lesser in efficiecy that works just fine.
> > > >
> > > If you think I said that, you are not comprehending. There are many times
> > > when one mode gets through and another mode doesn't. To compare the modes,
> > > bandwidth, throughput, and power need to at least be normalized. We know
> > > that 1000w CW gets through when one watt PSK31 doesn't. So what?
> > >
> > So as an engineer and a ham of 51 years you are still too stupid to
> > understand that a communicator uses what works when he needs it to work.
>

> We are not discussing using what works.

You can't even keep up with the conversation. *I* started this subject
by describing what I encountered. YOU attempted to change to a
"comparison of mode efficiencies", an argument which was rejected but
you continue on track.

This thread is closed by default due to your inappropriate trolling.

2841. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 04:22:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a80q6mhml1@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 38868

CAM wrote:
>
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > But what will come next, since the REAL reasons for the anti-code jealousies
> > remain?
>
> As long as amateur radio is organized onto an "incentive", i.e. caste
> system, the problems will continue. That's why I advocate a single permanent
> class of amateur radio license along with one temporary learner's license.

You continue to be beyond amazing. Claiming genius you exhibit the
worst sort of damfoolery. You are not a fool, yet deliberately misuse
the term "caste". Check your Websters on that one. ANYONE who can (and
is willing to) pass the required tests can qualify for any ham radio
license of any level.

You are just intellectually dishonest, and you damn well know it.

2842. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 04:23:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a80q7bhml2@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 38869

CAM wrote:
>
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > There was, is now but to a far lesser extent, and more than likely always
> > will be a caste system in the ARS as to some extent as there is in every
> > human activity.
>
> The caste system based on competition has its place in a free
> market, profit-driven, economy and may the best competitors win.
> But in an elective hobby, what is the purpose of putting individuals
> into competition, dividing them into classes, and grinding the "lower"
> classes into the dirt? This hobby is NOT about dog eat dog competition,
> at least, it shouldn't be. Every member and potential member of the ARS
> should be welcomed with open arms.

There's only one fly in your ointment, jerk. ANYONE can, if they wish,
get ANY ham radio license. It is entirely up to them. No caste involved
and you know it.
Newcomers will still be newcomers, whatever or wherever. It just shows,
and they can't help it any more than oldtimers can.

2843. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 04:23:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a80q7ohml3@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 38870

CAM wrote:
>
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > Well, I tell you what, I've seen enough this time around to let me know
> > for sure that most of these folks are not on the level, at all, and are on
> > this group only to spew nonsense . . . in very bad faith indeed.
>
> Val, do you believe, as Dick has implied, that Shannon's Theorem
> has a "crack" in it?
>
> > But the real goal, in my view, has not been met,
> > that goal being the destruction of anything in Ham Radio bigger than
> > the lowest of the low no-coders.
>
> A very vocal minority of hams have wanted to bring about the destruction
> of no-coders for many years. Can you blame some of them for being pissed?

That is pure bullshit, and you know it. No one here is likely to be responsible for the licensing of more no-code techs than I, as a VE. I loathe the irresponisble individual -such as you- who aspires to tear down the ARS to a minimal level to which you can then become the "boss" by virtue of your alleged but unproven superior intellect. Yes. Cecil, I consider you a loathsome individual. That's just the way you have led it to become.

2844. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 04:23:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a80q82hml4@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 38871

K0HB wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
>
> > The caste system based on competition has its place in a free
> > market, profit-driven, economy and may the best competitors win.
>
> I don't believe that our current sliced-and-diced license structure
> makes any good regulatory sense, I didn't compete with anyone
> to gain my license.

Sliced-and-diced? How's that again? Tech for beginners, General for
those who are no longer beginners, and Extra for those who are
definitely NOT beginners?
(assuming, of course, none of tbem just sits on their butts bitching
about having to actually take a test to advance). That's a full load of
nonsense!

2845. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 04:23:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a80q87hml5@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 38872

K0HB wrote:
>
> If incentive licensing has been a success, the boundaries
> on the band between license classes ought to be apparent
> to the most casual observer. Unfortunately, they are
> undetectable by the criteria I mention, therefore we must
> conclude that incentive licensing is a failure.

So you insist that what one hears on the bands is the sole criteria of whether or not Incentive Licensing was successful. What a crock. You would insist that the only things one can know, all one's learned capabilities and gained skills are clearly identifiable by his on the air chatter, even though he may be chatting with someone who might have little or no such knowledge and capability? Hans, I'm really surprised at you. I thought you were smarter than that.
What one has in his library that he studies and learns, his workshop ant what he had learned to produce in it, the antennas he builds rather than buy, none of those things, among many more, could ever be detected by your inane methodology.

2846. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 04:23:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a80q8ehml6@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 38873

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > In the channel in use at the time, the CW signal was readable where the
> PSK31 was
> > not. That's the only valid comparison that can be made. Anything else
> falls under the
> > Yogi Berra theorem.
>
> Bunk...the channels weren't identical so the comparison is invalid.
> If anything, you are arguing for more robust coding schemes, better
> FEC and possibly a "slower" PSK rate for certain emergency
> situations.

"Bunbk" all you want, Slick, my receiver had a channel, and it was capable of copying CW when PSK3 would not print. On several stations on the same frequency area. You can twist it any way you wish, the facts do not change. Cecil insists that if I had narrowed the bandpass to 50 hz I would not have been able to copy CW either, but he has certainly not proved that nor need he do so, I assert that it simply does not matter. What worked was the more "inefficient" of the two modes. That fact is what really matters.

2847. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 04:23:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a80q8hhml7@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 38874

```
Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:a7ubap$8gq$1@208.206.142.114...
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > You were not using the same equipment for CW and PSK31 so your
> > > > > observation is apples and oranges. In a similar case, 1000w
> > > > > SSB will beat one watt CW. So what?
> > > >
> > > > I suppose you realize how stupid it sounds to insist that the most
> > > > efficient mode that won't work is better for the intended use than the
> > > > lesser in efficiecy that works just fine.
> > >
> > > If you think I said that, you are not comprehending. There are many
> times
> > > when one mode gets through and another mode doesn't. To compare the
> modes,
> > > bandwidth, throughput, and power need to at least be normalized. We know
> > > that 1000w CW gets through when one watt PSK31 doesn't. So what?
> >
> > So as an engineer and a ham of 51 years you are still too stupid to
> > understand that a communicator uses what works when he needs it
> > to work.
>
> Under the instant condition of getting a message through you
> can use whatever works for you...BUT the outcome and lesson
> learned should be what else can be done in the future to allow
> continued use of the preffered mode. Perhaps increasing power,
> running a slower PSK rate, developing more robust coding schemes,
> etc.
>

So the "preferred" mode is the mode that doesn't work under the instant
circumstances. In your world, maybe.
```

2848. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 04:23:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a80q8khml8@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 38875

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3CA263B8.36AF0C6C@IEEE.org...
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > > In the channel in use at the time, the CW signal was readable
> where the PSK31 was
> > > > > not.
> > > >
> > > > That's false, Dick. The computer was in the PSK31 channel and was NOT
> in
> > > > the CW channel. You know that and I know that you know that.
> > >
> > > That's incorrect and YOU know that. The computer was receiving the same
> > > IF bandwidth the receiver was using to play the CW.
> >
> > The computer was used to process PSK31. The computer was NOT used
> > to process CW. You were used to process CW. You were NOT used to process
> > PSK21. THEREFORE, the same equipment was ***NOT*** used for both. It is
> > similar to comparing 1000w SSB to one watt CW. The comparison conditions
> > must be the same (or compensated for) or you are comparing apples and
> oranges.
> >
> > That you could receive CW while the computer couldn't receive PSK31
> > is virtually irrelevant. I can run around my house and my computer
> > cannot do that. The computer is not equipped for running. I am. Your
> > computer was not equipped for CW. You were. Apples and oranges.
>
> The other unstated variable here is "throughput"...i.e. what was the CW
> character rate vs PSK31. Unless they were the same you are still
> comparing aples and oranges.

You two dipschits still don't understand. *I* was comparing a mode that
did work with one that did not. Nothing more or less.

2849. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 04:23:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a80q8mhml9@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 38876

CAM wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> > In the previous post you used "importance", now you are substituting
> > "logical weight". They are not the same thing.
>
> I was explaining what I meant by "importance". They are the same
> if one is talking logically, which I was. Someday you are going to
> have to familiarize yourself with black and white thinking.
>

That's why you never learned to copy CW that you can't write a
character at a time. One must think differently to do it and you can't.

2850. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 04:23:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a80q8phmla@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 38877

CAM wrote:
> nobody had more frequency privileges than I did
> as a Conditional in 1952.
>

That was an FCC mistake they soon saw reason to recitify.

2851. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 04:23:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a80q8shmlb@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 38878

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Richard McCollum wrote:
> > > There was, is now but to a far lesser extent, and more than likely always
> > > will be a caste system in the ARS as to some extent as there is in every
> > > human activity.
> >
> > The caste system based on competition has its place in a free
> > market, profit-driven, economy and may the best competitors win.
> > But in an elective hobby, what is the purpose of putting individuals
> > into competition, dividing them into classes, and grinding the "lower"
> > classes into the dirt? This hobby is NOT about dog eat dog competition,
> > at least, it shouldn't be. Every member and potential member of the ARS
> > should be welcomed with open arms.
>
> Let me see if I get this: You believe in a free market of modes ("live
> and let live") but not in a free market of licenses (no more "live and
> let live"). You believe that if I pass an Extra exam and you don't,
> that is somehow associated with dogs eating one another. You believe
> that if I pass the Extra and you don't, that you are being ground into
> the dirt?
>
> Gee, all this time and I thought I was only competing with me.
>

You were. Those who have no luck at all in competing with themselves
attempt to destroy those who do.

2852. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 04:24:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a80q91hmlc@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 38879

CAM wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> > An incentive system and a caste system are polar opposites.
>
> The level of achievement in an incentive system creates a
> pecking order which I am calling a type of caste system.
> It is understandable to do that for a profit-making business
> but why do that inside a hobby for amateurs? Why set up a
> system designed to make some members feel bad about their
> hobby?

It's not their hobby they feel bad about, rather they feel bad about themselves for their shortcomings in achievment therein. Ring any bells with you?

2853. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 04:55:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA3F3C2.D54D9766@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38880

K0HB wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
> > Incentive licensing set up a structure that allowed the upper class
> > to heap abuse upon the lower class.
>
> I'm no fan of incentive licensing, but I spend a lot of time on the
> air and have not seen a single instance of "abuse" being heaped
> on anyone, by anyone. I have to conclude that you have misplaced
> all your clues.

Do you ever read any of the postings on this newsgroup?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2854. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 05:02:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA3F576.C1E07587@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38881

Richard McCollum wrote:
> I happen to agree with you on a single class system although I could argue
> Jim's idea as well but to expect to cure human nature by declaration of
> equality is simply ridiculous.

If every ham had the same class, the class warfare could not continue.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2855. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 05:05:51 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <PCSo8.3394$BT6.267755@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38882

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA3F3C2.D54D9766@IEEE.org...
> K0HB wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
> > > Incentive licensing set up a structure that allowed the upper class
> > > to heap abuse upon the lower class.
> >
> > I'm no fan of incentive licensing, but I spend a lot of time on the
> > air and have not seen a single instance of "abuse" being heaped
> > on anyone, by anyone. I have to conclude that you have misplaced
> > all your clues.
>
> Do you ever read any of the postings on this newsgroup?

The answer to your patronizing question is "Obviously, yes."

But I wasn't talking about this newsgroup. I was talking about
Amateur Radio.

With all kind wishes for the early return of your clues,

de Hans, K0HB

2856. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 05:09:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA3F720.9BF3B93F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38883

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >There's just no good reason
> >for a hobby to have an institutionalized class system.
>
> Then you have failed to read the basis and Purpose of the Amateur Radio
> Service as codified in Part 97.

Part 97 doesn't make it a good thing.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2857. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 05:15:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA3F86E.A2AE5AC7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38884

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > We are not discussing using what works.
>
> You can't even keep up with the conversation. *I* started this subject
> by describing what I encountered.

And you erroneously reported that the same equipment was being used for
both modes. I pointed out your error and the subject shifted to how to
compare modes. You apparently still do not know how to do a valid
comparison having tucked tail and conjured up a crack in Shannon's
Theorem.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2858. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 05:16:10 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a81s7k32a3p@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 38944

Well... Just like my generation has a direct influence upon the future of 10,20 and many more years into the future. I can only hope that we will do better than our predecessors when they look back on us. Gee, if I was around in the 50's or 60's I would be responsible for what you claim to be so bad also.....

Ryan

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:a7vdnn$g4b$0@208.207.71.160...
>
>
> KC8PMX wrote:
> >
> > And all of the bitching you and similar types have about ham radio's present
> > situation are guilty of the problems you are bitching about.
> >
> > It is your generations that are responsible for molding the future (the
> > future as it was to you in the past which is the now present time) and
> > making ham radio exactly what you wanted it to be as opposed to what it is
> > now.
> >
> > Ya got what you asked for, either by actions or inactions!!
>
>
>
> Ya know, you might have accidently stumbled onto a point. (Hope it
> didn't hurt too much). When the VE system was begun lots of us who had
> concerns were advised to shun it like that plague it was sure to become.
> Instead, lots of us put on a happy face and helped with years of
> service. For nothing but the thanks of the likes of you. Seems like the
> 'advisers' might have been right.
>
>
> >
> > --
> > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > FF/MFR
> >
> > www.qsl.net/w8kea
> >
> > > That's what happened when some hams tried to equate CW skill with
> > > > technical expertise.

> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > Yep. we insisted that all hams at least know something about Morse
code.
> > > Now they aren't required to really know anything!

2859. Re: Morse Code Remembered

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 05:17:35 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0203282117.6965021b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 38885

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20020328005451.17929.00000090@mb-fk.aol.com>...
> In article <5f4fe4c2.0203271803.7cf2344a@posting.google.com>,
> horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) writes:
>
> >Ancient tribes developed rhythmic codes which were subsequently
> >pounded out upon hollow logs, signaling fellow tribesmen from a
> >distance.
> >
> >-- ENCYCLOPEDIA GALACTICA, 117th Edition, 1026 FE
>
> Hey Stew, welcome back to the funny farm.
>
> What next, exerpts from the Orange Catholic Bible and
> quotes from Irulan? :-)

I'm glad to see all are well.

It appears that another year's worth of debate hasn't produced any
perceptible change in anyone's positions on the issues.

Oh, I saw in the news that the Russians finally discovered the cause
of the Kursk submarine disaster. Apparently, a bored seaman aboard
the ship, also happened to be a radio aficionado, and he had rigged up
a system to practice CW, using parts from one of the torpedos that he
was trained to maintain... well it turns out that he wasn't too hot of
a technician, and he miswired his contraption, which was connected to
the torpedo's arming system controller power supply. Well, you can
all imagine the sequence of events, as the excited young apprentice
began to hunker down for a 15wpm speed run...
beep-beep-beeeeep-beep-BOOOOM!!!

Yes, my friends, MORSE CODE sank the Kursk.

2860. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 05:25:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA3FABD.A695B7A9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38886

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You continue to be beyond amazing. Claiming genius you exhibit the
> worst sort of damfoolery. You are not a fool, yet deliberately misuse
> the term "caste". Check your Websters on that one.

From Webster's: "caste - any rigid system of social distinctions".
Dick, that certainly describes your view of amateur radio. Every
time you use the term "nocoder", you are referring to the lowest
class of social distinctions within ham radio.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2861. Re: Morse Code Remembered

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 05:26:56 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <AWSo8.3430$BT6.276285@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38887

"stewart" <horseshit7@yahoo.com> wrote

>
> Yes, my friends, MORSE CODE sank the Kursk.
>

The Armenian judges gave this a 9.8 on the Olympic Troll-O-Meter, but they were over-ruled by the umpires in instant replay, who award it a 1.4.

The Armenian judges lodged a formal protest!

It was sufficiently trollish, of course, but way too obvious. It was poorly written, poorly executed, and was so incredibly lame as to lack the true drawing power of a really masterful troll. Maybe as high as a 1.6 for the intense stupidity of the premise, but a 9.8? Never! The Armenian judges tear their hair out, throw their balalaikas down in dismay, and perform the traditional Armenian Dismay Chant! They demand a recount!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2862. Re: Remotely Controlled HF for New Upgrades?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 05:27:15 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a81s7m42a3p@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 38946

Well.... yes and no. I could operate mobile, but that can get expensive with the gas prices going up again. (cops harass ya if ya park anywhere around here!) HF morse would definitely be unsafe as trying to write it down and then switching over to trying to send while driving would definitely be a dangerous endeavor. Guess I have my whole life ahead of me and why rush into every last little thing about ham radio all at once (spread it out a bit) is the only positive upbeat way to look at it.....

As far as the "re-test" subject goes, I would be willing to demonstrate my retention, and growth within the hobby even yearly if that was a requirement. Don't care if it was even a 300 question essay format either.

Ryan

Since you won't live where you can get on HF for years, I
> suppose that leaves you out.

2863. Re: Small Scale Example of Ham Testing!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 05:29:08 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <a81s7o52a3p@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 38945

No sweat.... That is one of the things that attracted me to the hobby in the first place. As I grow with the hobby, the amount of possibilities grows exponentially it seems!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR

www.qsl.net/w8kea

REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

>
> > --
> > Ryan, KC8PMX
>
> Ryan, you're right. Thanks for the dose of reality.
>
>

2864. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 05:29:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA3FBD2.B981D916@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38888

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Richard McCollum wrote:
> > > There was, is now but to a far lesser extent, and more than likely always
> > > will be a caste system in the ARS as to some extent as there is in every
> > > human activity.
> >
> > The caste system based on competition has its place in a free
> > market, profit-driven, economy and may the best competitors win.
> > But in an elective hobby, what is the purpose of putting individuals
> > into competition, dividing them into classes, and grinding the "lower"
> > classes into the dirt? This hobby is NOT about dog eat dog competition,
> > at least, it shouldn't be. Every member and potential member of the ARS
> > should be welcomed with open arms.
>
> There's only one fly in your ointment, jerk. ANYONE can, if they wish,
> get ANY ham radio license.

That is certainly a falsehood. My 91 year old aunt cannot obtain a ham license
any more than you can dunk a basketball.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2865. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 05:32:14 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <y%So8.3445$BT6.280005@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38889

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote

>
> Not within the hallowed halls of Part 97, you don't.

"Hallowed halls"????? You need to go rent a life!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2866. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 05:33:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA3FC9A.24DB6EF1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38890

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > A very vocal minority of hams have wanted to bring about the destruction
> > of no-coders for many years. Can you blame some of them for being pissed?
>
> That is pure bullshit, and you know it.

You are denying that there are some hams who wish the nocode tech
license had never existed? If you deny that, you are a bigger liar
than I thought.

We have witnessed the nocode tech license attacked on this very
newsgroup, Dick. How you can deny something so easily proven
is beyond belief.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2867. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 05:38:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA3FDC3.B55CC22A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38891

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > Bunk...the channels weren't identical so the comparison is invalid.
> > If anything, you are arguing for more robust coding schemes, better
> > FEC and possibly a "slower" PSK rate for certain emergency
> > situations.
>
> "Bunbk" all you want, Slick, my receiver had a channel, and it was
> capable of copying CW when PSK3 would not print.

The receiver didn't copy the CW, Dick, you did. The receiver didn't copy PSK31, your computer did. You are NOT your computer. Therefore, the two signals were not coming through the same channels. How you can claim that your ears and your computer sound card are identical channels is beyond belief. Do you really have SMD components instead of ear drums?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2868. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 05:40:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA3FE37.30B3523C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38892

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You two dipschits still don't understand. *I* was comparing a mode that
> did work with one that did not.

But you were ***NOT*** using the same equipment making it an apples
and oranges comparison. Should we agree with you that apples work
and oranges don't work?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2869. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 05:42:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA3FEB9.111AAC39@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38893

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > In the previous post you used "importance", now you are substituting
> > > "logical weight". They are not the same thing.
> >
> > I was explaining what I meant by "importance". They are the same
> > if one is talking logically, which I was. Someday you are going to
> > have to familiarize yourself with black and white thinking.
>
> That's why you never learned to copy CW that you can't write a
> character at a time. One must think differently to do it and you can't.

If I have to think like you, Dick, I would rather drink hemlock.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----
```

2870. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 05:44:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA3FF33.9CCD90CE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38894

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > nobody had more frequency privileges than I did
> > as a Conditional in 1952.
>
> That was an FCC mistake they soon saw reason to recitify.

Soon? How many years later?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2871. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 05:49:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA40050.68EE0895@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38895

Dick Carroll wrote:
> It's not their hobby they feel bad about, rather they feel bad about
> themselves for their shortcomings in achievment therein.

Is that why you are always in such a foul mood?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2872. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 05:50:17 UTC
From: Hans Brakob <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <321edf9ce90e46bedaba44f2065cfa2a.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 38896

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote]

> I did not get a direct reply to my question about
> what will happen on HF after code testing once-
> and-for-all goes away, probably within a couple
> of years.

If you look at HF amateur radio from the view of a non-involved historian, the only regulatory change which had a significant statistical impact on the growth of HF use by hams was the advent of the Novice license a half century ago.

Other than that, changes in licensing requirements related to HF have served only to generate sales of paper and ink to print new license manuals, and to excite the excitable minority. No other impact is evident, and won't be after this next curve in the regulatory road. Hams will still be hams, and the excitable minority will get excited all over again. In about 2011 we'll be awaiting the next "restructuring" plan.

Yawn.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2873. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 05:52:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA40139.553F2D6F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38897

K0HB wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3CA3F3C2.D54D9766@IEEE.org...
> > K0HB wrote:
> > >
> > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
> > > > Incentive licensing set up a structure that allowed the upper class
> > > > to heap abuse upon the lower class.
> > >
> > > I'm no fan of incentive licensing, but I spend a lot of time on the
> > > air and have not seen a single instance of "abuse" being heaped
> > > on anyone, by anyone. I have to conclude that you have misplaced
> > > all your clues.
> >
> > Do you ever read any of the postings on this newsgroup?
>
> The answer to your patronizing question is "Obviously, yes."
>
> But I wasn't talking about this newsgroup. I was talking about
> Amateur Radio.

I've heard the abuse on repeaters and at club meetings. I was
even abused when one guy thought I was a newcomer.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

2874. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 06:02:36 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca5576d$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39066

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:rIap8.2689$Ax5.128692625@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3ca53297$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > D'ya 'spect anything more from a man who professes to "hate" CBers, yet
> > sounds very much like the worst of the CB crop? (not all CBers are bad)
> > D'ya spect him to display anything different, based on the lack of
> intellect
> > displayed thusfar in his postings?
> >
> > I mean, the guy can't even communicate without poor use of English,
which
> > really isn't all that bad if he had something important to say. But his
> > sentence structure is horrific and, most of all, he attempts to say
> nothing
> > important. My guess is he sits in the nude (yyyyyyyyuckkkk) in front of
> his
> > computer with his 6-pack right close by, and probably picked up his
> welfare
> > check yesterday.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> If he got his check yesterday he'd have more than a six pack. And I'd
hate
> to put down CBers so severely as lumping him in with them.
>

Yeah, that's why I'm so careful to clarify that I am speaking of those who
aren't such great people/operators--CB or not. In fact, it's really obvious
that this guy is talking about people who act the exact way he does...he
just doesn't realize it...LOL

>
> But he did come on here and ask, "If a CBer marries a Tech, is she still
his
> sister?" And upon looking up his last name in QRZ there was a female with
a
> Tech license... So I just assumed that he was the CBer.
>

I think the assumption is probably accurate... ;>

Kim W5TIT

2875. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 06:04:11 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca557d1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39067

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020329231701.02283.00001253@mb-fc.aol.com...
> >I have been licensed since 1994, am a Tech+ and always
> >have been.
>
> WOW how Impressive a TECH PLUS
>

Then you're easily impressed. It's really no big deal.

Kim W5TIT

2876. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 06:07:59 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca558af$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39069

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020329232600.02283.00001256@mb-fc.aol.com...
> >Gads, this guy's hilarious.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> And so is your Buddy Carl. But what really is amazing is, why your Buddy
Carl
> didnt say that 98% of members of No Clue International are Coded Hams. He
cant
> prove 52%.

I don't even know Carl and couldn't care much less about what he did or did
not say. Do you hold the ARRL to the same "proof" standards that you do
NCI?

Kim W5TIT

2877. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 06:08:51 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca558e4_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39070

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020329233047.02283.00001258@mb-fc.aol.com...
> >My guess is he sits in the nude (yyyyyyyyuckkkk) in front of his
> >computer with his 6-pack right close by, and probably picked up his
welfare
> >check yesterday.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> No I set on the toilet and use your picture for Toilet Paper

I'm quite surprised you clean at all...there's no one who'd care whether you
did or not.

Kim W5TIT

2878. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 06:51:44 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca562f1$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39076

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020330014603.00568.00001382@mb-md.aol.com...
> >It's really no big deal.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
> We know it isnt, any 3rd grader could memorize enough in 2Hrs to be a
Tech
> plus.

Yeah, pretty much. In fact, I've heard loads of 2nd-4th graders that are already Extras and really enjoy HF!

I guess that would be an insult to you also, though. Your behavior toward other people really is atrocious. You should practice socializing instead of sitting in front of your swamp cooler...

Kim W5TIT

2879. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 06:52:31 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca56320$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39077

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020330014715.00568.00001383@mb-md.aol.com...
> >Do you hold the ARRL to the same "proof" standards that you do
> >NCI?
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Yes I do, and for your info ARRL is also useless.

Nah, that's *your* info, not mine...

Get lost creep...

Kim W5TIT

2880. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 06:53:13 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca5634a$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39078

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020330014315.00568.00001381@mb-md.aol.com...
> >I think the assumption is probably accurate... ;>
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Bite me TIT

I figured you to be built with enough blubber to bite your own tit.

Kim W5TIT

2881. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 07:22:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a814npfku0@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 38898

CAM wrote:
>
> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> >
> > From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> > >There's just no good reason
> > >for a hobby to have an institutionalized class system.
> >
> > Then you have failed to read the basis and Purpose of the Amateur Radio
> > Service as codified in Part 97.
>
> Part 97 doesn't make it a good thing.
>

Well, well. When the FCC does something you like, it's a great thing.
When they do something else, they suck. We see.

2882. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 07:24:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a814qvfku1@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 38899

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > We are not discussing using what works.
> >
> > You can't even keep up with the conversation. *I* started this subject
> > by describing what I encountered.
>
> And you erroneously reported that the same equipment was being used for
> both modes. I pointed out your error and the subject shifted to how to
> compare modes. You apparently still do not know how to do a valid
> comparison having tucked tail and conjured up a crack in Shannon's
> Theorem.
>

Horsecrap, Zero. The gear I was using was the gear I was using. What
worked was CW, what didn't was one of your vaunted high efficiency
modes, and that scalds your ass. Tough stuff.

2883. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 07:25:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a814t9fku2@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 38900

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > You continue to be beyond amazing. Claiming genius you exhibit the
> > worst sort of damfoolery. You are not a fool, yet deliberately misuse
> > the term "caste". Check your Websters on that one.
>
> From Webster's: "caste - any rigid system of social distinctions".
> Dick, that certainly describes your view of amateur radio. Every
> time you use the term "nocoder", you are referring to the lowest
> class of social distinctions within ham radio.

And you're still a lying SOB. A nocoder as defined by ME includes YOU.

2884. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 07:27:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8150kfku3@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 38901

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Richard McCollum wrote:
> > > > There was, is now but to a far lesser extent, and more than likely always
> > > > will be a caste system in the ARS as to some extent as there is in every
> > > > human activity.
> > >
> > > The caste system based on competition has its place in a free
> > > market, profit-driven, economy and may the best competitors win.
> > > But in an elective hobby, what is the purpose of putting individuals
> > > into competition, dividing them into classes, and grinding the "lower"
> > > classes into the dirt? This hobby is NOT about dog eat dog competition,
> > > at least, it shouldn't be. Every member and potential member of the ARS
> > > should be welcomed with open arms.
> >
> > There's only one fly in your ointment, jerk. ANYONE can, if they wish,
> > get ANY ham radio license.
>
> That is certainly a falsehood. My 91 year old aunt cannot obtain a ham license
> any more than you can dunk a basketball.

And then we can just blithely assume that your 91 year old aunt WISHES
to obtain a ham radio license?

2885. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 07:32:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a815aohdp0@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 38902

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > A very vocal minority of hams have wanted to bring about the destruction
> > > of no-coders for many years. Can you blame some of them for being pissed?
> >
> > That is pure bullshit, and you know it.
>
> You are denying that there are some hams who wish the nocode tech
> license had never existed? If you deny that, you are a bigger liar
> than I thought.
>
> We have witnessed the nocode tech license attacked on this very
> newsgroup, Dick. How you can deny something so easily proven
> is beyond belief.
>

You, sir are an umbelievably vicious liar. The people who have been criticised here by any, and mostly all, of us who believe in code testing are those rather like you, I fear, who are too clueless to understand why we believe there is still a role within ham radio for Morse code beyond novelty, and who sat on their fat asses for decades whining about the code test rather than just doing it. They deserve every work of criticism. No code techs who have no interest in anything beyond their VHF activities are NOT included and never were. As a VE I helped many of they get licensed.

2886. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 07:36:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a815hr$ht6$0@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 38903

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > Bunk...the channels weren't identical so the comparison is invalid.
> > > If anything, you are arguing for more robust coding schemes, better
> > > FEC and possibly a "slower" PSK rate for certain emergency
> > > situations.
> >
> > "Bunbk" all you want, Slick, my receiver had a channel, and it was
> > capable of copying CW when PSK3 would not print.
>
> The receiver didn't copy the CW, Dick, you did. The receiver didn't
> copy PSK31, your computer did. You are NOT your computer. Therefore,
> the two signals were not coming through the same channels. How you
> can claim that your ears and your computer sound card are identical
> channels is beyond belief. Do you really have SMD components instead
> of ear drums?
>

Why don't you go back and reread Ed Hare's post on the subject? He says
it is indeed possible to copy CW through a PSK width filter. Maybe he
can jerk you back to reality.

Really, this is so moot a point it's not worth wasting more time on.
It's a real shame you guys are so poor quality hams you have no idea
what I'm talking about.

2887. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 07:37:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a815k8$ht6$1@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 38904

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > You two dipschits still don't understand. *I* was comparing a mode that
> > did work with one that did not.
>
> But you were ***NOT*** using the same equipment making it an apples
> and oranges comparison. Should we agree with you that apples work
> and oranges don't work?
>

Again, THE ONLY COMPARISON I EVER MADE WAS THAT ONE WORKED AND THE
OTHER DID NOT!!!!! IS THERE ANY WAY I CAN PERSUADE YOU TO RENT A CLUE
LONG ENOUGH TO GET THAT STRAIGHT????

2888. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 07:38:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a815lk$ht6$2@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 38905

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > N2EY wrote:
> > > > In the previous post you used "importance", now you are substituting
> > > > "logical weight". They are not the same thing.
> > >
> > > I was explaining what I meant by "importance". They are the same
> > > if one is talking logically, which I was. Someday you are going to
> > > have to familiarize yourself with black and white thinking.
> >
> > That's why you never learned to copy CW that you can't write a
> > character at a time. One must think differently to do it and you can't.
>
> If I have to think like you, Dick, I would rather drink hemlock.
>

Whatever. One chooses his own poisen.

2889. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 07:41:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a815qv$ht6$3@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 38906

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > nobody had more frequency privileges than I did
> > > as a Conditional in 1952.
> >
> > That was an FCC mistake they soon saw reason to recitify.
>
> Soon? How many years later?
>

Do you ever really read anything here? CHeck N2EY's history postings. It was only a few years later that planning for the change began, and it culminated in incentive licensing in '68. But the planning started a full 120 years earlier.
Note that incentive licensing lasted for over 32 years before you dolts finally wore poor old Bill Cross down.

2890. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 07:42:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a815tc$ht6$4@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 38907

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > It's not their hobby they feel bad about, rather they feel bad about
> > themselves for their shortcomings in achievment therein.
>
> Is that why you are always in such a foul mood?

Pretty good joke, OM. I am very sure I'm far more of a success in every
way than you, despite your selfpromoted genius.

2891. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 07:45:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8161v$ht6$5@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 38908

```
CAM wrote:
>
> K0HB wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3CA3F3C2.D54D9766@IEEE.org...
> > > K0HB wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
> > > > > Incentive licensing set up a structure that allowed the upper class
> > > > > to heap abuse upon the lower class.
> > > >
> > > > I'm no fan of incentive licensing, but I spend a lot of time on the
> > > > air and have not seen a single instance of "abuse" being heaped
> > > > on anyone, by anyone. I have to conclude that you have misplaced
> > > > all your clues.
> > >
> > > Do you ever read any of the postings on this newsgroup?
> >
> > The answer to your patronizing question is "Obviously, yes."
> >
> > But I wasn't talking about this newsgroup. I was talking about
> > Amateur Radio.
>
> I've heard the abuse on repeaters and at club meetings. I was
> even abused when one guy thought I was a newcomer.
>

Aw, you poor sensitive victim, you. Shame on them all.
```

2892. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 10:26:47 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <HjXo8.11800$Eb5.1068054@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 38909

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA3F576.C1E07587@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > I happen to agree with you on a single class system although I could
argue
> > Jim's idea as well but to expect to cure human nature by declaration
of
> > equality is simply ridiculous.
>
> If every ham had the same class, the class warfare could not continue.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>

And some other nonsense would. It still is not a regulatory criterion.

2893. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 12:45:38 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a81nppqsd1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38910

```
"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a80q8h$hml$7@208.206.142.79...
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:a7ubap$8gq$1@208.206.142.114...
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > > You were not using the same equipment for CW and PSK31 so
> > > > > > your observation is apples and oranges. In a similar case,
> > > > > > 1000w SSB will beat one watt CW. So what?
> > > > >
> > > > > I suppose you realize how stupid it sounds to insist that the
most
> > > > > efficient mode that won't work is better for the intended use than
> > > > > the lesser in efficiecy that works just fine.
> > > >
> > > > If you think I said that, you are not comprehending. There
> > > > are many when one mode gets through and another mode
> > > > doesn't. To compare the modes, bandwidth,
> > > > throughput, and power need to at least be normalized. We know
> > > > that 1000w CW gets through when one watt PSK31 doesn't.
> > >
> > > So as an engineer and a ham of 51 years you are still too stupid to
> > > understand that a communicator uses what works when he needs it
> > > to work.
> >
> > Under the instant condition of getting a message through you
> > can use whatever works for you...BUT the outcome and lesson
> > learned should be what else can be done in the future to allow
> > continued use of the preffered mode. Perhaps increasing power,
> > running a slower PSK rate, developing more robust coding schemes,
> > etc.
>
> So the "preferred" mode is the mode that doesn't work under the instant
> circumstances. In your world, maybe.

The preffered mode is whatever YOU want it to be.
Today, emergency comms do NOT consider morse
```

to be a preffered mode. You can argue that till hell
freezes over...but it will be your own opinion vs
reality.

For the reading comprehension impaired...what I said
was: "Under the instant condition of getting a message
through you can use whatever works for you..." NOTE -
That does not rule out YOUR use of any mode.

I then said: "BUT the outcome and lesson
learned should be what else can be done in the future to allow
continued use of the preffered mode."
The point again is that morse is NOT that preffered mode
anymore. Disagree all you want, but doing so won't make it
so.

More to the issue, I then said: "Perhaps increasing power, running
a slower PSK rate, developing more robust coding schemes, etc."
That point you can ignore if you want...others can and will
think it through, do the work and help evolve the technology
such that future incidents won't result in a need to change modes.

And, in the end....nothing said here indicates any "crack" or
hole in Shannon's law.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2894. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 12:48:24 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a81nv1$1eg$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38911

```
"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a80q8k$hml$8@208.206.142.79...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3CA263B8.36AF0C6C@IEEE.org...
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > > > In the channel in use at the time, the CW signal was readable
> > where the PSK31 was
> > > > > > not.
> > > > >
> > > > > That's false, Dick. The computer was in the PSK31 channel and was
NOT
> > in
> > > > > the CW channel. You know that and I know that you know that.
> > > >
> > > > That's incorrect and YOU know that. The computer was receiving the
same
> > > > IF bandwidth the receiver was using to play the CW.
> > >
> > > The computer was used to process PSK31. The computer was NOT used
> > > to process CW. You were used to process CW. You were NOT used to
process
> > > PSK21. THEREFORE, the same equipment was ***NOT*** used for both. It
is
> > > similar to comparing 1000w SSB to one watt CW. The comparison
conditions
> > > must be the same (or compensated for) or you are comparing apples and
> > oranges.
> > >
> > > That you could receive CW while the computer couldn't receive PSK31
> > > is virtually irrelevant. I can run around my house and my computer
> > > cannot do that. The computer is not equipped for running. I am. Your
> > > computer was not equipped for CW. You were. Apples and oranges.
> >
> > The other unstated variable here is "throughput"...i.e. what was the CW
> > character rate vs PSK31. Unless they were the same you are still
> > comparing aples and oranges.
```

>
>
>
> You two dipschits still don't understand. *I* was comparing a mode that
> did work with one that did not. Nothing more or less.

Then why did you reference Shannon as somehow not fitting reality?
Get your science straightened out and give ALL the details in making
that comparison.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2895. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 12:54:52 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a81ob2$el0$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38912

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a815hr$ht6$0@208.206.142.79...
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > > Bunk...the channels weren't identical so the comparison is invalid.
> > > > If anything, you are arguing for more robust coding schemes, better
> > > > FEC and possibly a "slower" PSK rate for certain emergency
> > > > situations.
> > >
> > > "Bunbk" all you want, Slick, my receiver had a channel, and it was
> > > capable of copying CW when PSK3 would not print.
> >
> > The receiver didn't copy the CW, Dick, you did. The receiver didn't
> > copy PSK31, your computer did. You are NOT your computer. Therefore,
> > the two signals were not coming through the same channels. How you
> > can claim that your ears and your computer sound card are identical
> > channels is beyond belief. Do you really have SMD components instead
> > of ear drums?
>
> Why don't you go back and reread Ed Hare's post on the subject? He says
> it is indeed possible to copy CW through a PSK width filter. Maybe he
> can jerk you back to reality.
>
> Really, this is so moot a point it's not worth wasting more time on.
> It's a real shame you guys are so poor quality hams you have no idea
> what I'm talking about.

The poor quality is in your lack of being able to articulate
the specific technical differences between the two signals to
understand WHY you could copy the morse by ear while the
PSK signal was not copyable by the computer. You mention
nothing about power, nothing about throughput speed
(i.e. symbol rate/baud rate), etc.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2896. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 13:03:25 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a81p46$k7h$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38913

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3ca3d766_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> news:ua6dk1r67nj667@corp.supernews.com...
> > ...What * I * have been reading, since 1998
> > on this newsgroup, from the anti-code folks, almost to a person, is
> > a viciousness that goes WAY beyond any opposition to CW.
>
> I submit that, if you see that only from the anti-code folks, then you are
> very narrow sighted. It comes from both sides, Val, and has since I have
> been reading this newsgroup.

And I would submit that "viciousness" is a word that goes far beyond
the truth of what anyone has said. I ask Val to offer up any of
my alleged "viciousness" or that of others on the no-code test side.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2897. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 13:09:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a81pb0$ej5$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38914

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a815aohdp0@208.206.142.79...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > A very vocal minority of hams have wanted to bring about the
destruction
> > > > of no-coders for many years. Can you blame some of them for being
pissed?
> > >
> > > That is pure bullshit, and you know it.
> >
> > You are denying that there are some hams who wish the nocode tech
> > license had never existed? If you deny that, you are a bigger liar
> > than I thought.
> >
> > We have witnessed the nocode tech license attacked on this very
> > newsgroup, Dick. How you can deny something so easily proven
> > is beyond belief.
>
> You, sir are an umbelievably vicious liar.

Dick adds a new word from Val... Vicious :-) :-)

> The people who have been
> criticised here by any, and mostly all, of us who believe in code
> testing are those rather like you, I fear, who are too clueless to
> understand why we believe there is still a role within ham radio for
> Morse code beyond novelty, and who sat on their fat asses for decades
> whining about the code test rather than just doing it. They deserve
> every work of criticism. No code techs who have no interest in anything
> beyond their VHF activities are NOT included and never were. As a VE I
> helped many of they get licensed.

Revisionist history! Even assuming that has been Dick's position all
along, it sure isn't THE position of the procode test advocates. Many
still believe the nocode tech should never have happened. What
is the amount in "many", I don't know, but it is surely not just a handful.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2898. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 13:13:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CA46894.315CAC30@earthlink.net>
Source record: 38915

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You believe
> > that if I pass the Extra and you don't, that you are being ground into
> > the dirt?
>
> I wasn't talking about me, Dave. I was talking about the nocode techs
> who are remembered by "The St. Valentine's Day Massacre" of ham radio
> and who must endure an endless stream of insults, e.g. lazy, knuckle-
> dragging, whining, cheating, stupid, ignorant, dumbed-down, ...

Ahhhh! So in what you've incorrectly described as a caste system, we aren't talking about you or me but only of others. Can you produce one individual who has been "ground into the dirt" by a meritocracy-based system of amateur radio licensing? Can you produce proof for your claim that incentive licensing was "designed" to make hams "feel bad"?

Tell us more about the ham radio St. Valentine's Day massacre. How many dead and injured? Where did it take place?

Any response to my comments that you would have a "free market of modes" but not a "free market of licensing"?

I'd say you're shooting blanks on this latest of your numerous tangents.

Dave K8MN

2899. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 13:17:03 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a81ptnlbr1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38916

```
"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:PWQo8.2840$BT6.243639@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> news:XMPo8.1546$M05.74749153@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:lqNo8.2406$BT6.201862@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote
> > >
> > > > The former military and commercial ditty-boppers who were paid to
> learn
> > > > code
> > > > then come on here and proceed to tell the rest of us why its so
great
> > > really
> > > > frost my ass.
> > >
> > > Hey Brian,
> > >
> > > Which participants here on rrap (if any) were paid to learn Morse
code?
> > > I don't know of a single one. (Doncha just hate it when someone
spoils
> > > your rant?)
> >
> > You'd be wrong, then.
> >
>
> Non-responsive answer. I'll give you another chance ---
>
> Which participants here on rrap (if any) were paid to learn Morse code?
> de Hans, K0HB

Without knowing each person's history, that can't be answered.
However, it is clear to me that many hams (a lesser percent as we
go forward in time because commercial code has ended) did
get paid to learn code. The pages of QST, CQ have often
cited a ham's military morse training and, on occasion, a prior
commercial morse training for some hams. Maybe none of us in
RRAP fit that mold, but clearly there are hams that do.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK
```

2900. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 13:21:49 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a81ptj$j2n$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38918

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a80q8phmla@208.206.142.79...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> > nobody had more frequency privileges than I did
> > as a Conditional in 1952.
>
> That was an FCC mistake they soon saw reason to recitify.

Soon? 1967/8...thats 15/16 years by my math. Almost a generation.
And, the conditional preceeded 1952 by a year or too if I recall
the history correctly (Jim N2EY can clarify).

Cheers,
Billl K2UNK

2901. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 13:24:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CA46B14.307F50B9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 38917

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Do you really believe that making some radio amateurs feel bad was the
> > purpose behind incentive licensing?
>
> Nope, the intentions were good. The results were predictably bad.
> Incentive licensing set up a structure that allowed the upper class
> to heap abuse upon the lower class. It's not a new phenomenon. It's
> human nature and therefore was entirely predictable. There is
> absolutely no reason for a ham radio licensing hierarchy to exist.
> Let's have one license so that performance alone determines
> hierarchy within ham radio.

...but you previously stated that the system was "designed" to make other hams "feel bad". Have you had a change of heart or did you just blurt something out which was in error? As to performance: We already have a system in which testing is done in order to demonstrate knowledge of the subject. I don't know of many countries which have only one amateur radio license class. Most have at least two so that there is an entry level license.

So that other hams won't feel bad, do you think it might be a good idea to regulate the maximum amount of money which could be spent on amateur radio by any individual? Should we limit the power for all to 100 watts and limite tower height to 35 feet with a limit on the number of yagi or quad elements? Maybe we could set the tower height limit based on geographic location, i.e. those who dwell on hill tops might only be permitted 30 feet while valley dwellers could put up a tower of 70 feet. I feel your pain and would hate to see anyone's self-esteem lowered.

Dave K8MN

2902. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 13:28:55 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a81qav$9c3$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38920

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a815qv$ht6$3@208.206.142.79...
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > nobody had more frequency privileges than I did
> > > > as a Conditional in 1952.
> > >
> > > That was an FCC mistake they soon saw reason to recitify.
> >
> > Soon? How many years later?
>
> Do you ever really read anything here? CHeck N2EY's history postings. It
> was only a few years later that planning for the change began, and it
> culminated in incentive licensing in '68.

And YOU consider that "soon"? 16 years may be soon when comparing
archeology, but even for government regulation that's a long time. In
1973 the dolts in Washington established a national 55mph speed limit
which wasn't altered until 1987...that sure wasn't soon in any driver's
mind.

> But the planning started a full 120 years earlier.

Huh? Perhaps you meant 12 years...but even that isn't
soon.

> Note that incentive licensing lasted for over 32 years before you dolts
> finally wore poor old Bill Cross down.

I wonder if Bill Cross even has 32 years of service with
the FCC. By the way...who are the "dolts" you
refer to? NCI wasn't even a twinkle in anyone's
eye until about 1998. Who in the ammateur ranks
lead the "wearing down" of the FCC before that?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2903. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 13:31:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CA46CA5.571F9A82@earthlink.net>
Source record: 38919

K0HB wrote:
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote
>
> > 0.58% * $12,000,000 = $69,600.00. I could buy a lot of new test equipment
> for
> > the ARRL Lab with that, or attend a few important industry meetings. And
> I
> > don't see it as a cost-savings issue at all, Clay. The number of pages in
> QST
> > are going to be determined by the amount of advertising, just like every
> other
> > magazine in the world. What would you want to see in QST? Minutes that
> you
> > have already read on the ARRL Web site, or 3-4 additional feature articles
> a
> > year instead?
>
> Not all members have access to the web, but all members DO get QST.
> ARRL is a radio club, and QST is first and foremost the "Official Journal"
> of that club. As such, QST should first and foremost contain "news of
> the club". Membership issues (BoD minutes, Section News) should not
> be crowded out of the Official Journal to devote more pages to pablum
> like "The Doctor Is In" or "Chinese Radio Sports Association Officials
> Visit ARRL". (I didn't make that one up!) Put that crap on the web.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
> PS: Yes, the Dakota division director knows my views.

I share your views, Hans, and have made my views known to the Roanoke
Division Director. His reponse was that the matter had been tabled
until a later date--an answer worthy of Senator Byrd. I once wrote to
the Senator asking support an issue and, though I read his response
several times, gleaned that he was both fer it and a'gin it.

Dave K8MN
I could only

2904. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 13:36:28 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CA46DDB.C7729733@earthlink.net>
Source record: 38921

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3CA2A5A7.B157CB21@earthlink.net...
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > > The former military and commercial ditty-boppers who were paid to learn
> code
> > > then come on here and proceed to tell the rest of us why its so great
> really
> > > frost my ass. Its imperative that the government keep their welfare QSO
> > > system going so that we can revere their greatness. Well, I'm not
> > > impressed.
> > >
> > > Brian
> >
> > So you're just some geek with a cold ass, huh?
>
> ??? You doing a finger test?

Excuse me? You are the one who gave us a temperature readout on your
posterior.

> > I have to confess that I
> > learned my morse while in uniform, Brian. Of course it was a Cub Scout
> > uniform and the pay was awful.
>
> A Cub Scout is neither a military nor a commercial radio operator, but maybe
> you didn't know that.

Yeah, I knew that. What I couldn't understand is who you were talking
about. You know--those guys who were paid to learn morse. Where are
they who cause you numbness of the gluteus maximus?

> > I don't give a hoot if you're impressed or not.
>
> Good, cause I didn't hear a "Hoot." And I'm still not impressed.

And I still don't care.

Dave K8MN

2905. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 13:39:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a81qvijva1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38922

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:PqPo8.1520$fa5.75316685@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3CA36418.3F238275@IEEE.org...
> > Valentine Germann wrote:
> > > But what will come next, since the REAL reasons for the anti-code
> jealousies
> > > remain?
> >
> > As long as amateur radio is organized onto an "incentive", i.e. caste
> > system, the problems will continue. That's why I advocate a single
> permanent
> > class of amateur radio license along with one temporary learner's
license.
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> That's precisely the correct number of license classes: 1 (one).
Anything
> more is superflous.

On this point I disagree. I can see justification for three
licenses:

1 - A beginner, low power, limited frequencies
2 - An intermediate, moderate power (up to maybe 500 watts), all or most
frequencies
3 - Advanced/Expert/Extra, full power, all frequenies.

None would require code. The ONLY real justification for
different privileges that could be tied back to the license
class is power. I can accept a limited frequency gain for
the expert over the intermediate to be an incentive...but
only a small amount. Current additional frequency privileges
between Advanced and Extra would do it. The reality of
frequency privileges is that they just do NOT tie back
to any of the syllabus materials one is expected to learn
for the higher license...and that's true today also.

Around the globe, many countries get by with only two
licenses now.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2906. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 13:45:32 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a81ra7epn1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38923

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a80q87hml5@208.206.142.79...
>
> K0HB wrote:
> > If incentive licensing has been a success, the boundaries
> > on the band between license classes ought to be apparent
> > to the most casual observer. Unfortunately, they are
> > undetectable by the criteria I mention, therefore we must
> > conclude that incentive licensing is a failure.
>
> So you insist that what one hears on the bands is the sole criteria of
> whether or not Incentive Licensing was successful. What a crock. You
> would insist that the only things one can know, all one's learned
> capabilities and gained skills are clearly identifiable by his on the
> air chatter, even though he may be chatting with someone who might have
> little or no such knowledge and capability? Hans, I'm really surprised
> at you. I thought you were smarter than that.

Dick, on what would YOU base the measure of success? What means
would you suggest to gauge if incentive licensing is a success?

> What one has in his library that he studies and learns, his workshop
> ant what he had learned to produce in it, the antennas he builds rather
> than buy, none of those things, among many more, could ever be detected
> by your inane methodology.

If I don't even build an antenna am I not a good ham?
Are techs, novices, generals forclosed from building
their own antennas, their own transmitters? IF the only
way to judge success of incentive licensing is truly
beyond measure...then the question of success/value
of incentive licnesing is truly unanswered...and it
undermines any claims of the value of incentive licensing.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2907. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 13:47:18 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a81rdd$lj6$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 38924

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:MbPo8.2625$BT6.221964@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
> > My timetable sez 2004.
>
> You are not a regulator so your timetable has no influence.
> Good luck anyhow.
> de Hans, K0HB

Have you never developed your own "timetable" that includes
speculation on events beyond your direct influence? :-) :-)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2908. Re: ot - plug needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 14:28:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CA4753D.8BF035EE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 38929

```
Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3CA3A6BC.942AA540@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3CA29F80.B409D647@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> In article <20020326230645.21793.00000156@mb-ch.aol.com>,
> >> >yodoc@aol.comnospam
> >> >> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >>Roll is a technical moron,
> >> >> >
> >> >> >Len:
> >> >> >
> >> >> >NOW there is something that is certainly true, at least in comparison
> >> >> >to others in this newsgripe like Ed Hare, Hansl, Jim Miccolis, Cecil,
> >> >> >and even your own good self! However, as a strictly AMATEUR radio
> >> >> >operator, I can usually hold my own in purely practical matters of a
> >> >> >technical nature.
> >> >>
> >> >> More bullshit, total AMATEUR. All you are is an OPERATOR of
> >> >> ready-built equipment, a functional illiterate as far as anything
> >> >> that goes on behind the front panel.
> >> >
> >> >I see our sidewalk superintendent is back on the job in his "happy old
> >> >man" persona. Yep, there are so many grumpy old men about and he
> >> >doesn't associate with them. He told our newcomer Val (and our newest
> >> >ham) that he avoids 'em.
> >>
> >> Poor baby, you feel some primal urge for retribution? :-)
> >
> >Len, you are the sourpuss who seems to have some need validate your
> >existence by putting mere radio amateurs in "their place". You made
> >your statement regarding happy old men. It has now come back to bite
> >you in the ass.
>
> Poor baby, still hurt are you? You can't see the fun I'm having
```

> all the time in poking little needles into all your pompous
> jingoistic balloons? :-) :-) :-)

You over estimate your importance and abilities.

> >A singular grumpy little old man with no amateur license is in evidence.
> >Do you feel picked upon? Do you have any feelings that you have picked
> >on others?
>
> Poor baby...definitely still hurt. Tsk, tsk. :-)

Are you talking to me or to yourself?

> No amateur license, still the professional license. :-)

You still don't get it. There are those of us who have worked in radio professionally. There are those of us who are radio amateurs. This particular newsgroup is about amateur, not professional radio. You are not a radio amateur.

>
> >Yet you didn't bother to answer the question. How would you know just
> >how much Larry knows?
>
> it's evident. he just can't talk about technical things in radio
> unless he's read it as advertising copy. :-)

Since I don't recall that Larry has ever brought up many technical matters and since your latest outburst is based upon whether he knows who manufactured a particular item, I'll have to discount your knowledge of Larry's technical abilities.

> all that time when larrah was in school, being summa come
> loud, bragging about "job placement offers" and then winds
> up a bus driver with the fancy title "paratransit operator!" :-)

What kind of individual gets his jollies poking fun at someone's job?

> >Ahhh, you must have missed the part about this being an amateur radio
> >newsgroup. One would expect to find radio amateurs here.
>
> no kidding! :-) it always seems to be the same ones, too. :-)

What's that to you?

> >We don't see many lady factory workers.
>
> one doesn't find many females in this predominently white
> male hobby with wayyyy too many male chauvinists, either.

You don't find many women as amateur auto mechanics either. There is nothing which prevents women from participating in amateur radio.

> But these weren't "lady factory workers" on a production line,
> either. Spacecraft are built in Clean Rooms. Soldering and

> micro-welding require NASA certification. Everyone worked
> using 10-power stereo microscopes...and inspection was
> done the same way by NASA personnel.

Not many hams have the need to have their work done in clean rooms or to have their soldering NASA certified.

> Not really "lady factory workers" but you wouldn't know the
> difference.

Sure, I know the difference. The ladies you describe are factory workers with specialized skills, working in a clean room. To my knowledge, they aren't radio amateurs. That's where they are similar to a guy like you.

> >Your last sentence was a hoot after I mused on its source.
>
> no, what is a "hoot" is imagining you knowing anything about
> spacecraft or clean rooms or precision assembly. State
> doesn't get into that much. :-)

No, I don't know much about clean rooms or precision assembly. I don't expect to have a need for those skills either. Most radio amateurs don't.

> >No, and you aren't into amateur radio yet either.
>
> ...and with herr heil's and others' attitudes, it isn't looking
> like a fun hobby, is it?

It's tremendously enjoyable, Len. You know as much about that as I do about clean rooms and precision assembly.

> don't worry, pudgy long-timer, your privileged extra bands
> on hf look secure.

I haven't worried. There aren't any "Extra bands" only Extra Class segments within bands. I don't limit myself to those.

> >You post. Therefore we know you exist.
>
> Nietzsche is peachy. :-)
>
> >Your comments to Larry are certainly not debate.
>
> the summa come loud bus driver has never attempted debate
> in here. he issues mister-sergeant memos and proclamations. :-)

My point was that you were not attempting debate with Larry. You were name-calling.

> >Now you've gotten yourself into capitalization so
> >we know you are worked into a lather.
>

> poor baby. i will write a la e.e.cummings then so your ancient
> eyes aren't all a twitchy. :-)
>
> >I'm not wearing a uniform, Len.
>
> davie sure fooled a lot of others, then. sure as hell looked about
> as brown a brown-shirt can be! :-)

You're simply fascinated with Nazis.

> >In the past, I've told you the whys.
>
> oh? a "word to the whys" is sufficient? :-)
>
> >You seem to have a problem with tradition, with the ARRL, with radio
> >amateurs in general (despite your frequent denials).
>
> i have a large problem with "traditions" then keep regulations
> static and unchangeable.
>
> i have a problem with the arrl that seems to do the same thing.
>
> i don't have any problems with amateurs "in general." i have
> problems with individuals who insist on foisting off their
> personal value-sets on the others "for their own good" or the
> generally snotty sonsabeepers who want to denigrate others
> for not being "as good as they are." i've got a problem with
> some of those amateurs who insist that all must have "fun"
> only in the way they have fun

Your bias against anything which smacks of authority or tradition is
showing. You aren't a participant. You aren't a radio amateur. Soccer
players don't take their cues from those sitting in the stands booing.

> for that reason i have this very large needle that is used to
> perforate all those pompous balloons of self-importance.
> more fun! the noise must be truly deafening on the other
> side of the screen! :-) :-) :-)

In your Walter Mitty world, I'm sure the noise is deafening and I'm sure
that imaginary needle seems quite large. In reality, you have as much
impact as a fart on an ocean liner's deck. It can't be smelled and
can't be heard.

> >You aren't a ham.
>
> i'm a human being. try it sometime, you might like it! :-)

Nice line, Quasimodo.

> i'm a radio-electronics hobbyist who is also a professional
> in that field. both are interesting to me. it's too bad that
> some, like heil, insist on their own personal definitions of

> hobby activities and seek some elitist status that all must
> approach before being granted an audience.

You can continue to do those things. You'll still need to pass an exam
in order to add amateur radio to your list of hobbies. I absolutely
insist upon that being the only way you'll have the opportunity to join
the world of ham radio. So does the FCC.

> >Your words aren't likely to carry much weight with hams or with those
> >who regulate them.
>
> it's true that i don't carry many weighty hams despite this
> easter meal tradition of having one for dinner. :-)
>
> maybe davie thinks i have something nasty in general about
> having a ham for easter? :-)
>
> last i looked, the fcc accepts input from all citizens on all
> civil radio regulation matters, any radio service. the fcc
> doesn't require its staff or commissioners to have amateur
> radio licenses in order to set amateur regulations. what the
> fcc does with that "input" is up to them. if they don't do
> what i think is nice then there are other avenues of petitioning
> my government within the constitution of the united states
> of america. i don't need to "write my district director" of the
> arrl. :-)

You've had your say with the FCC. You've had your say here. The
Commission isn't required to give weight to your views or to adopt them.
No one here is required to give weight or credence to your views. Your
Congressman simply won't understand them.

> >You're a newsgroup Harold Pransky.
>
> no. just a citizen of the usa with a large needle who likes
> puncturing over-inflated balloons of the joe mccarthy variety.
> joe mccarthy...old "tailgunner joe" who tried to keep society
> free of "undesireable elements." the same type of activity
> engaged in by the control-freak long-timers forbidding any
> hobby fun not authorized by them. :-)

Be careful with that imaginary needle, Len.

> >All of your writing is on the outside of the envelope.
>
> i've pushed the envelope before, even made new envelopes.
> you keep on making sure your envelope is securely glued
> shut so no undesireables creep in. that seems to make you
> happy. :-)

The only person keeping you out of amateur radio is--you!

Dave K8MN

2909. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 14:33:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CA47B25.BDAF63E4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 38930

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3CA3AA04.60BF583D@earthlink.net>, commandante
> clinker<k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >You're one happy old man.
>
> yup! lots and lots of balloons floating around that can use
> a good puncturing! pow! bang! oh, my, the sound must
> be deafening on the other side of the screen! :-)

Imaginary needles create only imaginary noise--especially when they come
from a make-believe radio amateur.

Dave K8MN

2910. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 15:14:14 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329101414.11779.00001534@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 38937

>Every
>time you use the term "nocoder", you are referring to the lowest
>class of social distinctions within ham radio.

Well its true, you cant handle that, lets face it, they are only 1 step up from being a CBer, and not a very Big Step at that.

2911. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 15:19:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA48615.6BCCFF58@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38938

Dave Heil wrote:
> ...but you previously stated that the system was "designed" to make
> other hams "feel bad". Have you had a change of heart or did you just
> blurt something out which was in error?

The Tacoma Narrows Bridge was designed to fall down. The designers
were, unfortunately, ignorant of that fact.

> So that other hams won't feel bad, do you think it might be a good idea
> to regulate the maximum amount of money which could be spent on amateur
> radio by any individual?

All we have to do to keep other hams from feeling bad is remove the power
of the assholes who are abusing them.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2912. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 15:27:21 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <tJ%o8.72$ml2.8673@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38939

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

> The pages of QST, CQ have often
> cited a ham's military morse training and, on occasion, a prior
> commercial morse training for some hams. Maybe none of us in
> RRAP fit that mold, but clearly there are hams that do.

Brian specifically has his ass frosted by the ones on RRAP.

"The former military and commercial ditty-boppers who
were paid to learn code then come on here and proceed
to tell the rest of us why its so great..."

I simply asked him who these people were.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2913. test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 15:34:17 UTC
From: F8 MASQUE <cestdupipo@dupipo.fr>
Message-ID: <3ca48976$0$24014$4d4eb98e@read.news.fr.uu.net>
Source record: 38940

[No readable article body recovered]

2914. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 15:41:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA48B25.A0AA7C66@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38941

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >Every
> >time you use the term "nocoder", you are referring to the lowest
> >class of social distinctions within ham radio.
>
> Well its true, you cant handle that, lets face it, they are only 1 step up
> from being a CBer, and not a very Big Step at that.

Thanks for proving my point.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

2915. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 15:53:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329105314.27437.00000461@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 38942

>Subject: Re: 15wpm hump
>From: "K0HB" K0HB@earthlink.net
>Date: 03/29/02 00:32 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <y%So8.3445$BT6.280005@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net

>"Hallowed halls"????? You need to go rent a life!

With all that money, THIS is the best you can do with retirement, Hans?

73

Steve, K4YZ

2916. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 15:58:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA48F18.EEB92B36@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38943

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> > Do you ever really read anything here? CHeck N2EY's history postings. It
> > was only a few years later that planning for the change began, and it
> > culminated in incentive licensing in '68.
>
> And YOU consider that "soon"? 16 years may be soon when comparing
> archeology, but even for government regulation that's a long time.

To put it in perspective, when the incentive licensing change
happened, Dick was three times as old as he was when the
Conditional license was established with all amateur frequency
privileges.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2917. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 16:45:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a825nmkpl0@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 38947

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You believe
> > that if I pass the Extra and you don't, that you are being ground into
> > the dirt?
>
> I wasn't talking about me, Dave. I was talking about the nocode techs
> who are remembered by "The St. Valentine's Day Massacre" of ham radio
> and who must endure an endless stream of insults, e.g. lazy, knuckle-
> dragging, whining, cheating, stupid, ignorant, dumbed-down, ...
>

Gee, you don't seem to understand that wasn't for the nocode techs at
all, rather was for guys like you, Carl and Bill, and The Gadfly, who
would rather sit and whine about the requirements until the sole ham
making rules at the FCC got tired of hearing it and capitulated,
allowing your Extra Lite.

2918. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 16:45:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a825ntkpu0@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 38948

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Do you really believe that making some radio amateurs feel bad was the
> > purpose behind incentive licensing?
>
> Nope, the intentions were good. The results were predictably bad.
> Incentive licensing set up a structure that allowed the upper class
> to heap abuse upon the lower class.

Youi're so full of crap you stink way up here a thousand miles away. No one ever hears of such nonsense until rrap, and even then the vile spewings of the likes of you forced it.

It's not a new phenomenon. It's
> human nature and therefore was entirely predictable.

It's entirely predictable that those who actually achieve are trashed by those who don't? Not that I ever heard or read. And for sure the reverse isn't any more predictable, outside your twisted mind.

There is
> absolutely no reason for a ham radio licensing hierarchy to exist.

So now that you realize the Grate Dumbdown was not at all a success, you now prefer to just do away with the whole licensing scheme. Send out licenses in Cocoa Puff boxes. Right, we got it.

2919. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 16:46:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a825pe$kq0$0@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 38949

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > If Cecil has been making the
> > same mistakes for 51 years, and still can't see it, what do you think it
> > might take to wake him up?
>
> A helpful posting?

You missed it, then.

2920. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 16:54:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8268e$m7f$0@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 38950

Bill Sohl wrote:
>

I then said: "Perhaps increasing power, running
> a slower PSK rate, developing more robust coding schemes, etc."
> That point you can ignore if you want...others can and will
> think it through, do the work and help evolve the technology
> such that future incidents won't result in a need to change modes.
>

If you'd been paying attention you would know that I had no control of what the other stations were doing, no way to alter any condition. Above speil remains useless.

> And, in the end....nothing said here indicates any "crack" or
> hole in Shannon's law.
>
Un-huh. And what I said is "Could there be a crack in Shannon's theory" relating to real world communications? When the most efficient mode fails and the least efficient works, something smells, and all the explaining and rationalization you can do won't alter the facts. We know what Shannon found. We also know that it has meaning in design and explanation of systems, and indeed does explain why I saw what I did that morning. But it didn't do a thing toward solving the instant communications problem, which you and Cecil have a real problem understanding for some reason.

2921. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 16:56:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a826cg$m7f$1@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 38801

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> I feel your pain

Cecil doesn't even feel his own pain.

2922. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 17:00:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a826jq$m7f$2@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 38802

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > ...but you previously stated that the system was "designed" to make
> > other hams "feel bad". Have you had a change of heart or did you just
> > blurt something out which was in error?
>
> The Tacoma Narrows Bridge was designed to fall down. The designers
> were, unfortunately, ignorant of that fact.
>
> > So that other hams won't feel bad, do you think it might be a good idea
> > to regulate the maximum amount of money which could be spent on amateur
> > radio by any individual?
>
> All we have to do to keep other hams from feeling bad is remove the power
> of the assholes who are abusing them.
>

heh heh heh.... Boy I sure feel powerful around here! NOT! Guess it
couldn't be me he's talking about, could it?

His frustration at never being able to pass the 20wpm code test is
becoming more and more clear.

2923. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 17:05:13 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca5f2c5_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39116

Jealousy, Larry? You're hilarious.

Kim W5TIT

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020330015629.00944.00000395@mb-cu.aol.com...
> In article <ua6mtnj2dbifa3@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
> <vgermann@socket.net> writes:
>
> >Now, one might expect this kind of thing among the lower-rent types one
sees
> >a lot on UseNet, but I was startled five years ago to see it on THIS
> >newsgroup, and I am still startled today. For a while I again got caught
up
> >in the free-for-all but now, after only a few weeks "back" on this group,
I
> >am simply appalled at the abounding bad faith, and so will not respond
> >anymore to most of those who spew on this board about the horrors of CW.
I
> >know SO many will be SO disappointed -- NOT!
>
> Val:
>
> I hope you do continue to post here, because you seem to possess the
> ability to analyze the code/no-code debate in a refreshingly honest and
fair
> manner.
>
> >For me personally CW is part and parcel of amateur radio and always will
be.
> >Now, with its commercial demise, it is UNIQUE to amateur radio, which is,
> >for me a PLUS, since I am of a historical bent and, like many people,
prefer
> >to BE "unique", if only in a small way. Add to this the idea that CW can
be
> >done on little power, with very simple equipment, and is understood
around
> >the world, and, well, it's hard for me NOT to advocate some testing here,
> >especially for the very top of the tree, the EXTRA class.
>
> Well, you and I agree on this, however, the debate is based on the
> underlying jealousy of people who have failed, mainly through their
> own indifference, laziness, or fear of failure, to succeed at the code
> testing requirements -- and have thus germinated the debate based
> on their own long-standing hatred of something they don't understand.

>
> >The historical
> >legacy of a group like Ham Radio IS important. It's part of the identity
of
> >the group. In light of this I can only view the viciousness of the
> >anti-code types as a true psychological problem, one existing within
THEIR
> >heads.
>
> No truer words have ever been written.
>
> >Like so many in our society today, jealousy has taken over their
> >minds in this area and they have thus ceased to speak and act in a
rational
> >way, much of the time, where this issue is concerned.
>
> Yes, and that jealousy has ripened into the kind of visceral hatred of
> anyone who is able to achieve something through their initiative and
> perseverence. They are truly lazy, and have a murderous resentment
> of those who are not, and have profited from their ambition.
>
> >I don't see one thing wrong with code testing, and incentive licensing,
for
> >many reasons, NONE of which have anything to do with "hazing" or any crap
> >like that.
>
> No, actually, Incentive Licensing was one of the things the ARRL did right
> in it's heyday. With the loss of the leadership which brought that
concept
> to ham radio, and the replacement with the Politically Correct culture
which
> prefers to pander to the lowest common denominator, we now have a
> permanently Balkanized ARS.
>
> >In my view, "arguments" like the "hazing" dodge have lowered the
> >intellectual content of the whole debate, which I think was the actual
> >intent.
>
> The term "Morse hazing ritual" is one which is carefully calculated to
> generate an extreme emotional response, for the sole purpose of trying
> to break the debate down to the level of downshouting which the NCTA
> seems to prefer, since they cannot defend their position in a more
> reasonable and logical way.
>
> >That is, to me the whole "anti-code" crowd has seized on code as a
> >stalking dog for a bad-faith attack on incentive licensing based on what
> >amounts to jealousy. That's my view. And because so much of the
anti-code
> >effort has been driven by this jealousy and bad faith, the debate has
been

> >marked by the viciousness we see, now on both sides, to a disturbing
extent.
>
> And it has always been that way. I got sucked into this debate over a
> decade ago when I was accused of "ethnic cleansing" by a no-coder on the
> old Fidonet Ham Radio echo.
>
> >So today, in the spring of 2002, the code battle is over, or soon will
be.
> >But what will come next, since the REAL reasons for the anti-code
jealousies
> >remain?
>
> What comes next is the conversion of the Novice/Tech sub-bands to
> more room for HF phone. There is where Ham Radio will really get a
> bloody nose, as the code-tested HF phone jockeys vent their outrage
> on the new codeless phone jockeys. The whole thing is about the
> power of personal projection with instant gratification that only comes
> from talking into a microphone and being heard over vast distances.
> The code testing requirements either delayed people from achieving
> that power, or kept it from them completely -- until now. Once they get
> the power, and find out that it isn't all that great to begin with, the
> real damage will be done. The code/no-code debate is all about HF
> phone. This crap about "technical advancement" and "digital" is
> just a smoke screen.
>
> >I don't think we'll have to wait long to find out.
> >
> >Val
>
> I think you're right.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

2924. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 17:07:02 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca5f32e_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39117

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020330022451.00564.00001486@mb-md.aol.com...
> >Yeah, pretty much. In fact, I've heard loads of 2nd-4th graders that are
> >already Extras and really enjoy HF!
> >
>
> And your still a Tech Plus
>

Do you have a point? Why would I want a higher grade license if I don't
enjoy HF?

> >
> >Your behavior toward
> >other people really is atrocious.
>
> Isnt that a shame, get use to it TIT
>

Oh, I don't have to. I don't have to deal with you at all. You, on the
other hand, have to deal with your failure every day.

Kim W5TIT

2925. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 17:07:57 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Nb1p8.224$ml2.22546@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38803

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote

> Ahhhh! So in what you've incorrectly described as a caste system, we
> aren't talking about you or me but only of others. Can you produce one
> individual who has been "ground into the dirt" by a meritocracy-based
> system of amateur radio licensing? Can you produce proof for your claim
> that incentive licensing was "designed" to make hams "feel bad"?

Cecil will now trot out the mythical "Dr. Williamson".

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2926. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 17:11:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8277g$og9$0@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 38804

CAM wrote:
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> > > Do you ever really read anything here? CHeck N2EY's history postings. It
> > > was only a few years later that planning for the change began, and it
> > > culminated in incentive licensing in '68.

>
> > And YOU consider that "soon"? 16 years may be soon when comparing
> > archeology, but even for government regulation that's a long time.

For a drastic change that affected a large portion of the persons
involved adversly in that they lost a significant portion of their
allowed spectrum, it did indeed require about 10 years of work within
and outside the government to finalize the plan. Compared to the last
restructing which was completed in the term of less than a year, but
withdrew privileges from no one, such a long term of processing is not
at all surprising, despite your uninformed assertion.

>
> To put it in perspective, when the incentive licensing change
> happened, Dick was three times as old as he was when the
> Conditional license was established with all amateur frequency
> privileges.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

Ah, gee Old Boy, and what was it that kept YOU down? The One Hit
$hit?

2927. Re: Wanted to be a NoCode

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 17:14:23 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca5f4e2_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39118

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020330103823.00950.00001400@mb-cu.aol.com...
> I wanted to be a NoCode, but I was never Dumb enough to pass a real Ham
Test,
> so I will never get the chance..

Let me suggest clear grain alcohol...it works much quicker.

Kim W5TIT

2928. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 17:15:59 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca5f543_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39119

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:illp8.2158$ml2.223245@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote
>
> >
> > I would invite them to strap on a stick of dynamite, head in to their
> shack,
> > light a cigarette and pop the top on a can of Shlitz, and do the rest of
> us
> > a favor.
> >
>
> I was starting to think that you might be here to conduct some reasoned
> debate and discussion. From the above trash it's clear I was mistaken.
>
> Twit filter = On
>
> Hans
>

I find it interesting, Hans, that you usually only offer any kind of
friendship or agreement *after* someone says something with which you
disagree, just so that you can then dismiss them.

Kim W5TIT

2929. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 17:17:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a827ja$pb1$0@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 38805

Bill Sohl wrote:

> Then why did you reference Shannon as somehow not fitting reality?

Because it DIDN'T fit reality! All the gushing, glowing spieling by the digifreaks here failed to produce under real world conditions. All the mush about how great Shannon's work will be for ham radio needs to be put into perspective, not bulldozed over everything else as has long been done on rrap.
THAT is what my comment meant, in case you had a brainlock.

> Get your science straightened out

My science is at least a good as yours, and when you add in real world radio experience I'd wager its much better.

and give ALL the details in making
> that comparison.

It was there. You and Cecil just chose to misinterpret it, as always.

2930. Re: Long Reply to WIFRI Long Reply!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 17:17:42 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca5f5a9$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39120

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uabqt894v2d04d@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all!
>
> One again, my original comments will be preceded by arrows,
> Mr. Hare's comments will be "plain type," and my new comments
> will be inside [[double brackets]].
>

Yawn You're finding yourself way, way too important...buhbye...

Kim W5TIT

2931. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 17:20:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a827o1$pb1$1@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 38806

```
Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:a815hr$ht6$0@208.206.142.79...
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > > > Bunk...the channels weren't identical so the comparison is invalid.
> > > > > If anything, you are arguing for more robust coding schemes, better
> > > > > FEC and possibly a "slower" PSK rate for certain emergency
> > > > > situations.
> > > >
> > > > "Bunbk" all you want, Slick, my receiver had a channel, and it was
> > > > capable of copying CW when PSK3 would not print.
> > >
> > > The receiver didn't copy the CW, Dick, you did. The receiver didn't
> > > copy PSK31, your computer did. You are NOT your computer. Therefore,
> > > the two signals were not coming through the same channels. How you
> > > can claim that your ears and your computer sound card are identical
> > > channels is beyond belief. Do you really have SMD components instead
> > > of ear drums?
> >
> > Why don't you go back and reread Ed Hare's post on the subject? He says
> > it is indeed possible to copy CW through a PSK width filter. Maybe he
> > can jerk you back to reality.
> >
> > Really, this is so moot a point it's not worth wasting more time on.
> > It's a real shame you guys are so poor quality hams you have no idea
> > what I'm talking about.
>
> The poor quality is in your lack of being able to articulate
> the specific technical differences between the two signals to
> understand WHY you could copy the morse by ear while the
> PSK signal was not copyable by the computer. You mention
> nothing about power, nothing about throughput speed
> (i.e. symbol rate/baud rate), etc.

Yeh, you and Cecil have long ago learned that much of the time if you
can't dazzle them with pseudo-brilliance you can baffle them with
bullshit. Sorry, it doesn't work all the time.
```

2932. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 17:23:58 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Oq1p8.241$ml2.24921@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38807

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote

>
> With all that money, THIS is the best you can do with retirement,
Hans?
>

I'll let you know when I retire.

"Hallowed halls"???? Bwahahahahahahahahahahahah!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2933. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 17:30:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a828as$r9n$0@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 38808

```
Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:a815ao$hdp$0@208.206.142.79...
> >
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > A very vocal minority of hams have wanted to bring about the
> destruction
> > > > > of no-coders for many years. Can you blame some of them for being
> pissed?
> > > >
> > > > That is pure bullshit, and you know it.
> > >
> > > You are denying that there are some hams who wish the nocode tech
> > > license had never existed? If you deny that, you are a bigger liar
> > > than I thought.
> > >
> > > We have witnessed the nocode tech license attacked on this very
> > > newsgroup, Dick. How you can deny something so easily proven
> > > is beyond belief.
> >
> > You, sir are an umbelievably vicious liar.
>
> Dick adds a new word from Val... Vicious :-) :-)
>
> > The people who have been
> > criticised here by any, and mostly all, of us who believe in code
> > testing are those rather like you, I fear, who are too clueless to
> > understand why we believe there is still a role within ham radio for
> > Morse code beyond novelty, and who sat on their fat asses for decades
> > whining about the code test rather than just doing it. They deserve
> > every work of criticism. No code techs who have no interest in anything
> > beyond their VHF activities are NOT included and never were. As a VE I
> > helped many of they get licensed.
>
> Revisionist history! Even assuming that has been Dick's position all
> along, it sure isn't THE position of the procode test advocates. Many
> still believe the nocode tech should never have happened. What
> is the amount in "many", I don't know, but it is surely not just a handful.
```

Oh, I believe the nocode tech license should have never happened, I have no problem stating that up front. But it did, and I helped it by testing many into the license. I know that it isn't a total bust, but it sure isn't a smashing success either. The dropout rate, not to mention the "toss the HT in the drawer and forget it, this isn't for me" rate, while the license stays active in the database and props up the "numbers". What it did is usher a new era into ham radio that has been less than useful, in fact it has further dropped the standards of the ARS rather drastically toward the noise floor of a zero technical base. Of course, there are a handful of Dr Willimason's who just wanted a private chat channel, despite their lofty education, and I have no problem with all that. The larger problem is that the nocode tech license largely serves as a substitute for CB for a huge percentage of those holding it - those who got in knowing nothing and intend to stay there.
And they are not alone. The question pool tests had the same effect through the Extra class in far too many cases. But hey, this hobby is in GREAT shape.

2934. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 17:34:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329123437.22643.00000117@mb-de.aol.com>
Source record: 38809

In article <3ca3dcc4_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>Good grief, you're so syrupy above I can't help but wonder who you are
>trying to impress...

himself? :-)

2935. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 17:34:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329123439.22643.00000118@mb-de.aol.com>
Source record: 38810

In article <20020328222202.19127.00000735@mb-fm.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Ah! That's what's so nice about today's academics...liberal
>>thought and the free expression of ideas.
>
> "Liberal thought and the free expression of ideas" is part and parcel of
>"The American Way". Lies, abuse and subtrefuge are not.

Ah, so explain a document of 25 January 1999 in the collection of comments on FCC 98-143?

The Dill Sergeant is not being addressed here, only an academic and intellectual.

> Nor yours, judging by the number of "Len's a creep" messages that have
>permeated the NG lately.

Well, ole Stebie, you've generated a few thousand of them...:-)

> He's just more civil about absorbing your abuse, Your Lyingness.

Poor baby. Still going at it with all those pejoratives? :-)

> I am sure you see it that way...But that's because you have absolutely
>no supporters here due to your established history of lying and abuse.

Oh, my, still at it..."lying and abuse!" :-)

I need no "supporters." :-) [no jokes about that...]

Is it necessary to "choose up sides" or what? :-)

I was of the opinion, and still am after 17 or so years of communicating by computer-modem that everyone stood on their own words in this medium. I'll stand on my words. I don't expect to please others, coddle them, or "be part of a group (think)."

Nobody should "look for love" in a newsgroup or public message board. One has to be mature enough to take a position and defend it.

Some others, like yourself, are unable to address a subject but instead try to jump on the person of the message-maker. You spend far too much time on that, threatening, intimidating, a gross amount of spewed libel month after month just to satisfy your deluded little ego.

> You find it necessary to call people names and analogize THIER opinions
>with neo-Nazism, then wonder why you can't find any support, even from those
>you alledge to "support".
>
> >Ein volk, ein welt!
>
> Point made.

Four words in German are "Nazi?!?"

The above translates to "one people, one world." What is "Nazi"
about that? It's a phrase, a political catch-phrase.

Poor Stebie, just can't think out of the box, can't see a comment
on group thinking made to another...he feels duty-bound like a
latter-day Quixote to tilt at everything he perceives is a
windmill. Those are the windmills of his mind.

I'm trying to argue the code test issue. It's still there in
the regulations, in the recommendations of the ITU-R.

There's far too much spent on arguing personalities in here,
almost all of them licensed, long-time radio amateurs. That
keeps on signalling that amateur radio is not a "fun hobby"
except on the long-timers' terms, under their direction.
There is no openness, little freedom, all order and discipline
as if it were a military organization.

2936. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 17:34:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329123440.22643.00000119@mb-de.aol.com>
Source record: 38811

In article <20020328223442.19127.00000741@mb-fm.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>> I see all those years of night school are starting to bear fruit for
>>ya,
>>>Lennie.
>>
>>Anyone can do it if they apply themselves, take the time, and its
>>available in a local area. Good for accredited college course
>>credit. Good for personal knowledge advancement on new
>>technologies, even if not for credit. There's always self-teaching.
>
> Then why haven't you been able to pass a 35 question test and acquire an
>Amateur Radio license?

I'm not after an amateur radio license. I'm in here trying to argue the code test requirement for an amateur radio license.

This is an unmoderated newsgroup. As such it is open to anyone with access from their ISP. There is no requirement to have a valid amateur radio license in order to participate.

You may work towards making this a moderated newsgroup. You may contact Paul Schleck or Jeffrey Herman on achieving the closed society you appear to need. Since they are both licensed radio amateurs you should have some common ground...until they disagree with you. :-)

> I do seriously believe you are simply incapable and sufficiently
>ignorant of the material when youa re not able to call it up on-line.

That is not a coherent or meaningful sentence. What must one "call up on-line?"

Obtaining an amateur radio license is not my object in life now. I made that clear several times in public postings for the last five years. I am arguing against the morse code test requirement for an amateur radio license. It's that simple.

Many cannot understand the above. It is quite possible that they are so wrapped up in their personal lifestyle choice that they cannot argue a subject on the basis of a subject. That is their loss, not mine. Most seem to react on a highly personal basis when confronted with a general subject issue.

>>Some folks just can't hack it and try to dump their frustrations on
>>others.

>
> Such as an ex-electronics technician who can't make it past 10 minutes
>in a VE session?

Not understood statement. I stopped being an employed
electronics technician in 1961 and have held employed positions
as an electronics engineer thereafter until retirement.

It was not my intention to get an amateur radio license at any time
that I've been trying to argue the code test subject.

>(*) Before those who know that the GROL is a lifetime license jump on me for
>that one, Lennie insists that he allowed his to expire. Mr. "I Am A
>Professional Radio Engineer" is oft to make such stupid comments and then try
>to find some excuse as to why he did it.

In an off-hand remark once, I said I'd allowed my General
(commercial) Radiotelephone Operator License to virtually
expire...by leaving it in our safety deposit box. Note the use
of the word "virtual." It is still there. There is so little need
for that license now that it will probably remain there as
nothing more than a personal memento.

That license was originally a First Class Radiotelephone
(commercial) obtained fully in one test session in a Chicago
FCC field office in 1956. That license enabled me to earn
extra income. Some radio amateurs use their amateur
license as qualifications for a major part of their personal
income. Earning income classifies an occupation
as "professional." Nothing dumb or stupid about that.

> This was but one of many.

No. Robeson is fixated on his terrible need to GET someone,
any which way he can, whether by outright lies or
disinformation or just not understanding written words. He is
expected to continue with that tirade until he gets psychological
counseling/therapy. There is little hope for debate on any
subject with him.

2937. Re: ARRL's January Board Meeting -- A Brief Look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 17:53:19 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <ua9ag4171r4u7b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38815

Ahhh...no. Your car, your house, your boat, your ham rig are all assets worth a definable chunk of money. You can't invest your house without turning it into cash, and this raises holy hell with the rain on your ham rig. Assets are one thing. Investments are a totally different breed of cat.

Jim

>
> 1) The ARRL Foundation has assets totaling $2.15 million.
> This is, no doubt, a good thing in that the interest income from this
> amount has to be in $100,000 to $200,000 range

2938. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 17:58:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a829vi$2a4$0@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 38816

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:a80q87hml5@208.206.142.79...
> >
> > K0HB wrote:
> > > If incentive licensing has been a success, the boundaries
> > > on the band between license classes ought to be apparent
> > > to the most casual observer. Unfortunately, they are
> > > undetectable by the criteria I mention, therefore we must
> > > conclude that incentive licensing is a failure.
> >
> > So you insist that what one hears on the bands is the sole criteria of
> > whether or not Incentive Licensing was successful. What a crock. You
> > would insist that the only things one can know, all one's learned
> > capabilities and gained skills are clearly identifiable by his on the
> > air chatter, even though he may be chatting with someone who might have
> > little or no such knowledge and capability? Hans, I'm really surprised
> > at you. I thought you were smarter than that.
>
> Dick, on what would YOU base the measure of success? What means
> would you suggest to gauge if incentive licensing is a success?
>
> > What one has in his library that he studies and learns, his workshop
> > ant what he had learned to produce in it, the antennas he builds rather
> > than buy, none of those things, among many more, could ever be detected
> > by your inane methodology.
>
> If I don't even build an antenna am I not a good ham?
> Are techs, novices, generals forclosed from building
> their own antennas, their own transmitters? IF the only
> way to judge success of incentive licensing is truly
> beyond measure...then the question of success/value
> of incentive licnesing is truly unanswered...and it
> undermines any claims of the value of incentive licensing.

Why, you're right, Bill, When even all the test questions and their
exact answers are handed out in advance, who could ever be expected to
actually learn anything before getting that Extra? It's all moot anyway.

2939. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 18:05:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a82acm$39k$0@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 38817

```
Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:a815qv$ht6$3@208.206.142.79...
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > nobody had more frequency privileges than I did
> > > > > as a Conditional in 1952.
> > > >
> > > > That was an FCC mistake they soon saw reason to recitify.
> > >
> > > Soon? How many years later?
> >
> > Do you ever really read anything here? CHeck N2EY's history postings. It
> > was only a few years later that planning for the change began, and it
> > culminated in incentive licensing in '68.
>
> And YOU consider that "soon"?

Yeah, When, within a half dozen years, FCC began forming action to undo
what they had just done that half dozen years previously, it is more
than clear that they realized what a mistake that earlier action had
been. How can you even think about disagreeing? Incentive licensing, by
contrast, was in force for over 32 years. It would *still* be in force
except for all the juvenile whiners. You don't think Bill Cross is dumb
enough to act against all that 'victim' mass, do you? Hey, he's a career
bureaucrat and that means he works for politicians. That means PC All
The Way, he wouldn't dare cross swords with a (GASP) Victim Group, it'd
mean *he* was the goat, and from that moment on, his government career
is toast. NO WAY!
```

2940. Long Reply to N2EY's Long Reply!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 18:06:51 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <ua9a8cmhq96od0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 38813

Hello, all!

I'm running behind on the replies to what I believe are interesting and significant messages. Below is one of those. My original comments are preceded by arrows while N2EY's comments are not. My most recent comments, to N2EY's comments, are inside [[double brackets]].

>So, would it be correct to say that the creation of the
>current Technician license DID have an effect, and DID
>bring more people into the fold, in a burst that started
>ten or so years ago?

The number of US hams grew all through the 1970s and 1980s, when all US ham licenses required a code test. The growth continued after the Tech lost its code test in 1991. W1RFI posted numbers that show the growth increased after 1991, but has slowed somewhat in recent years. We can play number games all day, but doing so does not put even one more amateur signal on the air.

[[I am truly trying to understand what is going on, and what has gone on, vis-�-vis licensing and the resultant numbers of hams, etc. I think it's important to use numbers to try and understand what is and is not happening in amateur radio, and what polices may or may not be successful. I believe that this understanding depends on accurate numbers and if it's a game, it's a serious one!]]

Surges are to be expected - when the "price" of something drops,
There is usually a surge of "sales".

[[Unless no one is buying, at all, which seems to be happening vis-�-vis the change in the code test. That is, even 5 wpm has had little or no effect on recruitment of totally new people to HF, or so it seems. Thus, apparently, the shift to NO code testing at all?]]

>Then, as the 1990s went on, some of those folks DID qualify
>with code at the first level, and it was these same folks,
>and mostly them alone, who came onto HF in a big way HF
>after April, 2000, restructuring. That is, there was no
>real influx of NEW people onto the HF bands, OR into
>amateur radio, when the code requirement was dropped to
>5 wpm for ALL license classes. Would that be right?

It sure seems that way. The main effect of the restructuring was lots of upgrades, not lots of new hams. IMO the problem is NOT the tests - it's lack of publicity.

[[Here's the crux of the whole thing, for today's policy makers, in my view. That is, they seemed to be overwhelmingly worried about QUANTITY and not QUALITY, and there must be a reason for that. But IS there a huge problem with quantity and is the problem severe enough to justify the angst that has been created by all of these changes? On the one hand, the ability and desire to pass ANY test these days says volumes for a new recruit. On the other hand, the system for giving those tests has radically changed over the last two decades, to make everything more "accessible." It's sometimes hard for me to see the reason for the current shuffling and re-shuffling when there are, what, 650,000 hams? Why the apparent panic? Is it all about HF?]]

>. . . there never has been a legal REQUIREMENT to
>USE CW on the air, am I right?

Not since about 50 years ago. There was once a requirement
that hams certify a certain amount of on-air USE of CW/Morse
(so many hours in a certain number of months preceding the
renewal application) in order to renew their licenses.

[[Now THAT is fascinating. I guess the problem was it led to a lot of cooked books since, er, ah, how could that be enforced?]]

This was changed about 50 years ago to a requirement to operate
using any mode, then dropped entirely.

[[Also fascinating, in that for some time there was in effect a requirement to BE ACTIVE to keep the license! And wasn't renewal a 5-year affair then?]]

For at least 35+ years there has been NO requirement for any ham
to use any mode, or to operate at all. Neither has there ever been
a requirement to USE any of the theory stuff, either. The old
Novice license went through a period (1967-1978?) when it conveyed
only CW/Morse privileges.

[[What an impossibility it would be these days to certify 50,000 or 60,000 people a year for renewal, under a "must operate" rule!]]

>However, was it not a fact that if one took the trouble to learn
>code at 13 wpm, or some higher level, then it occurred to at least
>SOME people that it sure would be silly NOT to use it, since it
>worked so well for some things? Would that be a fair statement?

Sure. Just like if you require all drivers to use a stick shift
For their driving test, some will like it and buy stick shift
cars instead of automatics.

>That is, [the above] is the argument I think I am seeing from
>some code supporters. Does this idea hold any water?

Of course. In fact, that's kind of what happened to me. My first
interest in ham radio came from hearing hams on 75 meter AM.
I wanted to join them, and set out to get a license. Along the way
I discovered that CW was fun once I had decent skills at it. Thus

It became my primary mode. Would I have learned CW/Morse and used
it without the license requirement? I really don't know.

[[Here is another critical issue, what will happen to CW usage once testing disappears? The ARRL position seems similar to the old Bush Administration's "Thousand Points of Light" escape hatch, one stating that volunteerism will make up for a lack of involvement by any "higher authority." But this is, I think, a very cheesy position to take, VERY, and quite reminds me of an old movie in which a loving relative, pushing a wheelchair-bound uncle down a boardwalk, speaks for several minutes in cooing terms . . . then pushes the crippled oldster into the ocean. That is, what is ARRL going to do vis-�-vis CW besides wishing it well . . . all the way to the water? That is, I think CW is part of the historical legacy of amateur radio and is now UNIQUE to amateur radio, and so is worth protecting and encouraging, at the highest level.]]

All I can say is that at least some anti-code-test folks are also
against expanding the 'phone sub-bands because doing so will
effectively reduce the spectrum available for DIGITAL modes.

[[The enemy of my enemy is my friend, to the end of boardwalk! That is,
this "support" for CW operating might keep it Grand-fathered in, at least as
far as the next convenient scenic overlook. And after that . . . splash!?]]

Some folks say there should be no mode restrictions on amateur
HF, and that such restrictions constitute a form of "welfare"
for "narrow" modes, like CW. But without mode restrictions,
what is to prevent hams from using, say, the same FM voice
standards as on VHF/UHF?

[[I think you've hit on the whole idea! Just think of the hardware that
would have to be sold if "talk wars" broke out on HF, as broke out on CB
here in Columbia in the late 1970s! Where would the WORLD hide from the U.S.
generated noise!]]

On amateur VHF/UHF there are almost no mode restrictions.
(Yes, I recall 50.0-50.1 and 144.0-144.1). On 2 meters
this has resulted in most of the band being taken up by
FM voice repeaters, leaving less space for new modes to
operate. Without any mode restrictions on HF, it is
reasonable to assume something similar would take place.

[[And may be the secret agenda of some, eh? That is, who would get to sell
all the equipment? Who would get to "coordinate" the bands?]]

>Is everyone going to just be friends now?

All depends on how people behave. Look at how some people post
here - I see a variety of behaviors, ranging from very friendly
to very unfriendly.

[[Gresham's Law seems to operate with extreme effect on UseNet: The Bad
Drives Out the Good. Open up HF to "let the best mode win" and . . .

chaos?]]

-- As for the future of the band plans and CW:

>That depends entirely on USE of the mode. Many of us who
>actually USE CW/Morse will continue to do so and encourage
>others to do the same.

No doubt, and that's good! Let the best mode win?

I'm 47, so I expect it to be more like 40-50 years at least
[before any serious band plan change.]

[[Maybe. But I think the pressure will start in very soon to do something
about "band welfare." I hope I'm wrong.]]

>That's a fair-sized market, I think! That's half a billion
>dollars! [for Ham Radio equipment, per year.]

Compared to what? How much was the market for, say, FRS/GMRS
Radios last year? Or VCRs?

[[Half a billion dollars is half a billion dollars is half a billion dollars
is half a billion dollars!]]

And I would say that my guess was about as high as it gets.
I don't think most US hams spend as much as $1000 total on
equipment every year.

[[One wonders what the REAL number is, total, and whether that number is
going up or down or maintaining. Here is a real hidden factor in all the
regulatory changes, in my view. That is, the fact that it's simply not
spoken of with reference to rule making . . . speaks volumes, to me.]]

>And looking at QST and its advertising, the ratio between HF
>and VHF related ads is at least FOUR-TO-ONE, in full-page
>ads, and higher than that in smaller ones. That is, if there
>IS any real money in amateur radio, it does seem to be in HF.
>Is that a fair statement?

Nope. Ads simply reflect what the manufacturers are trying to
sell, not what they are actually selling. I can name all sorts
of examples down through the years where highly advertised items
did not sell in large quantities, but rigs that were almost
unadvertised sold like hotcakes.

[[Off the point, I think. For years and years this ratio has been
maintained, guaranteeing (for me) that HF is where the money is, especially
for the few U.S. makers still in the game. I think it is THEY who have the
ear of Foggy Bottom, such as it is, every bit as much as any other ARS
faction. These economic factors cut across all boundaries and borders and
to me explain the fact that the Europeans are bailing on code as well. It's
the dollar value of the market, and it's future, that is in play here, in my
view. NCI simply provided a convenient stalking dog here in the U.S., and

as someone said, if they did not come into existence naturally, well, they were invented, for the very purpose!]]

>That is VERY interesting, [the NON-flood of new HF hams]
>and could well explain the rush to now do away completely
>with code testing, in hopes of finally having the desired
>effect.

Yup. And that effect will probably not happen. Sure, there will be a short-term surge of new licenses, and a surge of upgrades - but only a short-term surge. Just my opinion, but recent history has shown that to be the case.

[[And thus more "panic," or rather, changes. Where will it all stop, with what amounts to a "CB Service"? That is, if the slide continues, the pressure will be on for more "accessibility," won't it? So often in human affairs the actions of the gatekeepers are: See the cliff, run TOWARD it, and FASTER!]]

>And if this does not work, will
>elimination of the written exams follow?

Nope. But they may be reduced still further.

[[Yes, you can see this coming, too. And how far can it go?]]

. . . let me offer you a suggestion and a challenge: Learn the code, sending and receiving, and let us know your progress. Tell us the methods you use and how long it takes you to go from "this is a dit" to, say, 15-20 wpm. If you need any help, just holler. My email address is for-real.

[[I'll let you know! The plan now is to take the elements for General in about three weeks . . . and pass them. Eeek!]]

Do not be misled by the naysayers and negativism sometimes seen here. There are lots of nice folks on the air using CW/Morse. Join us!

[[I intend to! No doubt the great majority of the people on this board, and in amateur radio in general, are pretty much "OK" in person, in most social situations. That seems obvious. But I have real problem with folks who deliberately, and over a long period of time, post troll after troll after troll. I don't think I want to know those people, at all! UseNet gives an isolation and immunity that can reveal, quickly, things about a person you might NEVER find out in even a fairly close friendship situation. I guess we have to, to a certain extent, take the good with the bad. The net can put a pretty serious edge on things, but it can lead to plain speaking that is valuable, too.]]

(I prefer 40 meters, around 7030-7045 kHz).

[[OK!]]

Listen to, say, 40 or 20 meters CW during a contest like
the CW SS, DX test or Field Day. All that activity is
generated by a few thousand stations - probably more like
a few hundred on any given band at any given time. The bands
can be that busy all the time if we USE them.

[[This leads to another serious question: Of the 600,000 plus licensees in
the ARS, how many are ACTIVE on the various sections of the spectrum? I saw
a message on the "DX" board that something on the order of 35,000 operators
were truly active on HF. I wonder if that's close?]]

[[Val]]

2941. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 18:21:16 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <wg2p8.322$ml2.32297@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38818

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

>
> There's far too much spent on arguing personalities in here,
> almost all of them licensed, long-time radio amateurs. That
> keeps on signalling that amateur radio is not a "fun hobby"
> except on the long-timers' terms, under their direction.
> There is no openness, little freedom, all order and discipline
> as if it were a military organization.
>

You forgot about Steve's "hallowed halls of Part 97". It's
his religion, sacred and holy, and he faithfully awaits the
resurrection of Marconi who will lead us all into the
promised land at 20+ WPM.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
Most Reverent Keeper of the Codes of Morse

2942. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 18:24:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA4B178.D1DDEF77@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38819

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Gee, you don't seem to understand that wasn't for the nocode techs at
> all, rather was for guys like you, Carl and Bill, and The Gadfly, who
> would rather sit and whine about the requirements until the sole ham
> making rules at the FCC got tired of hearing it and capitulated,
> allowing your Extra Lite.

What kind of person are you to abuse the handicapped?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2943. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 18:28:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA4B25A.FC7D47A6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38820

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Youi're so full of crap you stink way up here a thousand miles away. No
> one ever hears of such nonsense until rrap, and even then the vile
> spewings of the likes of you forced it.

Just like the rapist said: "She wore a tight skirt and made me rape her!"

> So now that you realize the Grate Dumbdown was not at all a success,
> you now prefer to just do away with the whole licensing scheme. Send out
> licenses in Cocoa Puff boxes. Right, we got it.

Take away the power from the assholes and things would be a lot nicer.
The 5wpm code exam was a very good start in that direction.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2944. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 18:29:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA4B2A4.D6CA8E26@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38821

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > If Cecil has been making the
> > > same mistakes for 51 years, and still can't see it, what do you think it
> > > might take to wake him up?
> > >
> > > A helpful posting?
> >
> > You missed it, then.

I don't think I missed it. It just wasn't helpful.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----
```

2945. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 18:34:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA4B3C8.DCD513F6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38822

Dick Carroll wrote:
> If you'd been paying attention you would know that I had no control of
> what the other stations were doing, no way to alter any condition.

That's an admission that your observation was out of control.
Tell us something that we didn't already know.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2946. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 18:36:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA4B439.26213E33@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38823

Dick Carroll wrote:
> His frustration at never being able to pass the 20wpm code test is
> becoming more and more clear.

Uhhhhhhh Dick, I never tried to pass the 20wpm code test. There
never was any incentive for me to try to pass it.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2947. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 18:39:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA4B4DD.FF4DCDC4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38824

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Ah, gee Old Boy, and what was it that kept YOU down?

Nothing ever kept me down, Dick. Everything I have ever
attempted was easy for me. My motto has always been:
"Work Smarter, Not Harder!"
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2948. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 18:44:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA4B60E.AF0295A8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38826

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > Then why did you reference Shannon as somehow not fitting reality?
>
> Because it DIDN'T fit reality!

Please explain in detail how Shannon's Theorem doesn't fit reality.
You will become world famous if you are correct.

The fact is that Shannon was right on. The reason that you could read
CW and your computer couldn't read PSK31 is that PSK31 operates much
closer to Shannon's limit than does CW. So your observation matches
Shannon's Theorum exactly. Sorry you are so confused about what happened.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2949. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 18:45:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA4B65D.E516E898@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38827

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Yeh, you and Cecil have long ago learned that much of the time if you
> can't dazzle them with pseudo-brilliance you can baffle them with
> bullshit. Sorry, it doesn't work all the time.

Dick, if ignorance is bliss, why are you so unhappy?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2950. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 18:46:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a82cpi$9g8$0@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 38825

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Gee, you don't seem to understand that wasn't for the nocode techs at
> > all, rather was for guys like you, Carl and Bill, and The Gadfly, who
> > would rather sit and whine about the requirements until the sole ham
> > making rules at the FCC got tired of hearing it and capitulated,
> > allowing your Extra Lite.
>
> What kind of person are you to abuse the handicapped?
>

Ah, victims. Sorry OB, I had no idea. I gleaned from all your postings
that you were a person of superlative, even supernatural, talents, and
never a hint of 'handicap'. But I suppose one who has to suffer being
"inferior" just because they lack the ability to discipline themselves
to do something like learning or developing decent skills at some
mundane activity like Morse code could, indeed, consider themselves as
handicapped. I truly am apologetic. I had no idea. And all this does
help to understand your attitudes and to decipher your
postings/rantings.

2951. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 18:47:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA4B6DF.E55C795C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38828

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Oh, I believe the nocode tech license should have never happened, ...

Oh boy, and you accused me of being a liar when I said that very thing.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2952. Re: Long Reply to N2EY's Long Reply!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 19:00:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA4B9D9.E1C4DA5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38829

Valentine Germann wrote:
> Just like if you require all drivers to use a stick shift
> For their driving test, some will like it and buy stick shift
> cars instead of automatics.

I don't know of any states that require a stick shift test. It
is not the purpose of government to preserve historical legacies.

> I think CW is part of the historical legacy
> of amateur radio and is now UNIQUE to amateur radio, and so is worth
> protecting and encouraging, at the highest level.]]

It is not the purpose of government to preserve a historical
legacy. That falls upon the individual members of the ARS like
you and me.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2953. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 19:06:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA4BB42.FA0E0F6D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38830

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Gee, you don't seem to understand that wasn't for the nocode techs at
> > > all, rather was for guys like you, Carl and Bill, and The Gadfly, who
> > > would rather sit and whine about the requirements until the sole ham
> > > making rules at the FCC got tired of hearing it and capitulated,
> > > allowing your Extra Lite.
> > >
> > What kind of person are you to abuse the handicapped?
>
> Ah, victims. Sorry OB, I had no idea. I gleaned from all your postings
> that you were a person of superlative, even supernatural, talents, and
> never a hint of 'handicap'.

I was diagnosed by a clinical psychologist as having an aural handicap.
You know that yet you continue to heap abuse upon me.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2954. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 19:14:59 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <T23p8.2240$J_7.110823782@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38831

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a81qvijva1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> news:PqPo8.1520$fa5.75316685@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3CA36418.3F238275@IEEE.org...
> > > Valentine Germann wrote:
> > > > But what will come next, since the REAL reasons for the anti-code
> > jealousies
> > > > remain?
> > >
> > > As long as amateur radio is organized onto an "incentive", i.e. caste
> > > system, the problems will continue. That's why I advocate a single
> > permanent
> > > class of amateur radio license along with one temporary learner's
> license.
> > > --
> > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
> > That's precisely the correct number of license classes: 1 (one).
> Anything
> > more is superflous.
>
> On this point I disagree. I can see justification for three
> licenses:
>
> 1 - A beginner, low power, limited frequencies
> 2 - An intermediate, moderate power (up to maybe 500 watts), all or most
> frequencies
> 3 - Advanced/Expert/Extra, full power, all frequenies.
>
> None would require code. The ONLY real justification for
> different privileges that could be tied back to the license
> class is power.

And thus, safety.

I can accept a limited frequency gain for
> the expert over the intermediate to be an incentive...but
> only a small amount. Current additional frequency privileges
> between Advanced and Extra would do it.

Bill, I respect your opinion, but disagree. A license with little slivers within the same band is unnecessary. The knowledge to operate safely at one frequency is the very same as the knowledge necessary to operate 1kHz lower, as long as its within the amateur band. A power or mode license would make more sense - to me.

The reality of
> frequency privileges is that they just do NOT tie back
> to any of the syllabus materials one is expected to learn
> for the higher license...and that's true today also.
>
> Around the globe, many countries get by with only two
> licenses now.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

I accept a limited license based on safety, and possibly tenure.

Brian

2955. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 19:25:43 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Xc3p8.2241$m8.111061375@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38832

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a80q6mhml1@208.206.142.79...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Valentine Germann wrote:
> > > But what will come next, since the REAL reasons for the anti-code
jealousies
> > > remain?
> >
> > As long as amateur radio is organized onto an "incentive", i.e. caste
> > system, the problems will continue. That's why I advocate a single
permanent
> > class of amateur radio license along with one temporary learner's
license.
>
> You continue to be beyond amazing. Claiming genius you exhibit the
> worst sort of damfoolery. You are not a fool, yet deliberately misuse
> the term "caste". Check your Websters on that one.

You're such a jerk to everyone. It gets you upset and thats enough reason.
Live with it, just as we've lived with unnecessary and irrelevant
requirements for years.

> ANYONE who can (and
> is willing to) pass the required tests can qualify for any ham radio
> license of any level.

And anyone who wants to can stop reading Cecil's posts and getting all upset
over them. Just as we choose not to jump through unnecesary government
hoops or use our Right to Petition to change bad things.

> You are just intellectually dishonest, and you damn well know it.

If the government told me to line up a bunch of non-combatant Somalis and
shoot them so that they all fall into a bulldozed trench, I would not. And
I've been to Somalia and have no love for the place or people.

Yet, some people will do anything their government demands of them. Is
there anything at all, anything, that the American government has asked you
to do and you told them to go soak their heads?

Brian

2956. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 19:28:39 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Hf3p8.2244$Ca.111171991@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38833

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020329101414.11779.00001534@mb-mq.aol.com...
> >Every
> >time you use the term "nocoder", you are referring to the lowest
> >class of social distinctions within ham radio.
>
> Well its true, you cant handle that, lets face it, they are only 1 step
up
> from being a CBer, and not a very Big Step at that.

Bruce, recall when -you- asked if a No-Coder married a CBer if she would
still be his sister?

Give my regards to your wife.

Brian

2957. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 19:35:32 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <8m3p8.2249$Nd.111313238@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38834

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:MxRo8.2968$BT6.258501@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote
>
> > > When I got my extra (before dis-incentive licensing) there were
> > > beginner HF privileges for Novices and full HF privileges for
> > > Conditional/General/Advance/Extra. Hams got along, and what
> > > class of license you held was not something anyone cared about
> > > very much.
> >
> > Agree on the heirarch, but why so many classes with "all priveleges?"
>
> Conditional and General were essentially the same license, but the
> Conditional was issued via mail (similar to today's administration by
> VE's).
>
> Advanced was in limbo, similar to what it is today. No new Advanced
> licenses were being granted, but holders were allowed to renew.
>
> Amateur Extra had one "benefit", and that was that you needed
> that license to establish a station in space, but you gained no
> HF privileges over Conditional/General/Advanced.
>
> > Should the FCC be in the "gratuitious certificate" program?
>
> I don't care one way or the other, especially since all the work
> is done by volunteers. Some folks like to display such
> things, so I suppose it does no harm.

OK, here's a practical test that can be used to divide the service.

Two kinds of licenses.

a. Radios with antennas attached to the shell of the radio (no transmission
line). Ex., HTX202, FT817, etc.
b. Radios that use transmission lines.

The exam: Climb a 200' tower, drag a tribander up, and mount it on the
mast, and tune it on 20/15/10 with SWR no greater than 1.5:1 on any band.

The above is as bad as anythign we currently have.

2958. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 19:43:59 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <3u3p8.2268$Tc.111272282@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38835

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CA46DDB.C7729733@earthlink.net...
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3CA2A5A7.B157CB21@earthlink.net...
> > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >
> > > > The former military and commercial ditty-boppers who were paid to
learn
> > code
> > > > then come on here and proceed to tell the rest of us why its so
great
> > really
> > > > frost my ass. Its imperative that the government keep their welfare
QSO
> > > > system going so that we can revere their greatness. Well, I'm not
> > > > impressed.
> > > >
> > > > Brian
> > >
> > > So you're just some geek with a cold ass, huh?
> >
> > ??? You doing a finger test?
>
> Excuse me? You are the one who gave us a temperature readout on your
> posterior.

Stay away from my ass, Dave. I saw Deliverance, and I know where it was
filmed.

> > > I have to confess that I
> > > learned my morse while in uniform, Brian. Of course it was a Cub
Scout
> > > uniform and the pay was awful.
> >
> > A Cub Scout is neither a military nor a commercial radio operator, but
maybe
> > you didn't know that.
>
> Yeah, I knew that. What I couldn't understand is who you were talking
> about. You know--those guys who were paid to learn morse. Where are
> they who cause you numbness of the gluteus maximus?

They're here. You figure it out. Might be some Cub Scouts here also.
We'll let you figure that one out, too.

> > > I don't give a hoot if you're impressed or not.
> >
> > Good, cause I didn't hear a "Hoot." And I'm still not impressed.
>
> And I still don't care.

But you still reply. Stop caring.

2959. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 19:45:10 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <av3p8.2273$yi.111465815@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38836

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:PWQo8.2840$BT6.243639@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> news:XMPo8.1546$M05.74749153@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:lqNo8.2406$BT6.201862@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote
> > >
> > > > The former military and commercial ditty-boppers who were paid to
> learn
> > > > code
> > > > then come on here and proceed to tell the rest of us why its so
great
> > > > really
> > > > frost my ass.
> > >
> > > Hey Brian,
> > >
> > > Which participants here on rrap (if any) were paid to learn Morse
code?
> > > I don't know of a single one. (Doncha just hate it when someone
spoils
> > > your rant?)
> >
> > You'd be wrong, then.
> >
>
> Non-responsive answer.

That's right. They've identified themselves. All you need is a memory.

2960. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 19:55:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329145506.20744.00000105@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 38837

In article <3CA3FDC3.B55CC22A@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

> Do you really have SMD components instead of ear drums?

...some radio amateurs are only partially Surface Mount
Technology. No technology and they are strictly "surface"
types. :-)

2961. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 19:55:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329145508.20744.00000106@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 38841

In article <20020328231529.19127.00000745@mb-fm.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>> Morse Code continues to be a viable, basic, uncomplicated mode of
>>>communication. It DOES continue to allow communications when most other
>>>modes went packing.
>>
>>you tellum, mistah radio expert!
>
> I'd ask you to explain what part of that paragraph was not true, but since
>you and I already know that it IS true, I'll save you the embarrasment.

On-off keying was simply the only way that early radio could
be used as a communications medium. Beyond that, OOK CW
is just slow, inefficient, and prone to errors due to entirely-human
decoding.

>>yah, that's why all the other radio services dropped it or never
>>considered it in the first place.
>
> Money...they save millions in "human resource" funds by not hiring Morse
>operators.

No. OOK CW methods are just slow and inefficient as a means
of communications. Despite all the braggadoccio of perfection in
something, humans are still prone to errors.

It is a stupid and senseless argument to argue that voice modes
in public safety radio services are "lesser" than OOK CW on some
basis of money and "human resources" when it comes to either
protection from harm or safety of life.

It is a stupid and senseless argument to argue that teleprinters
with their higher-speed, continuous operation are "lesser" than
manual telegraphy.

> My earlier premise that Morse is a dependable mode is not in contention
by
>ANYONE who has employed it. It's simply an "expensive" mode in terms of
>keeping operators on staff.

That is not a premise but a rationalization. A rather poor one.

That is simply a form of bragging by touting that a skilled manual
telegrapher should still be employed as a telegrapher because
they are so good at it. Closed-circle argument that gets nowhere
but is totally emotionally-satisfying for the telegrapher.

The above is extended to insist that morse code testing must be kept because all the long-time radio amateurs passed such a test and became proficient at it. Again, that is a closed-circle argument that is only emotionally satisfying to those who claim such things.

The constant counter-claim of "one cannot 'know' something without experiencing it (or be qualified by license, testing, participation)" is false by the nature of radio entire. "Radio" is a means of communication by propagation of modulated electromagnetic waves. There are many, many different radio services in the world. All but maritime and amateur radio in the USA have dropped morse code cognition capability as a prime requisite qualification for a radio operator license. Maritime radio services are now using voice and data modes as primary radio communications methods.

All radio, no exceptions, utilize the same radio physics in operation and propagation. The electronics technology used in all radio is the same. There is no real distinction in methods or "qualifications" of radio except those imposed by humans for the purposes of regulation of various radio services. Those are an artificiality about radio physics and do not apply to electrons or EM waves.

US amateur radio is one of the most open and publicized of hobbies. There is nothing hidden or secret about it and the US radio regulations forbid such use "for the purposes of obscuring communications content." The continued comment that "no one can possibly 'know' anything about amateur radio without having 'practical experience' in it" is a ridiculous fabrication.

> And in ANY case, ENGLISH is the international radiocommunication
>language...So now are you going to rant and rave against IT'S use, too?

The only language specifically cited for standardized worldwide radio communications is English for International Civil Aviation traffic control purposes. That was adopted in 1955 by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), a United Nations organization. The common ICAO communications language does not apply for any other radio service uses.

Other languages in common radio use are Spanish, English, French, German, Japanese, Chinese (perhaps two dialects), Russian, Arabic (several distinct languages under that broad category including Farsi), Portuguese, Malay, Tagalog, Indian, Dutch, several from Southeast Asian Pacific region.

>>in order to use international morse code anywhere by a native
>>of a non-alphabetic language requires that they also learn a
>>totally different written language.
>

> More evidence of lack of experience.

No, realistic. "English as a common language" is a near-sighted, bigoted myth promoted by ignorant, bigoted Americans. The ICAO decision of 1955 was based on civil aviation that had survived World War 2 and able to resume operation with faster-moving aircraft, the most aircraft, and its pilots' native language. That standardization came about as a result of warfare survival and as a practicality in entering the "jet age."

That "everyone uses English" to communicate in any medium is again a myth. That Americans use Extended ASCII in computer-modem communications (ASCII = American Standard Code for Information Interchange) can lead to that mythical assumption. IBM was under no such myth when it modified ASCII to include all the other alphabetic-based language alternates now found as switchable alternates in "code pages" of Operating Systems.

If anything can be said to be "common" in any communications, it is numerals. The common numerals now in use worldwide are of Arabic origin.

Alphabet-based languages are in the minority in this world. Syllabic-based languages are in the majority. That is reality. Reality is often uncomfortable, but it is still reality.

2962. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 19:55:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329145509.20744.00000107@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 38838

In article <tJ%o8.72$ml2.8673@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
<K0HB@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
>> The pages of QST, CQ have often
>> cited a ham's military morse training and, on occasion, a prior
>> commercial morse training for some hams. Maybe none of us in
>> RRAP fit that mold, but clearly there are hams that do.
>
>Brian specifically has his ass frosted by the ones on RRAP.
>
> "The former military and commercial ditty-boppers who
> were paid to learn code then come on here and proceed
> to tell the rest of us why its so great..."
>
>I simply asked him who these people were.

Try Jeffrey Herman, formerly of the USCG, at least three former
participants in here who were taught in the USN (names and
callsigns forgetten but remarks' styles unforgettable), perhaps
Jim Kehler, Jim Hampton (? who reads this newsgroup),
and approximately nine others who jumped in here over the past
five years and then left when they were not universally loved.

It might also include Hans Brakob but his past is a bit confused
since he has claimed (in private) a "college degree" either before
or during his USN active duty...but never achieved a commission
possible with such a degree, just a Master Chief Petty Officer
rating.

With all kind regards to mister chief...

2963. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 19:55:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329145510.20744.00000108@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 38839

In article <3CA48615.6BCCFF58@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dave Heil wrote:
>> ...but you previously stated that the system was "designed" to make
>> other hams "feel bad". Have you had a change of heart or did you just
>> blurt something out which was in error?
>
>The Tacoma Narrows Bridge was designed to fall down. The designers
>were, unfortunately, ignorant of that fact.

Er, the Tacoma Narrows Bridge is definitely up and staying up. Lots
(perhaps too many) motor vehicles use it daily, 24/7. The problem
there has always been the roadways at both ends of the Narrows,
now being corrected with much new road construction. :-)

>> So that other hams won't feel bad, do you think it might be a good idea
>> to regulate the maximum amount of money which could be spent on amateur
>> radio by any individual?
>
>All we have to do to keep other hams from feeling bad is remove the power
>of the assholes who are abusing them.

There's always that gray area of the "professional radio amateur"
who works in organizations and publishing houses, using his/her
license as a qualification for that job. :-)

2964. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 19:55:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329145510.20744.00000109@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 38840

In article <3ca47523_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "W5TIT - Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>That's your schtick...not the schtick of most "newcomers," Dick. I daresay
>that most people who would encounter you on the air or here in this
>newsgroup would sigh, roll their eyes, and glaze right over your affiliation
>with the hobby. You hardly represent anyone worthy of being called
>friendly.

To quote from Part 97.1 (e), Basis and Purpose -

"Continuation and extension of the amateur's unique ability
to enhance international goodwill."
:-)

2965. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 19:57:24 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <EG3p8.2286$Qc.111269190@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38842

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3CA35096.65D6FE73@psu.edu...
> Aye Carumba! I hope you thanked your friend! Must have been quite the
> party. Surprising you found the time to modify the antennna. ;^)
>
> - Mike -

Yep, Christmas Island on 10M SSB. It's a wonder we ever got to the beer!!!

I think the other guys commenting were worried what we were going to do with the dykes. Well, we didn't berate them and try to make them do anything they didn't want to do or were incapable of doing. We found a pair of side-cutters and everything was fine.

Brian

2966. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 20:02:41 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <BL3p8.2292$sr.111865133@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38843

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ua6v7e4jh005ed@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> > . . . your view is right on target, as the longterm evidence
> >gleaned by anyone reading this NG will soon show.
> > For myself, I really regret ever making the first post here. but once
> >the battle was engaged- and make no mistake it IS a battle- there
> >has not been a point at which I felt I could engage on even terms.
> >The slander and outright untruths shoveled so liberally by the no-
> >coders has been too intense.
>
> Well, I tell you what, I've seen enough this time around to let me know
> for sure that most of these folks are not on the level, at all,

Hey Val, I'm on the level. The code exam is unnecesary and superflous.
Really.

2967. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 20:03:27 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <jM3p8.2293$Sq.111837470@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38844

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA37DF3.89C1C447@IEEE.org...
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > Well, I tell you what, I've seen enough this time around to let me know
> > for sure that most of these folks are not on the level, at all, and are
on
> > this group only to spew nonsense . . . in very bad faith indeed.
>
> Val, do you believe, as Dick has implied, that Shannon's Theorem
> has a "crack" in it?

He'll have to ask his neighbor.

2968. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 20:04:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA4C8CC.529712FE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38846

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >The Tacoma Narrows Bridge was designed to fall down. The designers
> >were, unfortunately, ignorant of that fact.
>
> Er, the Tacoma Narrows Bridge is definitely up and staying up.

I was talking about the earlier one, you know the one that turned
to spagetti in the wind and fell down?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2969. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 20:05:25 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <9O3p8.2295$Kt.111982687@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38845

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3ca472ca_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> If Dick had his way, people would only be allowed to be hams if they
thought
> and acted just like him.

Then he would doubly hate amateur radio. He is such a disagreeable guy.

2970. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 20:07:58 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ca4c9df_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38848

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020327063722.01924.00000474@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> When the Morse code exam is gone, the hazing ritual will cease to
> >> exist. There won't be any reason not to learn Morse code.
>
> > Well, that's only 180 out. There won't be any reason for most
> >newcomers *to* learn it. Just ask them.
>
> You haven't been asking them, Dick; you have been telling them...
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

At least Dick has finally admitted that the Morse test IS a
hazing ritual. I think his progress quota for the year has
been depleted ... :-)

Carl - wa6vse

2971. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 20:08:47 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <jR3p8.562$ml2.46414@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38847

"Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net, waging his own private
little war on reality, declared:

>
> OK, here's a practical test that can be used to divide the service.
>

Why would you want a test to "divide the service"? That seems to
be a particularly dump huck idea.

Good luck on this one now!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2972. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 20:10:23 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <PS3p8.2301$%t.111998159@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38849

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:UNQo8.1622$Ue6.79329496@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> news:ua6dtuan2c6obd@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > >They act like a pack of wolves and if we don't respect their
> > >pecking order, we'll be torn apart.
> > >
> > >So much for the fraternity.
> >
> > What in hell are you talking about?
>
> I'm talking about the viciousness that you're talking about.
>
> > Code is HISTORY, or soon
> > will be, and the battle has gone the way the anti-coders
>
> Anti-code EXAM.
>
> > have advocated. BUT, was the code REALLY what it was about?
>
> A good part of it. It was an "enabler" in a system designed to segregate.
>
> > I don't think so.
>
> OK, what was it about?
>
> > I think it was (and IS) about the whole incentive
> > licensing system,
>
> Yes, the Incentive Licensing System gave the code exam equal weight with
the
> entirety of everything else in amateur radio combined. If incentive
> licensing were about gaining new MODE priveleges, that would be one thing,
> but examine this comparison and tell me where it makes sense:
>
> Novice: written and code. Priveleges: HF CW, Data, SSB, at 200 watts.
> VHF (220 and 900) all modes, 200 watts.
> Technician: written only. Priveleges: VHF+ all modes, 1,500watts!!!
> 1,500watts is a beginners license? 73 Magazine ran a story about
converting

> a microwave oven to 750 watt transmitter. Mmmm - fried eyeballs.
> Technician Plus: written and code. Priveleges: all of the above.
> General: written and code. Priveleges: 160m, HF, VHF+ all modes, 1,500
> watts.
> Advanced: written and code. Priveleges: 160m, HF, VHF+ all modes, 1,500
> watts.
> Extra: written and code. Priveleges: 160m, HF, VHF+ all modes, 1,500
> watts.
>
> If a Novice is considered to have enough knowledge (written exams) and
> enough CW ability (Morse exam) to operate on HF, doesn't that make all the
> other HF licenses redundant? Perhaps 160M operation is so unique that it
is
> properly the domain of only Generals and higher. But I doubt it.
>
> Notice that the last 3 licenses are all bands, all modes, and all 1,500
> watts. What does higher code speeds have to do with a sliver on the lower
> end of each band? Why of course, nothing. There's nothing in the exams,
> nor in the behavior of RF that the lowest license hasn't addressed or
> satisfied.
>
> Incentive Licensing is a meaningless and arbitrary construct. The
intention
> may have been good, but in practice it has only created numerous divides
> within the service.
>
> > and about the fact that the ARRL has set
> > up all of these contests and awards and DXCC programs, etc.,
> > thus making some hams "better than others."
>
> Other than being denied the slivers of spectrum where the DX might be
> running Q's, the ARRL awards programs have nothing to do with it.
>
> We've said that the Novice license was a gateway to more learning. Is the
> Extra license the END of learning? Of course not, so why have ever higher
> "classes" if the learning shouldn't stop. Jim advocates even more
licenses
> that the previous 6. At one time, the General License conveyed ALL
> priveleges. And hams didn't have to stop learning once they got all
> priveleges. So one "all priveleges" license and one "learners permit"
> license will satisfy all needs in amateur radio. Anything more than that
is
> redundant, superflous, and divisive.
>
> > There's a name for that for I won't write it here.
>
> We've been calling it "bigotry" for years.
>
> Val, I've said all of the above many, many times. I'm glad I've taken
this

> opportunity to state it again.
>
> While I'm at it, one other thing I've said again and again, prior to the
> latest restructuring: "What I fear most about the impending restructuring
> is a lack of enforcement. And what I fear the most about maintaining the
> Status Quo is a lack of enforcement."
>
> The Morse/CW exam has allowed some absolutely crazy people into the
service.
> Enforcement is the answer, not arbitrary exams to keep the hordes of
unclean
> CBers out. They've been with us for many, many years.
>
> What's your new call?
>
> 73, Brian/N0iMD

Welp Val, you could have learned something here. Too bad for you and too bad for amateur radio.

Sayonara,
Brian

2973. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 20:10:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329151038.12013.00000170@mb-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 38850

In article <3CA4B439.26213E33@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>> His frustration at never being able to pass the 20wpm code test is
>> becoming more and more clear.
>
>Uhhhhhhh Dick, I never tried to pass the 20wpm code test. There
>never was any incentive for me to try to pass it.

Not quite. Under the Rules of Engagement in this zone, that is
defined as "failure!" :-)

"Failure is not an option..." :-)

2974. Re: California Hams!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 20:15:51 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ca4cbb7_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38951

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020325062123.16464.00000004@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net
>
> >> Do count the weak ones; the Morse guys are digging them out of the mud!
:-)
>
> >And what of the SSB Op who'se digging SSB signals out of the mud? Are
their
> >efforts somehow diminished because they're using the "wrong" mode?
>
> I made that suggestion to Carl because I know that he is not a very
experienced
> CW op, so if he made the comparison, I wanted to ensure he was doing so
based
> on real-world conditions.

I beg your pardon ... I have logs with hundreds of CW QSOs,
including things like Johnston Island and So Africa from So Cal
on 40 CW with 3W from a HW-7 ... the fact that I don't enjoy
and prefer not to use CW any more does not implicitly mean
that I an "inexperienced" (I may be "out of practice" ... quite
deliberately ... but I wouldn't say I was "inexperienced.")

> I believe that the SSB op who is doing the same is a good operator.
>
> Why do you feel that SSB is a "wrong" mode?

I think he was asking if you were implying that SSB was the "wrong"
mode by only mentioning "the Morse guys ... digging them out of the
mud" ... I knew what you meant, but I figured someone would call
you on it ... perhaps overly sensitive, but after years of oppression,
what can you expect? :-)

Carl - wa6vse

2975. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 20:19:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329151936.22569.00000166@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 38952

In article <3CA4C8CC.529712FE@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >The Tacoma Narrows Bridge was designed to fall down. The designers
>> >were, unfortunately, ignorant of that fact.
>>
>> Er, the Tacoma Narrows Bridge is definitely up and staying up.
>
>I was talking about the earlier one, you know the one that turned
>to spagetti in the wind and fell down?

My apologies, Cecil. :-)

Having driven over it enough times...and endured the parking wait
in the construction areas on the Tacoma side...many many many
drivers "turned to spaghetti" waiting for the gridlock to pass. :-)

My apologies again for inserting a non-ham-radio topic in here.
Das ist verboten according to the Rules of Engagement. :-)

2976. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 20:21:27 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <b14p8.579$ml2.42969@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38953

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote

>
> I accept a limited license based on safety, and possibly tenure.
>

Try this on for size. This proposal allows for a "new guy" license,
and a "regular" license.
Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of) WT Docket No. 98-143
) 1998 Biennial Regulatory Review
) RM-9148
Amendment of Part) RM-9150
97 of the) RM-9196
Commission's)
Amateur Service)
Rules.)

PERSONAL COMMENTS OF HANS BRAKOB, K0HB

OVERVIEW

These comments contain proposals on reducing the number of amateur radio
operator license classes, and suggestions regarding Morse testing.

I. Discussion:

The NPRM proposes reducing the number of operator classes from six to four. This reduction would be accomplished by phasing out Novice and Technician Plus classes, leaving the remaining four classes in place. It is worthy of note that this plan would preserve the heart of the so-called "incentive licensing" plan which was implemented in 1968.

I believe that the effects originally expected of the incentive licensing scheme have not been realized in practice. There is little evidence that this scheme, now 30 years old, has produced any notable increase in the skills, operating excellence, advanced electronic techniques, or other tangible valuable difference between the operators in the various "non-entry-level" classes of licensee.

As a non-scientific but pragmatic experiment, tune a receiver to 14.350MHz. Close your eyes and slowly tune the receiver down across the 20M amateur radio band. Try to detect the "class boundaries" based on a difference in signal quality, better operating practices, or more advanced technical conversations. I think you will find no detectable difference as you transit across the frequencies which mark the boundary between General, Advanced, and Amateur Extra sub-bands. Thus it can be assumed that the expectations of the incentive

licensing program (greater levels of technical and operating skill at higher license classes) have not been realized, and the incentive licensing plan can be safely abandoned as providing no significant benefit to the public interest, necessity, or convenience (PICON).

II Proposal:

A. License Classes:

If the interest of the FCC is (as stated in the NPRM) streamlining of the licensing structure, then I propose that the license classes be reduced to two classes, namely "Basic" and "Advanced".

The "Basic" license would have an entry-level test (basic regulations, safety, operating procedures, basic DC and AC electronics). Without CW endorsement this class would have full frequency and mode privileges above 30MHz, power limited to 50W output.

The "Standard" license test would be of a difficulty level similar to the current Advanced class test, and would have full privileges above 30MHz at power levels up to 1500W.

B. Morse required for operation below 30MHz

Either license class could gain access to all MF/HF amateur radio frequency allocations (at 50W and 1500W respectively) upon passing a Morse test of 5WPM and gaining a "CW endorsement" for their operator license.

The Morse test should be "fill in the blank" or "1 minute of solid copy". Multiple-choice test formats should not be allowed.

C. Status of current licensees.

Current licensees should be redistributed as follows:

Current class	Converts to
Novice:	Basic CW Endorsed
Technician:	Basic
Technician+:	Basic CW Endorsed (Note 1)
General:	Advanced CW Endorsed
Advanced:	Advanced CW Endorsed (Note 2)
Extra:	Advanced CW Endorsed (Note 2)

Notes:
1) "Old" Technicians (who took same written test as General and 5WPM) would be "Standard" CW endorsed.

2) Current Advanced and Extra licensees could continue to have that class printed on their license in recognition of their previous status.

Respectfully submitted,

H. Hans Brakob, K0HB

2977. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 20:24:08 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <I34p8.2317$JH.112731548@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38954

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:jR3p8.562$ml2.46414@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Brian P Burke" bpburke@prodigy.net, waging his own private
> little war on reality, declared:
>
> >
> > OK, here's a practical test that can be used to divide the service.
> >
>
> Why would you want a test to "divide the service"?

Again, "The above is as bad as anythign we currently have." i.e., big joke.
Get it?

Again, only one license is necessary.

2978. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 20:28:03 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ca4ce96_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38955

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020327062230.01924.00000468@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>
> >> There are three values in Shannon's theorem: Power, bandwidth, and
> >throughput.
>
> > Then there's the crack in Shannon for real world communications where
the
> >user has no control over the situation.

HUH??? Dick, why don't you try, just for a change of pace,
to say something that even comes CLOSE to making any
sense?

> Can you explain what you believe to be wrong with Shannon's theory in
technical
> terms?

I gotta see this explaination ... I haven't read ahead, but I'm
sure I'll be ROTFLMAO ...

Carl - wa6vse

2979. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 20:31:32 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Ea4p8.2324$KL.112949292@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38956

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ua6ekjlvaoojb5@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Following this coment from someone who calls himself "Len":
>
> >>If you need to be a Yiddisher, wear a yarmulke when you post..
>
> Steve Robeson wrote:
>
> >That's what I like about you, Your Insultingness...you can be
> >offensive in any number of religions.
>
> There comes a time to simply stop responding to people who
> are worthless individuals and are on the net soley to perform
> as absolute asswipes

"Asswipes?" Do you use that kind of language on the air?

Or do you have a dual personality?

Larry Roll/K3LT thinks its OK to say the most revolting things on RRAP, but somehow becomes civil when he clicks on the radio. I don't know how he does it. I honestly doubt he does.

So do you use the word "asswipes" on the air, or rather, will you when your license comes in? Perhaps we should get your neighbor to weigh-in on the use of "asswipes?"

2980. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 20:34:55 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Pd4p8.2326$pO.113077466@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38957

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a7vged$op5$0@208.207.71.160...
>
>
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> >
> > Following this coment from someone who calls himself "Len":
> >
> > >>If you need to be a Yiddisher, wear a yarmulke when you post..
> >
> > Steve Robeson wrote:
> >
> > >That's what I like about you, Your Insultingness...you can be
> > >offensive in any number of religions.
> >
> > There comes a time to simply stop responding to people who
> > are worthless individuals and are on the net soley to perform
> > as absolute asswipes -- and have been doing so for YEARS.
> > In my view, the time to stop responding to this poster ["Len"]
> > was even before the InterNet was created, but that wasn't
> > possible, unfortunately. Please, let's all stop responding to
> > this "Len", who has shown what he truly is. Please, no more.
>
>
>
> There are a few posters whose posts I never open. He has long been
> one. The others are added slowly over time, and I just very recently
> added The Gadfly, B.Burke also.

> When one has nothing constructive whatever to add to the conversation,
> and instead only adds to the the QRM and QRN on a band, it's time to
> tune on.

Yet Cecil "rarely or never" adds anything and you can't wait to open his
posts, they infuriate you so much. So you can say all you want about me,
but you will secretly read each and every post I make. You can't help
yourself.

2981. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 20:39:19 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329153919.00997.00001235@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 38958

>Thanks for proving my point.
>--
>cheers, CAM, W5DXP
>

What that you cant handle it.?

2982. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 20:41:45 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <dk4p8.2329$sl.112771128@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38959

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020328192613.27329.00000141@mb-bd.aol.com...
> In article <a7vged$op5$0@208.207.71.160>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
> writes:
>
> >Valentine Germann wrote:
> >>
> >> Following this coment from someone who calls himself "Len":
> >>
> >> >>If you need to be a Yiddisher, wear a yarmulke when you post..
> >>
> >> Steve Robeson wrote:
> >>
> >> >That's what I like about you, Your Insultingness...you can be
> >> >offensive in any number of religions.
> >>
> >> There comes a time to simply stop responding to people who
> >> are worthless individuals and are on the net soley to perform
> >> as absolute asswipes -- and have been doing so for YEARS.
> >> In my view, the time to stop responding to this poster ["Len"]
> >> was even before the InterNet was created, but that wasn't
> >> possible, unfortunately. Please, let's all stop responding to
> >> this "Len", who has shown what he truly is. Please, no more.
> >
> > There are a few posters whose posts I never open. He has long been
> >one. The others are added slowly over time, and I just very recently
> >added The Gadfly, B.Burke also.
> >
> > When one has nothing constructive whatever to add to the conversation,
> >and instead only adds to the the QRM and QRN on a band, it's time to
> >tune on.
>
> Goodbye, Dick. It wasn't nice seeing you here. Have fun wherever
> you go... :-)

Hey "asswipe," err I meant Len.

I wonder what cussword he has for me? Or maybe its his CW neighbor that
comes up with the nomenclature.

Anyway, I spent a few minutes explaining my concerns and rejection of the
code exams and inventive licensing, now he says he isn't going to read it.
What a party pooper. Welp, the next newbie PCTA without a clue comes on
here and I won't bother.

If he's been reading since '98... Never mind.

Brian, awaiting cussword assignment.

2983. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 20:44:03 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329154403.00997.00001236@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 38960

>CBer." Hmmmm....OH, you mean the group of people with whom the worst you
>personify so well. Got it!
>
>Kim W5TIT
>
>

No, I mean lossers like you who couldnt obtain a License, until the standards
were lowered.

2984. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 20:45:49 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <1o4p8.2333$TN.113050992@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38961

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3CA38351.2390E697@psu.edu...
> Yahh, sometimes the only way I know he is still around is Steve's
> postings back to him. But Steve has certain strong feelings on *that*
> matter! 8^)
>
> Still would be nice tho'
>
> - Mike -

Yes, very unnatural strong feelings about him. We had a character on here a few years ago who had some kind of bi-sexual thing going. You know who wouldn't stay off this guy's butt. It really got sick. But Val knows all that since he's been reading since '98.

Brian

2985. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 20:46:32 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ca4d2ed_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38962

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a7ti18$50j$0@208.206.142.81...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
> >
> > >> There are three values in Shannon's theorem: Power, bandwidth, and
> > >throughput.
> >
> > > Then there's the crack in Shannon for real world communications where
the
> > >user has
> > >no control over the situation.
> >
> > Can you explain what you believe to be wrong with Shannon's theory in
technical
> > terms?
>
> It has application only in theory and design work, and is not in any
> way useful in analyzing why to use one mode over another when the
> equipment available cannot take advantage of the efficiencies noted by
> Shannon.

So if you have crappy equipment, using outdated techniques that
can't begin to get close to the Shannon limit, and refuse to adopt
better techniques that can, that somehow makes Shannon "irrelevant"
as you've put it? I don't think so ...

> If the lesseer mode works under the instant circumstances using
> the system that is availabe and the more efficient does not, only a fool
> would attempt to force a comparison based on a Shannon analysis.

You're mixing situations here ... first, the lesser system (that would
be Morse) is available (and therefore works) ... in the next breath,
the more efficient system (virtually anything but Morse, under equal
conditions of power, bandwidth, and throughput) is (apparently) not
available (poor planning) and therefore "does not work."

> That is exactly what happened on the morning noted, where I
> could easily copy the CW ID on the PSK31 stations but not the
> PSK31 signal itself.

As I recall this from a couple or three years ago, you were just
in the process of figuring out how to hook your computer up

to your radio and get PSK-31 running ... based on your general demonstrated level of (mis)understanding of anything more technically advanced than OOK Morse, I find it highly probable that you didn't have things set up correctly in terms of levels, etc. and weren't getting optimum copy on the PSK-31 ... don't blame operator ineptness on Shannon ...

> None of this in any way changes anything Shannon said. It merely
> points, again, to "In theory, theory and practice are the same, but in
> practice they are often different".

That's a bunch of baloney, Dick ... any disagreement you may note between theory and practice is rooted in your inability to understand how to correctly apply the theory ... you seem to view theory as an alternative definition akin to "hypothesis" or "idea" ... theory as we technical folks use the term means "law" as in "laws of physics" ... if applied correctly by competent practitioners, theory and practice will agree so closely that you won't be able to tell the difference ...

Carl - wa6vse

2986. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 20:48:15 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <jq4p8.2336$YX.113575081@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38963

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020328230248.19127.00000743@mb-fm.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: 15wpm hump
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 03/28/02 21:44 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20020328214454.17929.00000120@mb-fk.aol.com>
>
> >i'm sure it would be heart-warming all around for a few to have
> >this totally a "high-five" slapping area all around. stifle all
> >dissent, nothing contrary to "official" viewpoints, everyone
> >marching to the same drumbeat in lock-step. ein volk, ein
> >welt!
>
> Nope...just an ability to "discuss" matters without having to be lied
to or
> "dissed" by a creep who has no practical experience in Amateur Radio
matters.
>
> That would be you, by the way.....
>
> Steve

Hey Steve, who was that grunt who had the bi-sexual tendencies and used to post on here? No, I don't mean your other nemesis, Cutie Boy, I mean the other guy at about the same time. I forget his name.

Brian

2987. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 20:51:12 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <4t4p8.2341$NY.113617216@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38964

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020328185721.09495.00000540@mb-cs.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: 15wpm hump
> >From: "Valentine Germann" vgermann@socket.net
> >Date: 03/28/02 11:03 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <ua6ekjlvaoojb5@corp.supernews.com
>
> >Please, let's all stop responding to
> >this "Len", who has shown what he truly is. Please, no more.
>
> I almost agree, Val. The purpose of keeping this creep off balance
is
> that there are always new people who come along who are unaware of what he
> "stands" for.

Steve, you're not keeping him "off-balance." However, your own equilibrium
has been severely affected. Just like your vehement hatred for Cutie Boy
and the bi-guy.

2988. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 20:52:42 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329155242.02602.00001206@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 38965

>Give my regards to your wife.
>
>Brian
>
>

Not a problem, your Mother will; be glad to hear from you

2989. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 20:54:18 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <_v4p8.2343$UR.113250598@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38966

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020328192614.27329.00000142@mb-bd.aol.com...
> In article <ua6ekjlvaoojb5@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
> <vgermann@socket.net> writes:
>
> >Following this coment from someone who calls himself "Len":
> >
> >>>If you need to be a Yiddisher, wear a yarmulke when you post..
> >
> >Steve Robeson wrote:
> >
> >>That's what I like about you, Your Insultingness...you can be
> >>offensive in any number of religions.
> >
> >There comes a time to simply stop responding to people who
> >are worthless individuals and are on the net soley to perform
> >as absolute asswipes -- and have been doing so for YEARS.
>
> Ah! That's what's so nice about today's academics...liberal
> thought and the free expression of ideas... :-)
>
> >In my view, the time to stop responding to this poster ["Len"]
> >was even before the InterNet was created, but that wasn't
> >possible, unfortunately.
>
> Not everyone shares your exhalted view, your highness. :-)
>
> >Please, let's all stop responding to
> >this "Len", who has shown what he truly is. Please, no more.
>
> Yes, poor Val has been soooo upset. Tsk, tsk.
>
> Let's have ONE viewpoint, ONE position on everything.
> Cancel everything else, forbid dissent, quash freedom.
> Ein volk, ein welt! (march, march, march, march......)

Len, I'm guessing you already have your license but won't divulge it here
for obvious reasons. The hit squad is posted on every band, every corner of
amateur radio.

Brian

2990. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 20:56:14 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Ox4p8.2347$U01.113819803@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38967

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020328222202.19127.00000735@mb-fm.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: 15wpm hump
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 03/28/02 19:26 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20020328192614.27329.00000142@mb-bd.aol.com>
>
> >Ah! That's what's so nice about today's academics...liberal
> >thought and the free expression of ideas.
>
> "Liberal thought and the free expression of ideas" is part and parcel
of
> "The American Way". Lies, abuse and subtrefuge are not.
>
> >Not everyone shares your exhalted view, your highness.
>
> Nor yours, judging by the number of "Len's a creep" messages that
have
> permeated the NG lately.
>
> >Yes, poor Val has been soooo upset. Tsk, tsk.
>
> He's just more civil about absorbing your abuse, Your Lyingness.

"Asswipe?" Is that anything like Hans calling people "Dump Hucks?"

2991. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 21:04:58 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <_F4p8.2362$661.114086108@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38968

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020329145509.20744.00000107@mb-mm.aol.com...
> In article <tJ%o8.72$ml2.8673@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "K0HB"
> <K0HB@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
> >
> >> The pages of QST, CQ have often
> >> cited a ham's military morse training and, on occasion, a prior
> >> commercial morse training for some hams. Maybe none of us in
> >> RRAP fit that mold, but clearly there are hams that do.
> >
> >Brian specifically has his ass frosted by the ones on RRAP.
> >
> > "The former military and commercial ditty-boppers who
> > were paid to learn code then come on here and proceed
> > to tell the rest of us why its so great..."
> >
> >I simply asked him who these people were.
>
> Try Jeffrey Herman, formerly of the USCG, at least three former
> participants in here who were taught in the USN (names and
> callsigns forgetten but remarks' styles unforgettable), perhaps
> Jim Kehler, Jim Hampton (? who reads this newsgroup),
> and approximately nine others who jumped in here over the past
> five years and then left when they were not universally loved.
>
> It might also include Hans Brakob but his past is a bit confused
> since he has claimed (in private) a "college degree" either before
> or during his USN active duty...but never achieved a commission
> possible with such a degree, just a Master Chief Petty Officer
> rating.
>
> With all kind regards to mister chief...

Dammit Len, I was just going to see how far these forgetful OTs were going
to feign "Alzheimer's ."

Now down at the American Legion or the VFW, tehy'll tell anyone who will
listen about their code days when the "Chicoms" were doing this or that.

2992. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 21:08:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA4D7B3.A3701567@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38969

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >Thanks for proving my point.

> What that you cant handle it.?

Handle what?

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2993. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 21:10:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA4D831.2062B94B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38970

WA8ULX wrote:
> No, I mean lossers like you who couldnt obtain a License, until the standards
> were lowered.

You realize that you just violated The Amateur's Creed.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2994. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 21:49:23 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3CA4E163.6D7231BF@psu.edu>
Source record: 38971

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> mike coslo wrote:
<some snippage here>

> >Plus there is one not so endearing quality from some of the
> >Procode crowd. That is the concept that "Extra Lites" such
> >as myself are considered second class citizens by so many
> >of them. I'm pro-code, but my inferior status in their eyes turns
> >me right off to thier cause.
>
> Well, what else can you expect from the people who have
> been in the field for many years and have had this system
> forced on them from above! They played the FCC game
> by the rules and climbed the tree fair and square, most of
> them, and then saw the whole thing trivialized, first by the
> "waivers" and then by the other changes. It does not matter
> whether these changes are "better" or "worse" for Ham
> Radio or World Peace, or whatever, the particpants in the
> old system, many of them, are going to be disgruntled.

What I would expect is some graciousness - and here I am posting in this group!! ;^) I don't begrudge the old timers what they had to do to get their licenses. In fact, I love talking to them about the experiences they have had and to pick their minds for knowledge that their experience has given them.

But the times have changed. I think it would display more grace and character for the disgruntled ones to do more constructive things like get more people involved in using the CW they have learned, promoting it as fun (remember, this is a hobby) touting its benefits - I bet you could get some people interested just by talking about some qrp CW on mountaintops with that nifty little Yaesu rig running on batteries and an minimal antenna. In fact, it would be a great thing to set up a sked with new Generals in the area.

THAT is my idea on how to promote CW.

Or of course, they can call people like me an extra-lite. They can make fun of the no-code Techs too.

I have a pretty good idea which tactic is actually better for the ARS though.

- mike KB3EIA -

2995. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 21:51:52 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ca4e247_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38972

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020326005954.21793.00000077@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <sx2n8.216922$uv5.18731391@bin6.nnrp.aus1.giganews.com>,
"Jester"
> <maverick@topgun.comSPAM> writes:
>
> >Are the majority of people who want to see the code requirement lifted,
are
> >they those that have not put the time forth to learn the code?
>
> Yes, for the most part.

What, other than your desired answer, do you base that,
Larry?

For example, only about 48% of NCI's members are not
coded hams ... slightly over 52% of NCI's members ARE
coded hams ... including a lot of advanceds and extras.

> >Here is the point at least learning the code takes a sort of discipline
and
> >an effort to show you are serious or dedicated to amatuer radio, if not I
am
> >afriad it will turn into 11 meter free for all.

That bogus argument has been raised for years ... and it didn't
happen with the no-code tech back in the early 90's and it hasn't
happened with the drop to 5 wpm for HF access ... the "spectre
of CB" is nothing more than a scare tactic perpetuated by the
PCTA and code elitists like Larry.

> There is plenty of evidence that the HF phone sub-bands have been
> that way for years. IMHO, there is not practical need to add to the
> existing chaos by further reducing licensing standards, particularly
> with regard to code testing -- but that's the way we're going, like it
> or not.

Larry .. check the FCC statistics on who the offenders have been.
Far and away, 20wpm extras were the sociopaths that were getting
busted ... proving that, as the FCC said on the record, "A Morse
test proves one's ability to copy Morse, nothing more, nothing less."
The Morse myth that passing a Morse test ensures that one will be
a better operator is BS.

> >You want to remove the code
> >and what leave the question pool as it is ?

>
> Not me. The only thing that would be acceptable to me would be to
> return to the Pre-Restructuring licensing standards.

Well, Larry, please don't hold your breath (maybe I shouldn't say
that :-) Since the FCC soundly rejected all of the Petitions for
Reconsideration of WT 98-143 "the fat lady has sung" ... live
with it, stop bitching and whining ... and for God's sake, please
stop demeaning every new ham just because they didn't have
to go through the ordeal of your #$#&*^ beloved Morse hazing
ritual.

Carl - wa6vse

2996. Re: DARC didn't fly with Germany's administration

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 21:54:22 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ca4e2dd$1_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38973

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020325061730.16464.00000003@mb-fx.aol.com...
> From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse-shack@fast.net
>
> >The interesting fact about the poll taken by DARC is
> >that only about 1/3 of DARC's members even cared
> >enough to vote ... thus, the result represents a 52%
> >"majority" amongst only 1/3 of the members ...
>
> What percentage of amateurs chose to "vote" by filing comments for the
> restructuring NPRM?

Even less, indicating that most hams don't care if the code
test goes away or not ... or, alternatively, that many are too
lazy to "vote." (I'm inclined to give certain credence to the
2nd explaination, considering voter turnout at real elections.)

Carl - wa6vse

2997. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 22:00:54 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329170054.11835.00001363@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 38974

>You realize that you just violated The Amateur's Creed.
>

Who cares, Ham Radio is joke anymore anyway.

2998. Re: You can't pass this item up!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 22:01:02 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ca4e476_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38975

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:asKn8.5028$ub3.2388@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=1341648551
>
> --
> (���) 73, de Hans, K0HB
>

Hans ... where did you get a picture of Dick with a handwritten
quote? :-)

Carl - wa6vse

2999. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 22:04:26 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329170426.11835.00001365@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 38976

>For example, only about 48% of NCI's members are not
>coded hams ... slightly over 52% of NCI's members ARE
>coded hams ... including a lot of advanceds and extras.

Prove it, lets see the Membership Rooster, or are we just to take your word for it.

3000. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 22:20:20 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <EM5p8.719$ml2.57256@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38977

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote>

> It might also include Hans Brakob but his past is a bit confused
> since he has claimed (in private) a "college degree" either before
> or during his USN active duty...but never achieved a commission
> possible with such a degree, just a Master Chief Petty Officer
> rating.

Purdue NESEP did not teach Morse code, and graduates were
not required to accept commissions. Most E8 and E9 participants
declined O2 status and the hazing being a of mustang junior officer.

Sorry if that offends the ex-RA enlisted grades.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3001. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-29 22:36:26 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ca4ecc3_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 38978

First, I'm SO glad to see that this "K0HB's Modest
Trickle" business is not prostate related :-) There's
enough of that sort of discussion on the bands
and I'd hate to see it take over here ...

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ua152i91d1gk85@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all!
>
> I did not get a direct reply to my question about
> what will happen on HF after code testing once-
> and-for-all goes away, probably within a couple
> of years. However, in another thread, KOHB
> stated that in his opinion the post-code-testing
> "flood" of new operators on HF would be only a
> "modest trickle," because "everyone who wants
> to be on HF is already there," or something to
> this effect. Is this view widely held?

NO ... otherwise there wouldn't be groups like
NCI around the world, working to eliminate the
unnecessary Morse barrier.

> That is, the general impression I have received,
> which could certainly be in error, is that code
> testing has created a great pent-up mass of
> VHF-only operators, and others, who are at
> the ready to instantly leap onto HF if only the
> "hazing ritual" be done away with.

There are a few no-code techs ... relatively
few ... who only aspire to local 2m communications.
However, most of the techs I've met, talked with
at ham events, etc. are interested in HF, but either
can't or won't jump through the hoop that the Morse
test represents. For some it's a matter of ability,
due to certain handicaps ... for others it's a matter
that they're so disinterested in Morse that they will
wait for the requirement to disappear, and for others,
it's just a matter of principle ... they COULD do the
5 wpm, but they WON'T just on the principle of the
thing.

> But can it be true that there is NO "pent-up mass"
> out there, in actual fact, and that it's really and truly
> true that "everyone who wants to be on HF is already

> there" -- code test or no? I find this hard to believe,
> for a couple of reasons.
>
> First, if the above is true then why all the angst about
> code and code testing? Did no one ever CHECK and
> see just how many folks really WERE being held back
> or kept out of amateur radio due to the testing for code?
> If KOHB is right, well, apparently no one ever did that, and
> the whole "pent-up mass" could in fact caucus inside a
> phone booth, relatively speaking!

Hans has a right to his silly opinions :-) With at least
a couple of hundred thousand no-code techs, do you
REALLY believe that only a few are interested in HF?

> This seems like a substandard way to make policy,
> at least to me. Where have I gone wrong?
>
> Secondly, who in fact has been the driving force behind
> the whole NCI business if not those who either were
> themselves, or were speaking for, the presumed great
> mass which was being kept off HF, or out of amateur
> radio, by code testing? If that mass doesn't really exist
> then I have to confess my amazement. What's it all
> REALLY been about if "everyone who wants to be on
> HF is already there?

The driving force behind NCI has been the members,
about 48% uncoded and about 52% coded, and the
Board of Directors who do the day to day work.

> So, what HAS it all been about, if KOHB is right?

Hans is not right ... he's either just pulling chains (which
he has a propensity to do, just to see what sort of a
reaction he can get), or he's got a really silly idea on this
one. All of the evidence is against his view, so I think he's
chain-pulling again ...

Carl - wa6vse

3002. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 00:12:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CA502FD.5AF62F67@adelphia.net>
Source record: 38979

That's too bad Cecil. You don't know the great pleasure that can be derived from a really good challenge! 8^)

- Mike -

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Ah, gee Old Boy, and what was it that kept YOU down?
>
> Nothing ever kept me down, Dick. Everything I have ever
> attempted was easy for me. My motto has always been:
> "Work Smarter, Not Harder!"

3003. No coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 00:16:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CA503EF.AEB8C4AB@adelphia.net>
Source record: 38980

What are you no-coders doing to benefit the ARS?

- Mike -

3004. Pro coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 00:17:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CA5041B.E69E3637@adelphia.net>
Source record: 38981

What are you pro-coders doing to benefit the ARS?

- Mike -

3005. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 00:18:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a83090$47u$0@208.207.71.140>
Source record: 38982

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Youi're so full of crap you stink way up here a thousand miles away. No
> > one ever hears of such nonsense until rrap, and even then the vile
> > spewings of the likes of you forced it.
>
> Just like the rapist said: "She wore a tight skirt and made me rape her!"

Uh, pal *you* are and have always been a primary source of it all. So
apply your homily to yourself. I know, you much prefer your victims just
roll over and take whatever you dish. Sorry, we ain't buying. Take that
to the bank.

> > So now that you realize the Grate Dumbdown was not at all a success,
> > you now prefer to just do away with the whole licensing scheme. Send out
> > licenses in Cocoa Puff boxes. Right, we got it.
>
> Take away the power from the assholes and things would be a lot nicer.
> The 5wpm code exam was a very good start in that direction.

"Power"??? what a joke you are. Where has ever been any "power" in a
ham radio license of any level? Your jealousy is yet again showing up,
big time.

3006. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 00:19:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a830av$47u$1@208.207.71.140>
Source record: 38983

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > If Cecil has been making the
> > > > same mistakes for 51 years, and still can't see it, what do you think it
> > > > might take to wake him up?
> > >
> > > A helpful posting?
> >
> > You missed it, then.
>
> I don't think I missed it. It just wasn't helpful.

Then nothing is likely to be.

3007. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 00:21:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a830eb$47u$2@208.207.71.140>
Source record: 38984

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > If you'd been paying attention you would know that I had no control of
> > what the other stations were doing, no way to alter any condition.
>
> That's an admission that your observation was out of control.
> Tell us something that we didn't already know.

"My observation was out of control". Gee, I didn't know I had any
control over radio wave propagation and the vagaries of operation at HF.
MY control lies on my end of the RF circuit. Tell us, O Guru, just how
do you do it?

3008. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 00:22:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a830gb$47u$3@208.207.71.140>
Source record: 38985

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Ah, gee Old Boy, and what was it that kept YOU down?
>
> Nothing ever kept me down, Dick. Everything I have ever
> attempted was easy for me. My motto has always been:
> "Work Smarter, Not Harder!"

And if you can't BS your way through it, destroy it. We see.

3009. Re: You can't pass this item up!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 00:26:42 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <6D7p8.949$ml2.86852@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38986

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote

>
> Hans ... where did you get a picture of Dick with a handwritten
> quote? :-)
>

It's not my item. I may not be real classy, but I'm classier
than that!

Enjoy.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3010. Re: No coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 00:30:55 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329193055.00993.00001309@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 38987

>What are you no-coders doing to benefit the ARS?
>
>
> - Mike

Thats easy there doing nothing

3011. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 00:42:49 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <dS7p8.973$ml2.86698@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38988

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote

>
> Hans is not right ... he's either just pulling chains (which
> he has a propensity to do, just to see what sort of a
> reaction he can get), or he's got a really silly idea on this
> one. All of the evidence is against his view, so I think he's
> chain-pulling again ...
>

Carl, I'm ashamed of you. You may feel my opinion is mistaken,
but it is an honest opinion. To dismiss it as silliness or
"chain-pulling", thus avoiding reasoned discussion is cowardly.

I would love to see a step increase (10-15%) in HF amateurs
on the air whenever the Morse test is not longer a qualifier for
HF access, but I have no confidence that such an increase
will materialize. Given the modest migration from Novice/Tech
Plus to General/Extra when 5WPM became the standard for
HF license qualification suggests to me that there is little or
no 'pent up demand' waiting for the elimination of this qualification
requirement.

I'd be delighted to be mistaken.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3012. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 00:44:26 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <KT7p8.976$ml2.90407@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 38989

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA4D7B3.A3701567@IEEE.org...
> WA8ULX wrote:
> >
> > >Thanks for proving my point.
>
> > What that you cant handle it.?
>
> Handle what?
>

It. :-)

3013. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 00:54:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a832cr$b2a$0@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 38990

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > Gee, you don't seem to understand that wasn't for the nocode techs at
> > > > all, rather was for guys like you, Carl and Bill, and The Gadfly, who
> > > > would rather sit and whine about the requirements until the sole ham
> > > > making rules at the FCC got tired of hearing it and capitulated,
> > > > allowing your Extra Lite.
> > >
> > > What kind of person are you to abuse the handicapped?
> >
> > Ah, victims. Sorry OB, I had no idea. I gleaned from all your postings
> > that you were a person of superlative, even supernatural, talents, and
> > never a hint of 'handicap'.
>
> I was diagnosed by a clinical psychologist as having an aural handicap.
> You know that yet you continue to heap abuse upon me.

I also know well that you manufacture a new story to fit every
circumstance and need.
```

3014. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 02:03:59 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <j29p8.2587$ki4.124627275@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38991

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020329170426.11835.00001365@mb-mq.aol.com...
> >For example, only about 48% of NCI's members are not
> >coded hams ... slightly over 52% of NCI's members ARE
> >coded hams ... including a lot of advanceds and extras.
>
> Prove it, lets see the Membership Rooster, or are we just to take your
word
> for it.

Bruce, post you wedding license. I want to see what state allowed you to
marry your sister.

3015. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 02:10:10 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <689p8.2594$5k4.124715362@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38992

Hans, I knew that in time I'd come around to your way of thinking.

Lose the "Advanced" name, it reminds me of incentive licensing for some reason.

CW endorsements can go away too.

73, Brian

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:b14p8.579$ml2.42969@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote

>
> I accept a limited license based on safety, and possibly tenure.
>

Try this on for size. This proposal allows for a "new guy" license,
and a "regular" license.
Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of) WT Docket No. 98-143
) 1998 Biennial Regulatory Review
) RM-9148
Amendment of Part) RM-9150
97 of the) RM-9196
Commission's)
Amateur Service)
Rules.)

PERSONAL COMMENTS OF HANS BRAKOB, K0HB

OVERVIEW

These comments contain proposals on reducing the number of amateur radio
operator license classes, and suggestions regarding Morse testing.

I. Discussion:

The NPRM proposes reducing the number of operator classes from six to four. This reduction would be accomplished by phasing out Novice and Technician Plus classes, leaving the remaining four classes in place. It is worthy of note that this plan would preserve the heart of the so-called "incentive licensing" plan which was implemented in 1968.

I believe that the effects originally expected of the incentive licensing scheme have not been realized in practice. There is little evidence that this scheme, now 30 years old, has produced any notable increase in the skills, operating excellence, advanced electronic

techniques, or other tangible valuable difference between the operators in the various "non-entry-level" classes of licensee.

As a non-scientific but pragmatic experiment, tune a receiver to 14.350MHz. Close your eyes and slowly tune the receiver down across the 20M amateur radio band. Try to detect the "class boundaries" based on a difference in signal quality, better operating practices, or more advanced technical conversations. I think you will find no detectable difference as you transit across the frequencies which mark the boundary between General, Advanced, and Amateur Extra sub-bands. Thus it can be assumed that the expectations of the incentive licensing program (greater levels of technical and operating skill at higher license classes) have not been realized, and the incentive licensing plan can be safely abandoned as providing no significant benefit to the public interest, necessity, or convenience (PICON).

II Proposal:

A. License Classes:

If the interest of the FCC is (as stated in the NPRM) streamlining of the licensing structure, then I propose that the license classes be reduced to two classes, namely "Basic" and "Advanced".

The "Basic" license would have an entry-level test (basic regulations, safety, operating procedures, basic DC and AC electronics). Without CW endorsement this class would have full frequency and mode privileges above 30MHz, power limited to 50W output.

The "Standard" license test would be of a difficulty level similar to the current Advanced class test, and would have full privileges above 30MHz at power levels up to 1500W.

B. Morse required for operation below 30MHz

Either license class could gain access to all MF/HF amateur radio frequency allocations (at 50W and 1500W respectively) upon passing a Morse test of 5WPM and gaining a "CW endorsement" for their operator license.

The Morse test should be "fill in the blank" or "1 minute of solid copy". Multiple-choice test formats should not be allowed.

C. Status of current licensees.

Current licensees should be redistributed as follows:

Current class	Converts to
Novice:	Basic CW Endorsed
Technician:	Basic
Technician+:	Basic CW Endorsed (Note 1)
General:	Advanced CW Endorsed
Advanced:	Advanced CW Endorsed (Note 2)
Extra:	Advanced CW Endorsed (Note 2)

Notes:
1) "Old" Technicians (who took same written test as General and 5WPM) would be "Standard" CW endorsed.

2) Current Advanced and Extra licensees could continue to have that class printed on their license in recognition of their previous status.

Respectfully submitted,

H. Hans Brakob, K0HB

3016. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 02:11:23 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <f99p8.2598$Un4.124887204@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38993

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a814t9fku2@208.206.142.79...

> And you're still a lying SOB. A nocoder as defined by ME includes YOU.

You're not a very nice person. How Val missed this is beyond me.

3017. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 02:12:32 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <ka9p8.2599$gc4.124332101@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38994

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020329154403.00997.00001236@mb-cu.aol.com...
> >CBer." Hmmmm....OH, you mean the group of people with whom the worst you
> >personify so well. Got it!
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> No, I mean lossers like you who couldnt obtain a License, until the
standards
> were lowered.

Hey Bruce, Val just got his licesne and has been reading this newsgroup
since '98. What would you like to say to him?

3018. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 02:15:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA51FC7.F8A7DF00@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38995

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >You realize that you just violated The Amateur's Creed.
>
> Who cares, Ham Radio is joke anymore anyway.

Well, I care about my hobby, Bruce. And I should have said,
"The Amateur's Code". Do you think The Amateur's Code is
outdated? Do you think we should now be inconsiderate,
disloyal, unprogressive, unfriendly, unbalanced, and
unpatriotic?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3019. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 02:17:01 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <xe9p8.2603$Jq4.125027759@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38996

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:n_Mo8.2366
> Perform this experiment, if you will. Turn on your HF rig and
> tune it to 14.150MHz when 20M has a lot of US signals
> at your location. Put on a blindfold and slowly increment
> the receive frequency. Based on the operator skill, the
> technical content of the conversation, and signal quality
> see if you can detect when you have tuned to 14.175 (the
> end of the Extra exclusive portion). Then blindfold yourself
> again and see if you can tell when you have tuned to the
> top end of the Advanced portion.
>
> If incentive licensing has been a success, the boundaries
> on the band between license classes ought to be apparent
> to the most casual observer. Unfortunately, they are
> undetectable by the criteria I mention, therefore we must
> conclude that incentive licensing is a failure.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Perfect. I like it!

3020. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 02:18:46 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <ag9p8.2609$ym4.124830005@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 38997

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a80q87hml5@208.206.142.79...
>
>
> K0HB wrote:
> >
> > If incentive licensing has been a success, the boundaries
> > on the band between license classes ought to be apparent
> > to the most casual observer. Unfortunately, they are
> > undetectable by the criteria I mention, therefore we must
> > conclude that incentive licensing is a failure.
>
> So you insist that what one hears on the bands is the sole criteria of
> whether or not Incentive Licensing was successful. What a crock. You
> would insist that the only things one can know, all one's learned
> capabilities and gained skills are clearly identifiable by his on the
> air chatter, even though he may be chatting with someone who might have
> little or no such knowledge and capability? Hans, I'm really surprised
> at you. I thought you were smarter than that.
> What one has in his library that he studies and learns, his workshop
> ant what he had learned to produce in it, the antennas he builds rather
> than buy, none of those things, among many more, could ever be detected
> by your inane methodology.

If there is no measurable difference in segregating amateurs, then there is
no purpose in it.

3021. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 02:23:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA521BA.477B90A8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 38998

Mike Coslo wrote:
> That's too bad Cecil. You don't know the great pleasure that can be
> derived from a really good challenge! 8^)

I've never been challenged, Mike, unless you consider "Go soak your head!" to be a challenge. In high school basketball, I would coast through three quarters while keeping the score relatively close. Then when everyone else was tired, I would explode in the fourth quarter. The coach called it my second wind. I never told him it was my first.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3022. Dont miss it Re: Special free gift

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 02:24:44 UTC
From: michele1975flynn@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <f35a60a7.0203291824.185549a1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 38999

Yup is Free.

Regards sandy

> Oh is cute. I love it very much! Thanks! ~ Ann :)
>
>>Hi,
>>
>> I got a Free Pocket Teddy Bear for my child. It is very cute and my
>> child loves it! Hurry up and get one for yourself while it is still
>> available.
>>
>> http://track.floppybank.com/click-21953-81562
>>
>> Get one now before it is too late. :-)

3023. Re: No coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 02:25:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA52206.89D1FC9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39000

Mike Coslo wrote:
> What are you no-coders doing to benefit the ARS?

Gaining pleasure from it just like the coded hams.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3024. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 02:26:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA5225A.F7805E7A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39001

Dick Carroll wrote:
> "Power"??? what a joke you are. Where has ever been any "power" in a
> ham radio license of any level?

The power you gained that allowed you to rest on your laurels after
your Extra license.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3025. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 02:28:06 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Vo9p8.2617$Mx4.125378941@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39002

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:EM5p8.719$ml2.57256@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote>
>
> > It might also include Hans Brakob but his past is a bit confused
> > since he has claimed (in private) a "college degree" either before
> > or during his USN active duty...but never achieved a commission
> > possible with such a degree, just a Master Chief Petty Officer
> > rating.
>
> Purdue NESEP did not teach Morse code, and graduates were
> not required to accept commissions. Most E8 and E9 participants
> declined O2 status and the hazing being a of mustang junior officer.
>
> Sorry if that offends the ex-RA enlisted grades.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Hell, I declined membership in the Chief's group as I didn't want to put up with their hazing rituals.

Brian

3026. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 02:32:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA523B8.6D44E11C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39003

Dick Carroll wrote:
> "My observation was out of control". Gee, I didn't know I had any
> control over radio wave propagation and the vagaries of operation at HF.
> MY control lies on my end of the RF circuit. Tell us, O Guru, just how
> do you do it?

If I were going to compare modes, I would normalize the throughput, the
power, and the bandwidth. That means gathering data and processing it
in a rational technical manner, something to which you seem to be allergic.

Assuming your CW and PSK31 used the same power, CW should have about
a 5:1 advantage over PSK31 based on Shannon's Theorem. So where's
the crack?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3027. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 02:34:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA5241C.E626B2F2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39004

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Ah, gee Old Boy, and what was it that kept YOU down?
> >
> > Nothing ever kept me down, Dick. Everything I have ever
> > attempted was easy for me. My motto has always been:
> > "Work Smarter, Not Harder!"
>
> And if you can't BS your way through it, destroy it. We see.

I don't believe in destroying things like you do, Dick. If something
is too hard, I simply go around it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3028. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 02:35:08 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <wv9p8.1229$nt1.117467@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39005

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote

> Lose the "Advanced" name, it reminds me of incentive licensing
> for some reason.

It appeals to old guys.

> CW endorsements can go away too.

Currently required by ITU.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3029. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 02:36:24 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Iw9p8.1232$nt1.117719@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39006

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote

>
> You're not a very nice person. How Val missed this is beyond me.
>

Val is very busy posturing. Please do not disturb him.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3030. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 02:37:45 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Zx9p8.1236$nt1.117688@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39007

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote

>
> Hey Bruce, Val just got his licesne and has been reading this newsgroup
> since '98. What would you like to say to him?
>

I'd like to tell him to lighten up and quit taking this so seriously. He's getting all puffed up about nothing.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3031. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 02:38:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA52535.1B4C9E7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39008

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > I was diagnosed by a clinical psychologist as having an aural handicap.
> > You know that yet you continue to heap abuse upon me.
>
> I also know well that you manufacture a new story to fit every
> circumstance and need.

It's a years old story, Dick, that I have related many times.
I had some damage to the left side of my head in the wreck
in which my wife and baby were killed. It affected my speech
processing capabilities.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3032. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 02:39:59 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <3A9p8.2631$tG4.125830184@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39009

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a828as$r9n$0@208.207.71.137...
>

> Oh, I believe the nocode tech license should have never happened, I
> have no problem stating that up front. But it did, and I helped it by
> testing many into the license.

Dick, have you never stood by your convictions? If you believed the NCT
license was wrong, why did you aid the government in licensing them? Now
you complain about it. Take it to Oprah or Judge Judy.

3033. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 02:41:08 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <8B9p8.1246$nt1.118531@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39010

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote

>
> Hell, I declined membership in the Chief's group

Gee, how did I guess you would!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3034. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 02:42:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA5260C.D378A6B8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39011

> Brian P Burke wrote:
> Hans, I knew that in time I'd come around to your way of thinking.

Hey Brian, how about turning off your HTML.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3035. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 02:46:36 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <gG9p8.2634$QK4.126049740@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39012

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:MbPo8.2625$BT6.221964@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
> > My timetable sez 2004.
>
> You are not a regulator so your timetable has no influence.
>
> Good luck anyhow.
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Bill has a little Voodoo doll of that Powell kid. If he says 2004, then
it'll probably happen in 2004.

3036. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 02:47:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CA52735.742B60EB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39013

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3CA46DDB.C7729733@earthlink.net...
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3CA2A5A7.B157CB21@earthlink.net...
> > > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > The former military and commercial ditty-boppers who were paid to
> learn
> > > > code
> > > > > then come on here and proceed to tell the rest of us why its so
> great
> > > really
> > > > > frost my ass. Its imperative that the government keep their welfare
> QSO
> > > > > system going so that we can revere their greatness. Well, I'm not
> > > > > impressed.
> > > > >
> > > > > Brian
> > > >
> > > > So you're just some geek with a cold ass, huh?
> > >
> > > ??? You doing a finger test?
> >
> > Excuse me? You are the one who gave us a temperature readout on your
> > posterior.
>
> Stay away from my ass, Dave. I saw Deliverance, and I know where it was
> filmed.

It would appear that you do not know where it was filmed.

> > > > I have to confess that I
> > > > learned my morse while in uniform, Brian. Of course it was a Cub
> Scout
> > > > uniform and the pay was awful.
> > >
> > > A Cub Scout is neither a military nor a commercial radio operator, but
> maybe
> > > you didn't know that.
> >
> > Yeah, I knew that. What I couldn't understand is who you were talking

> > about. You know--those guys who were paid to learn morse. Where are
> > they who cause you numbness of the gluteus maximus?
>
> They're here. You figure it out. Might be some Cub Scouts here also.
> We'll let you figure that one out, too.

You made the claim. I shouldn't have to figure it out. Where are these folks you speak of?

> > > > I don't give a hoot if you're impressed or not.
> > >
> > > Good, cause I didn't hear a "Hoot." And I'm still not impressed.
> >
> > And I still don't care.
>
> But you still reply. Stop caring.

I'd just like to see some facts to back your statement. It would appear that there are no individuals here who were paid to learn morse code.

Dave K8MN

3037. Re: Morse Code Remembered

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 02:49:27 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <XI9p8.2640$BM4.126143753@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39014

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0203282117.6965021b@posting.google.com...

> Yes, my friends, MORSE CODE sank the Kursk.

Its about to sink the ship Lollipop, too.

Welcome back. I've been absent, too. Nothing seems to have changed much.

73, Brian

3038. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 02:54:03 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a839pjasa1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39016

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a8268e$m7f$0@208.207.71.137...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
>
> I then said: "Perhaps increasing power, running
> > a slower PSK rate, developing more robust coding schemes, etc."
> > That point you can ignore if you want...others can and will
> > think it through, do the work and help evolve the technology
> > such that future incidents won't result in a need to change modes.
>
> If you'd been paying attention you would know that I had no control of
> what the other stations were doing, no way to alter any condition. Above
> speil remains useless.

That's the point...the lesson to be learned...the
post event review to see how to do it better
in the future.

> > And, in the end....nothing said here indicates any "crack" or
> > hole in Shannon's law.
> >
> Un-huh. And what I said is "Could there be a crack in Shannon's
> theory" relating to real world communications?

Well... do tell us all. Is it or is it not your contention
that there's soimething amiss with Shannon's law based on your
personal experience?

> When the most efficient
> mode fails and the least efficient works, something smells, and all the
> explaining and rationalization you can do won't alter the facts.

Your words here tell anyone with even the slightest familiarity
with labratory and/or testing that you don't have a clue what
you are talking about. You are, as Cecil has pointed out, NOT
comparing the same conditions.

> We know
> what Shannon found. We also know that it has meaning in design and
> explanation of systems, and indeed does explain why I saw what I did
> that morning.

So I ask again... Is it or is it not your contention
that there's soimething amiss with Shannon's law based on your
personal experience?

> But it didn't do a thing toward solving the instant
> communications problem, which you and Cecil have a real problem
> understanding for some reason.

Shannon's law is not intended to do anything for you. It
explains limits. Your post event comparison lacks
the qualitative statements as to the different variables being
compared.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3039. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 02:55:26 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329215526.10667.00001174@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 39015

>Bruce, post you wedding license. I want to see what state allowed you to
>marry your sister.
>

Ask your mama she will tell you son.

3040. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 02:56:33 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329215633.10667.00001175@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 39017

>Hey Bruce, Val just got his licesne and has been reading this newsgroup
>since '98. What would you like to say to him?
>

Nothing, if I wanted to I would

3041. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 03:00:54 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329220054.10667.00001178@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 39018

> Do you think The Amateur's Code is
>outdated?

Of course its a JOKE, just like Ham Radio has become. The best thing the FCC could do is sell the Freqs off to some service that could make good use of them.

3042. Re: No coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 03:02:00 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329220200.10667.00001179@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 39019

>Gaining pleasure from it just like the coded hams.
>--
>cheers, CAM

Are you a No-Coded HAM?

3043. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 03:12:46 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <O2ap8.2656$Y15.127042903@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39020

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:ua77phb42gmq71@corp.supernews.com...
>
> mike coslo wrote:

> For this reason I won't be replying
> to them very damned often in the future.

I thought you wouldn't be bothering us at all.

> >Plus there is one not so endearing quality from some of the
> >Procode crowd. That is the concept that "Extra Lites" such
> >as myself are considered second class citizens by so many
> >of them. I'm pro-code, but my inferior status in their eyes turns
> >me right off to thier cause.
>
> Well, what else can you expect from the people who have
> been in the field for many years and have had this system
> forced on them from above!

I expect civility from any ham, regardless of license class. If they've got
a problem with how the FCC runs this service, they can take it up with them.

> They played the FCC game
> by the rules and climbed the tree fair and square, most of
> them, and then saw the whole thing trivialized, first by the
> "waivers" and then by the other changes.

Does every driver out there who had to drive a stick or parallel park feel
SCREWED and take it out on the new drivers?

I'll bet that no ONE cares. I'll bet not ONE gives it any thought.

Now if the DMV made me do something arbitrary, stupid, and/or irrelevant in
order to get my license...

I'd petition my government to change it instead of insisting that all future
generations must also do something arbitrary, stupid, and/or irrelevant.

> It does not matter
> whether these changes are "better" or "worse" for Ham
> Radio or World Peace, or whatever, the particpants in the
> old system, many of them, are going to be disgruntled.

Then they can go kick their dogs. Just don't try kicking me.

> > I would tell a prospective ham that learning Morse code is
> >a worthwhile thing, they just need to buckle down and do it,

> >and once they learned it, they could be proud of the
> >accomplishment. But I wouldn't send them into this fray,
> >for sure 8^)
>
> Now THIS I can totally agree with!! :-)
>
> Val

After lurking since '98 you come on here asking questions as if you're a newbie, but you had all the answers in your hip pocket. You were simply setting the stage for being "outraged" then call someone an asswipe and stomp away pouting. Typical lib tactic.

By the way, there's no callsign for you at QRZ.

Brian

3044. Re: QRe: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 03:13:45 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <J3ap8.2657$U15.127040631@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39021

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3ca3dcc4_2@newsa.ev1.net...

> Good grief, you're so syrupy above I can't help but wonder who you are
> trying to impress...

The guy down the street.

3045. Re: Long Reply to N2EY's Long Reply!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 03:15:35 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a83ar6$3o2$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39024

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA4B9D9.E1C4DA5@IEEE.org...
> Valentine Germann wrote:
> > Just like if you require all drivers to use a stick shift
> > For their driving test, some will like it and buy stick shift
> > cars instead of automatics.
>
> I don't know of any states that require a stick shift test. It
> is not the purpose of government to preserve historical legacies.

Cecil is correct...No state in the USA requires a stick shift driving test.

> > I think CW is part of the historical legacy
> > of amateur radio and is now UNIQUE to amateur radio, and so is worth
> > protecting and encouraging, at the highest level.]]
>
> It is not the purpose of government to preserve a historical
> legacy. That falls upon the individual members of the ARS like
> you and me.

Right again.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3046. Re: No coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 03:16:49 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a83ar7$3o2$2@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39023

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3CA503EF.AEB8C4AB@adelphia.net...
> What are you no-coders doing to benefit the ARS?

The same things coded hams do. We engage in all
the various pursuits as each individual sees fit. Do you
doubt that?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3047. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 03:19:58 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <y9ap8.2661$C45.127188274@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39025

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:wv9p8.1229$nt1.117467@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote
>
> > Lose the "Advanced" name, it reminds me of incentive licensing
> > for some reason.
>
> It appeals to old guys.

Wouldn't you like it to appeal to younger folks?

> > CW endorsements can go away too.
>
> Currently required by ITU.

Get an exemption like Japan.

3048. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 03:22:11 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Dbap8.2663$Z75.127357291@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39028

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA5260C.D378A6B8@IEEE.org...
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > Hans, I knew that in time I'd come around to your way of thinking.
>
> Hey Brian, how about turning off your HTML.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Did it work? Brian

3049. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 03:23:37 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Ycap8.2664$w25.127075784@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39029

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:Iw9p8.1232$nt1.117719@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote
>
> >
> > You're not a very nice person. How Val missed this is beyond me.
> >
>
> Val is very busy posturing. Please do not disturb him.

Like them guys in front of the big mirrors at the Gym? I leave them alone,
too.

3050. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 03:27:06 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <egap8.2668$F75.127340992@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39031

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020329215633.10667.00001175@mb-fo.aol.com...
> >Hey Bruce, Val just got his licesne and has been reading this newsgroup
> >since '98. What would you like to say to him?
>
> Nothing, if I wanted to I would

Bruse said, "No, I mean lossers like you who couldnt obtain a License, until
the standards
were lowered."

Yet Kim has had her license longer than Val, who says he's still waiting on
his. But Kim is the "losser."

Your double standard is just as wide as Val's.

3051. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 03:33:52 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <zmap8.2672$5f5.127715459@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39033

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3CA52735.742B60EB@earthlink.net...

> > > > > I don't give a hoot if you're impressed or not.
> > > > >
> > > > > Good, cause I didn't hear a "Hoot." And I'm still not impressed.
> > > >
> > > > And I still don't care.
> > >
> > > But you still reply. Stop caring.
> >
> > I'd just like to see some facts to back your statement. It would appear
> > that there are no individuals here who were paid to learn morse code.
> >
> > Dave K8MN

Sure there are.

3052. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 03:40:58 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <etap8.2676$sa5.127482939@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39035

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3ca52fd0$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3CA51FC7.F8A7DF00@IEEE.org...
> > WA8ULX wrote:
> > >
> > > >You realize that you just violated The Amateur's Creed.
> > >
> > > Who cares, Ham Radio is joke anymore anyway.
> >
> > Well, I care about my hobby, Bruce. And I should have said,
> > "The Amateur's Code". Do you think The Amateur's Code is
> > outdated? Do you think we should now be inconsiderate,
> > disloyal, unprogressive, unfriendly, unbalanced, and
> > unpatriotic?
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
>
> Dick sets the example and...well, Bruce is jumping into it with both feet.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Kissing cousins. It was cute when Elvis did it.

3053. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 03:42:53 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <1vap8.2679$od5.127625270@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39036

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3ca52e69_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> The semicolon is where he had to think about what he was going to
> say...ppppfffttttt! :)
>
> Kim W5TIT

I only wonder what the familial relationship was between his mother and
father.

3054. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 03:57:11 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <rlap8.2689$Ax5.128692625@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39037

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3ca53297$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> D'ya 'spect anything more from a man who professes to "hate" CBers, yet
> sounds very much like the worst of the CB crop? (not all CBers are bad)
> D'ya spect him to display anything different, based on the lack of
intellect
> displayed thusfar in his postings?
>
> I mean, the guy can't even communicate without poor use of English, which
> really isn't all that bad if he had something important to say. But his
> sentence structure is horrific and, most of all, he attempts to say
nothing
> important. My guess is he sits in the nude (yyyyyyyyuckkkk) in front of
his
> computer with his 6-pack right close by, and probably picked up his
welfare
> check yesterday.
>
> Kim W5TIT

If he got his check yesterday he'd have more than a six pack. And I'd hate to put down CBers so severely as lumping him in with them.

But he did come on here and ask, "If a CBer marries a Tech, is she still his sister?" And upon looking up his last name in QRZ there was a female with a Tech license... So I just assumed that he was the CBer.

3055. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 04:09:04 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ATap8.1256$ml2.127995@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39038

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote

>
> Wouldn't you like it to appeal to younger folks?
>

Hopefully the structure would appeal to new folks
and the "Advanced" label would strike a chord with
existing licensees, thus tempering opposition. Also,
Canada has already set the "Basic - Advanced" precedent
in their two-category system, so there's a sense of uniformity
in the choice.

If you are 'put off' by a license label, then I guess
I have to believe you aren't really interested in
progress, but only picking at details for the sake
of picking at details.

>
> Get an exemption like Japan.
>

Japan doesn't have an exemption. Their full
priv HF people take Morse tests. They limit
their 'no-code HF' people to 10W and just
a couple of bands, then tell ITU that these
restrictions are intended to contain the
operations within JA.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3056. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 04:11:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA53AD7.F62D7885@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39039

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> > Do you think The Amateur's Code is
> >outdated?
>
> Of course its a JOKE, just like Ham Radio has become. The best thing the FCC
> could do is sell the Freqs off to some service that could make good use of
> them.

I said there were hams with that attitude the other day and Dick
called me a liar.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3057. Re: No coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 04:14:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA53BBD.B45830B2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39040

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >Gaining pleasure from it just like the coded hams.
> >--
> >cheers, CAM
>
> Are you a No-Coded HAM?

I consider myself a coded ham but I know a lot of nocode
techs who are having fun in the hobby. The point is that
all active hams, coded or not, gain pleasure from the hobby.
Otherwise, they wouldn't have chosen to be hams.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3058. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 04:16:26 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <u_ap8.1271$ml2.129399@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39041

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote

>
> Sure there are.
>

You seem unable to identify any, but hide behind a
sophomoric "if you don't remember, I'm not going
to tell you, neener, neener, neener" facade. That
pretty much discounts your assertion that they are
here frosting your ass on rrap.

Good luck with this one now.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3059. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 04:17:01 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329231701.02283.00001253@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 39042

>I have been licensed since 1994, am a Tech+ and always
>have been.

WOW how Impressive a TECH PLUS

3060. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 04:18:37 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329231837.02283.00001254@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 39044

>So, who gets your CB amplifier?
>
>Kim W5TIT
>

I wouldnt know since I have never had an Amplifier

3061. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 04:19:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA53CBC.8D72CA2C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39043

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3CA5260C.D378A6B8@IEEE.org...
> > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > Hans, I knew that in time I'd come around to your way of thinking.
> >
> > Hey Brian, how about turning off your HTML.
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> Did it work? Brian

Yep, thanks, my newsreader barfs on HTML. It displays all the
<h3>...</h3> embedded stuff.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3062. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 04:21:19 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329232119.02283.00001255@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 39045

> familial relationship

Hey brain dead what is the above supposed to be.

3063. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 04:24:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA53E19.5FA72B0D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39046

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >So, who gets your CB amplifier?
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> I wouldnt know since I have never had an Amplifier

If you have a transceiver, it has a number of amplifiers in it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3064. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 04:26:00 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329232600.02283.00001256@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 39047

>Gads, this guy's hilarious.
>
>Kim W5TIT

And so is your Buddy Carl. But what really is amazing is, why your Buddy Carl didnt say that 98% of members of No Clue International are Coded Hams. He cant prove 52%.

3065. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 04:27:55 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329232755.02283.00001257@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 39048

>Kissing cousins. It was cute when Elvis did it.
>

Its still cute when your mother does it.

3066. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 04:30:47 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329233047.02283.00001258@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 39049

>My guess is he sits in the nude (yyyyyyyyuckkkk) in front of his
>computer with his 6-pack right close by, and probably picked up his welfare
>check yesterday.
>
>Kim W5TIT

No I set on the toilet and use your picture for Toilet Paper

3067. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 04:32:13 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329233213.02283.00001259@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 39050

>Tech license... So I just assumed that he was the CBer.

Your mother is a CBer

3068. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 04:34:20 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329233420.02283.00001260@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 39051

>I said there were hams with that attitude the other day and Dick
>called me a liar.
>--
>cheers, CAM

I cant speak for Dick, but there are alot who would just rather see Ham Radio disappear.

3069. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 04:36:39 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020329233639.02258.00001209@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 39052

>If you have a transceiver, it has a number of amplifiers in it.
>--

WOW arent you the Techno Whizzard

3070. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 04:43:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA54267.667DC745@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39053

WA8ULX wrote:
> >If you have a transceiver, it has a number of amplifiers in it.
>
> WOW arent you the Techno Whizzard

Well, you said you never had an amplifier. Just didn't want you
to feel sad and left out.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3071. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 05:10:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020330001009.00376.00000266@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 39055

In article <a81ptj$j2n$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>news:a80q8phmla@208.206.142.79...
>>
>>
>> CAM wrote:
>> > nobody had more frequency privileges than I did
>> > as a Conditional in 1952.
>>
>> That was an FCC mistake they soon saw reason to recitify.
>
>Soon? 1967/8...thats 15/16 years by my math. Almost a generation.
>And, the conditional preceeded 1952 by a year or too if I recall
>the history correctly (Jim N2EY can clarify).
>
Here's what really happened:

Before 1951, the "incentive system" was based on modes. If you wanted to use 'phone on the ham bands between 3 and 25 MHz you needed a Class A. All other privs were granted to Class B and C hams. (B was FCC test and C was by mail). Getting a Class A required a year's experience as a Class B or C and another written test. Class C hams had to retake the Class B exams, too.

The 1951 restructuring gave us the new Novice, Tech and Extra, and renamed the old ABC licenses as Advanced, General and Conditional. The incentive system was expanded by this restructuring. FCC put some real teeth into the full privs requirements by closing the Advanced at the end of 1952.

But for some reason FCC changed its collective mind at the last minute and instead of increasing the requirements for full privs they simply gave all privs to all hams except Novices and Techs. This was done despite the fact that the 1951 restructuring had been worked out in detail over a period of years.

In 1958 the FCC started asking for ideas on how to get hams to go for the Extra. They got serious about the changes in 1963, when the FCC asked for restructuring ideas (and got a whole pile of them). The final result, after many proposals and counter proposals, went into effect in three stages starting in 1967.

Note that:

- there has been some sort of incentive system since at least the end of WW2 (57 years)
- the period of all privs to all classes except Novice and Tech lasted less

than 17 years (Feb 1953 to Nov 1968)
- the FCC currently thinks that three levels of incentive is right for the ARS.
- the FCC, not hams, instigated both the 1952 "Christmas present" and the
late-'60s "incentive licensing" changes.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3072. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 05:10:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020330001010.00376.00000267@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 39054

In article <3CA3ACCE.A09A040@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> An incentive system and a caste system are polar opposites.
>
>The level of achievement in an incentive system creates a
>pecking order which I am calling a type of caste system.

And that's a mistake. "Caste" and "level of achievement" mean opposite things.

>It is understandable to do that for a profit-making business
>but why do that inside a hobby for amateurs?

The alternative is to place no value on achievement. That's a bad thing.

73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Jim, N2EY

3073. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 05:24:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a83i5t$l2l$0@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 39056

CAM wrote:
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
> > That's too bad Cecil. You don't know the great pleasure that can be
> > derived from a really good challenge! 8^)
>
> I've never been challenged, Mike, unless you consider "Go soak your
> head!" to be a challenge. In high school basketball, I would coast
> through three quarters while keeping the score relatively close.
> Then when everyone else was tired, I would explode in the fourth
> quarter. The coach called it my second wind. I never told him it
> was my first.
>

Ayup, that's our boy. Another setting, another "top dog" story.

3074. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 05:25:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a83i8a$l2l$1@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 39057

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > "Power"??? what a joke you are. Where has ever been any "power" in a
> > ham radio license of any level?
>
> The power you gained that allowed you to rest on your laurels after
> your Extra license.

O. IC. Power that allowed me to never again have to take a ham radio test. That is a real nuker.

3075. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 05:28:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a83idc$l2l$2@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 39058

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > "My observation was out of control". Gee, I didn't know I had any
> > control over radio wave propagation and the vagaries of operation at HF.
> > MY control lies on my end of the RF circuit. Tell us, O Guru, just how
> > do you do it?
>
> If I were going to compare modes, I would normalize the throughput, the
> power, and the bandwidth. That means gathering data and processing it
> in a rational technical manner, something to which you seem to be allergic.
>

While you're going through all your gymnastics, I'll be working the other stations on the air. I'm a ham, not a scientist. When I'm on the air I find no reason to do scientific mode research, in fact it would definitely get in the way of copying CW. Maybe that's a part of your problem-you can't focus.

3076. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 05:29:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a83ifj$l2l$3@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 39059

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > Ah, gee Old Boy, and what was it that kept YOU down?
> > >
> > > Nothing ever kept me down, Dick. Everything I have ever
> > > attempted was easy for me. My motto has always been:
> > > "Work Smarter, Not Harder!"
> >
> > And if you can't BS your way through it, destroy it. We see.
>
> I don't believe in destroying things like you do, Dick. If something
> is too hard, I simply go around it.

More likely just avoid it, like you did the Extra exam, until they made
it a gimmee.

3077. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 05:50:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a83jni$pv6$0@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 39060

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > Then why did you reference Shannon as somehow not fitting reality?
> >
> > Because it DIDN'T fit reality!
>
> Please explain in detail how Shannon's Theorem doesn't fit reality.
> You will become world famous if you are correct.
>
> The fact is that Shannon was right on. The reason that you could read
> CW and your computer couldn't read PSK31 is that PSK31 operates much
> closer to Shannon's limit than does CW. So your observation matches
> Shannon's Theorum exactly. Sorry you are so confused about what happened.

Of course Shannon knew what he was talking about! But Shannon wasn't
there that morning, trying to copy messages. I was. Shannon's facts
about communications systems contributed not a thing to communications
that morning. Ancient CW did. That is part of the problem with blithely
assuming that the most efficient mode will be the mode of choice. Nature
has its own way of upsetting your best laid plans. You say that CW
couldn't be copied through the same filter that _PSK had to pass
through. Ed Hare says you're wrong. I believe him before I believe you.
So your tidy digital package fails to perform. Gee, Too bad. Get on CW.

3078. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 05:54:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA552FB.78E481EA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39061

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >The level of achievement in an incentive system creates a
> >pecking order which I am calling a type of caste system.
>
> And that's a mistake. "Caste" and "level of achievement" mean opposite things.

No they don't, Jim. In most companies, there exists a caste system based
on achievement (top management Vs janitors). From Webster's: "caste -
any rigid system of social distinction" Within Intel, for instance,
there is a rigid system of social distinction based on grade levels.
I was a level 8. My boss was a level 10. My techs were level 6.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3079. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 05:57:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA553BA.4D378755@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39062

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > "Power"??? what a joke you are. Where has ever been any "power" in a
> > > ham radio license of any level?
> >
> > The power you gained that allowed you to rest on your laurels after
> > your Extra license.
>
> O. IC. Power that allowed me to never again have to take a ham radio
> test. That is a real nuker.

More like a sledgehammer that you try to wield on this newsgroup and
probably in your everyday life.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3080. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 05:59:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA55425.5F079C0E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39063

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > If I were going to compare modes, I would normalize the throughput, the
> > power, and the bandwidth. That means gathering data and processing it
> > in a rational technical manner, something to which you seem to be allergic.
>
> While you're going through all your gymnastics, I'll be working the
> other stations on the air.

Yep, ham radio is filled with button pushers and that's too bad.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3081. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 06:02:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA554DE.C369AB3C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39064

Dick Carroll wrote:
> More likely just avoid it, like you did the Extra exam, until they made
> it a gimmee.

It was a gimmee for me, Dick. Too bad about you.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3082. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 06:09:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA5568D.1DA40327@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39065

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Of course Shannon knew what he was talking about! But Shannon wasn't
> there that morning, trying to copy messages. I was. Shannon's facts
> about communications systems contributed not a thing to communications
> that morning.

It certainly could have contributed to your knowledge but you seem to
reject knowledge with a passion usually reserved for nocoders.

> You say that CW
> couldn't be copied through the same filter that _PSK had to pass
> through. Ed Hare says you're wrong. I believe him before I believe you.

Ed was wrong if he believes that bandwidth, power, throughput, and
Shannon's Theorem are unimportant. Shannon's Theorem tells us exactly
why CW got through and PSK31 didn't. PSK31 operates a lot closer to
Shannon's limit than does CW. Again, assuming the same power, you
have to copy 50wpm CW through a 31 Hz filter to do a valid comparison
of the two modes. If CW and PSK31 are operated equidistant from
Shannon's limit, PSK will invariably win the contest.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3083. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 06:17:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020330011723.13743.00001262@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 39068

>Subject: Re: 15wpm hump
>From: "K0HB" K0HB@earthlink.net
>Date: 03/29/02 12:23 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <Oq1p8.241$ml2.24921@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>Bwahahahahahahahahahahahah!

That's what I thought. Sucks to be you.

Steve

3084. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 06:33:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020330013319.13743.00001264@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 39071

>Subject: Re: Question Pools and Such!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 03/29/02 14:55 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <20020329145508.20744.00000106@mb-mm.aol.com>

>It is a stupid and senseless argument to argue that voice modes
>in public safety radio services are "lesser" than OOK CW on some
>basis of money and "human resources" when it comes to either
>protection from harm or safety of life.

Then stop being stupid and senseless, Lennie. No one was talking about
"public service" communications.

>> My earlier premise that Morse is a dependable mode is not in contention
>by
>>ANYONE who has employed it. It's simply an "expensive" mode in terms of
>>keeping operators on staff.
>
>That is not a premise but a rationalization. A rather poor one.

Oh? It's not correct? You can prove otherwise?

>That is simply a form of bragging by touting that a skilled manual
>telegrapher should still be employed as a telegrapher because
>they are so good at it.

That's not what was said. Nice try at redirect...failed, but nice try.

>The above is extended to insist that morse code testing must
>be kept because all the long-time radio amateurs passed such
>a test and became proficient at it.

That's YOUR arguement and I see you are sticking with it. It's NOT what
>I< said, but nice try anyway, Lennie.

>All radio, no exceptions, utilize the same radio physics in
>operation and propagation. The electronics technology used in
>all radio is the same.

No one has said otherwise, Your Repetitiveness...What was the point?

>US amateur radio is one of the most open and publicized
>of hobbies.

HOLD YOUR HORSES LENNIE! >>YOU<< have repeatedly argued the OPPOSITE!
NOW what has changed YOUR mind...?!?! I agree that it IS open and a fairly
well known radio service, but YOU have staed otherwise in numerous threads!

A new rant rates a new spin, does it...?!?!

>The continued comment
>that "no one can possibly 'know' anything about amateur radio
>without having 'practical experience' in it" is a ridiculous
>fabrication.

YOUR continued demonstration of complete ignorance of Amateur Radio
PRACTICE...not PHYSICS, proves otherwise.

"Practice" and "physics" are two different animals. I have repeatedly
stated that I bow to your knowedge of what makes the box work. However YOU do
not know HOW to use the box...at least in Amateur practice.

> Reality is often uncomfortable, but it is still reality.

You should know.

Steve

3085. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 06:43:15 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020330014315.00568.00001381@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 39072

>I think the assumption is probably accurate... ;>
>
>Kim W5TIT

Bite me TIT

3086. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 06:46:03 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020330014603.00568.00001382@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 39073

>It's really no big deal.
>
>Kim W5TIT
>
>

We know it isnt, any 3rd grader could memorize enough in 2Hrs to be a Tech plus.

3087. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 06:47:15 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020330014715.00568.00001383@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 39074

>Do you hold the ARRL to the same "proof" standards that you do
>NCI?
>
>Kim W5TIT

Yes I do, and for your info ARRL is also useless.

3088. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 06:56:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020330015629.00944.00000395@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 39075

In article <ua6mtnj2dbifa3@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>Now, one might expect this kind of thing among the lower-rent types one sees
>a lot on UseNet, but I was startled five years ago to see it on THIS
>newsgroup, and I am still startled today. For a while I again got caught up
>in the free-for-all but now, after only a few weeks "back" on this group, I
>am simply appalled at the abounding bad faith, and so will not respond
>anymore to most of those who spew on this board about the horrors of CW. I
>know SO many will be SO disappointed -- NOT!

Val:

I hope you do continue to post here, because you seem to possess the
ability to analyze the code/no-code debate in a refreshingly honest and fair
manner.

>For me personally CW is part and parcel of amateur radio and always will be.
>Now, with its commercial demise, it is UNIQUE to amateur radio, which is,
>for me a PLUS, since I am of a historical bent and, like many people, prefer
>to BE "unique", if only in a small way. Add to this the idea that CW can be
>done on little power, with very simple equipment, and is understood around
>the world, and, well, it's hard for me NOT to advocate some testing here,
>especially for the very top of the tree, the EXTRA class.

Well, you and I agree on this, however, the debate is based on the
underlying jealousy of people who have failed, mainly through their
own indifference, laziness, or fear of failure, to succeed at the code
testing requirements -- and have thus germinated the debate based
on their own long-standing hatred of something they don't understand.

>The historical
>legacy of a group like Ham Radio IS important. It's part of the identity of
>the group. In light of this I can only view the viciousness of the
>anti-code types as a true psychological problem, one existing within THEIR
>heads.

No truer words have ever been written.

>Like so many in our society today, jealousy has taken over their
>minds in this area and they have thus ceased to speak and act in a rational
>way, much of the time, where this issue is concerned.

Yes, and that jealousy has ripened into the kind of visceral hatred of
anyone who is able to achieve something through their initiative and
perseverence. They are truly lazy, and have a murderous resentment
of those who are not, and have profited from their ambition.

>I don't see one thing wrong with code testing, and incentive licensing, for
>many reasons, NONE of which have anything to do with "hazing" or any crap
>like that.

No, actually, Incentive Licensing was one of the things the ARRL did right
in it's heyday. With the loss of the leadership which brought that concept
to ham radio, and the replacement with the Politically Correct culture which
prefers to pander to the lowest common denominator, we now have a
permanently Balkanized ARS.

>In my view, "arguments" like the "hazing" dodge have lowered the
>intellectual content of the whole debate, which I think was the actual
>intent.

The term "Morse hazing ritual" is one which is carefully calculated to
generate an extreme emotional response, for the sole purpose of trying
to break the debate down to the level of downshouting which the NCTA
seems to prefer, since they cannot defend their position in a more
reasonable and logical way.

>That is, to me the whole "anti-code" crowd has seized on code as a
>stalking dog for a bad-faith attack on incentive licensing based on what
>amounts to jealousy. That's my view. And because so much of the anti-code
>effort has been driven by this jealousy and bad faith, the debate has been
>marked by the viciousness we see, now on both sides, to a disturbing extent.

And it has always been that way. I got sucked into this debate over a
decade ago when I was accused of "ethnic cleansing" by a no-coder on the
old Fidonet Ham Radio echo.

>So today, in the spring of 2002, the code battle is over, or soon will be.
>But what will come next, since the REAL reasons for the anti-code jealousies
>remain?

What comes next is the conversion of the Novice/Tech sub-bands to
more room for HF phone. There is where Ham Radio will really get a
bloody nose, as the code-tested HF phone jockeys vent their outrage
on the new codeless phone jockeys. The whole thing is about the
power of personal projection with instant gratification that only comes
from talking into a microphone and being heard over vast distances.
The code testing requirements either delayed people from achieving
that power, or kept it from them completely -- until now. Once they get
the power, and find out that it isn't all that great to begin with, the
real damage will be done. The code/no-code debate is all about HF
phone. This crap about "technical advancement" and "digital" is
just a smoke screen.

>I don't think we'll have to wait long to find out.
>
>Val

I think you're right.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3089. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 07:21:45 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020330022145.00564.00001485@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 39079

>I figured you to be built with enough blubber to bite your own tit.
>
>Kim W5TIT
>

I got a felling you probably have alot more Blubber hanging around you than I could ever have.

3090. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 07:24:51 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020330022451.00564.00001486@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 39080

>Yeah, pretty much. In fact, I've heard loads of 2nd-4th graders that are
>already Extras and really enjoy HF!
>

And your still a Tech Plus

>Your behavior toward
>other people really is atrocious.

Isnt that a shame, get use to it TIT

3091. Re: People who want to abolish the Code!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 07:25:50 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020330022550.00564.00001487@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 39081

>Get lost creep...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Bite me TIT

3092. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 08:18:01 UTC
From: Ed Ellers <ed_ellers@msn.com>
Message-ID: <a83sbr$pcgfg$1@ID-39509.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 39082
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:

"I've purchased from RS and never been asked for a ham license. 2m amp was bought on sale about 2 yrs ago. No questions asked."

No questions asked, sure, but I bet they'd deny the sale if someone came in and acted as though they intended to transmit without a license. Last time I heard, RadioShack's policy was not to *knowingly* sell products to those who intend to use them illegally.

3093. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 08:50:35 UTC
From: Randy <Anonymous@anon.com>
Message-ID: <a83u9b$o71$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 39083
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Ed Ellers" <ed_ellers@msn.com> wrote in message
news:a83sbr$pcgfg$1@ID-39509.news.dfncis.de...
> Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> "I've purchased from RS and never been asked for a ham license. 2m amp
was
> bought on sale about 2 yrs ago. No questions asked."
>
> No questions asked, sure, but I bet they'd deny the sale if someone came
in
> and acted as though they intended to transmit without a license. Last
time
> I heard, RadioShack's policy was not to *knowingly* sell products to those
> who intend to use them illegally.

I broached this topic with the ARRL and Rad Shack some years back. Both said that to deny sales of Ham rigs to anybody would be a violation of the free trade agreement.(Make that income from sales) Both said that mere posession of Ham radios, license or not, is not a violation. Transmitting without a license is. I also made my position known to W5YI and his response fell in line with the ARRL.
What they said in short is that anybody can buy a Ham radio from Rad Shack, AES, or any other supply house so long as they can pay for it. No proof of license needed.
The sale of Ham radios to non-licensed persons is not illegal.
Perhaps this line of thinking should be addressed but until it is you can look forward to unending "pirate" operations on the Ham bands.
I do find it rather odd that sales of amplifiers MUST be accompanied with the inclusion of the Ham's call sign as part of the purchase. Go figure.
Now you know why I refuse to belong to the ARRL or any of it's affiliates.
Why waste my money?

3094. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 13:09:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020330080954.19000.00000224@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 39084

In article <3CA552FB.78E481EA@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >The level of achievement in an incentive system creates a
>> >pecking order which I am calling a type of caste system.
>>
>> And that's a mistake. "Caste" and "level of achievement" mean opposite
>things.
>
>No they don't, Jim.

Yes they do, Cecil.

>In most companies, there exists a caste system based
>on achievement (top management Vs janitors).

Amateur radio is not a company.

Top management and janitors exist to perform different functions.

>From Webster's: "caste -
>any rigid system of social distinction"

Key word there is RIGID. A janitor cannot become a top manager by achievement alone. He or she must be promoted, which requires the approval of some of those already in top management.

But any radio amateur can progress to the top license by simply passing a few tests. Thus the system is not rigid.

>Within Intel, for instance,
>there is a rigid system of social distinction based on grade levels.

So nobody could be promoted, huh?

>I was a level 8. My boss was a level 10. My techs were level 6.

Why is that bad?

Unlike a company, anyone who can meet the requirements can get the license and become a ham. The license requirements are all objective and achievement-based. There is no limitation on the number of hams or how fast or far a ham can progress. Nor is there any requirement to progress beyond entry level if a ham does not wish to. What could be more fair? What is wrong with live and let live?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3095. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 13:16:48 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a84e09ajj1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39085

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:ATap8.1256$ml2.127995@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote
> > Wouldn't you like it to appeal to younger folks?
>
> Hopefully the structure would appeal to new folks
> and the "Advanced" label would strike a chord with
> existing licensees, thus tempering opposition. Also,
> Canada has already set the "Basic - Advanced" precedent
> in their two-category system, so there's a sense of uniformity
> in the choice.

I've always felt the "Extra" name was not a good choice.
To the non-ham, I'd bet that Advanced creates a more
positive perception than Extra such that if asked which
license class a non-ham thoight was the highest given
Advanced and Extra to choose from, most would say
Advanced.

3096. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 13:23:27 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a84eclhir1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39086
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Ed Ellers" <ed_ellers@msn.com> wrote in message
news:a83sbr$pcgfg$1@ID-39509.news.dfncis.de...
> Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> "I've purchased from RS and never been asked for a ham license. 2m amp
was
> bought on sale about 2 yrs ago. No questions asked."
>
> No questions asked, sure, but I bet they'd deny the sale if someone came
in
> and acted as though they intended to transmit without a license. Last
time
> I heard, RadioShack's policy was not to *knowingly* sell products to those
> who intend to use them illegally.

That said, then NOT asking about a license makes perfect sense as
RS policy since by NOT asking, RS can never be said to knowingly
have sold a ham transciever to someone that intended to use it
illegally.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3097. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 13:37:31 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a84f71$621$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39087
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Randy" <Anonymous@anon.com> wrote in message
news:a83u9b$o71$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
> > "I've purchased from RS and never been asked for a ham license.
> > 2m amp was bought on sale about 2 yrs ago. No questions asked."
>
> I broached this topic with the ARRL and Rad Shack some years back.
> Both said that to deny sales of Ham rigs to anybody would be a
> violation of the free trade agreement.(Make that income from sales)

Call it whatever you want. If it is the law "Free Trade Agreement",
then that's the way it is.

> Both said that mere posession of Ham radios,
> license or not, is not a violation.
> Transmitting without a license is.

That is 100% correct. Do you think otherwise?

> I also made my position known to W5YI and his response
> fell in line with the ARRL.

So?

> What they said in short is that anybody can buy a Ham radio from
> from Radio Shack, AES, or any other supply house so long as they
> can pay for it. No proof of license needed.

Makes sense to me. I bought my rig in 1957 BEFORE I was licensed.
Would you want that to be illegal?

> The sale of Ham radios to non-licensed persons is not illegal.

Correct again!

> Perhaps this line of thinking should be addressed but until it is you can
> look forward to unending "pirate" operations on the Ham bands.

If you think that pirate radio is a function of non-hams buying
rigs from commercial suppliers (RS, AES or whatever) you are
not really thinking about all the alternative sources of rigs...sales
at hamfests of used equipment, classified ads in magazines of
used equipment by individual hams, etc.

> I do find it rather odd that sales of amplifiers MUST
> be accompanied with

> the inclusion of the Ham's call sign as part of the purchase.

In reality, even the amplifier sales find their way into
pirate hands. It just can't be stopped.

> Go figure.
> Now you know why I refuse to belong to the ARRL or
> any of it's affiliates. Why waste my money?

Huh? What SHOULD the ARRL do regarding equipment
sales to make you happy?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3098. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 13:50:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a84fqrikr0@208.206.142.98>
Source record: 39088

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3CA3ACCE.A09A040@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> An incentive system and a caste system are polar opposites.
> >
> >The level of achievement in an incentive system creates a
> >pecking order which I am calling a type of caste system.
>
> And that's a mistake. "Caste" and "level of achievement" mean opposite things.
>
> >It is understandable to do that for a profit-making business
> >but why do that inside a hobby for amateurs?
>
> The alternative is to place no value on achievement. That's a bad thing.

Jim, don't forget - Cecil doesn't ever achieve anything, it all came
natural to him. He doesn't work for knowledge or anything, he
automatically knows it. That would explain his position.

Dick

3099. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 13:57:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a84g86$jv5$0@208.206.142.98>
Source record: 39089

CAM wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >The level of achievement in an incentive system creates a
> > >pecking order which I am calling a type of caste system.
> >
> > And that's a mistake. "Caste" and "level of achievement" mean opposite things.
>
> No they don't, Jim. In most companies, there exists a caste system based
> on achievement

"Caste system based on achievment"??? Incorrect by definition.

(top management Vs janitors). From Webster's: "caste -
> any rigid system of social distinction"
Within Intel, for instance,
> there is a rigid system of social distinction based on grade levels.
> I was a level 8. My boss was a level 10. My techs were level 6.

That's a system of achievement,not a caste system. To everyone but you,
of course.

I see you've found another Webster's anomoly to play with. Have fun.

3100. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 13:59:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a84gcv$jv5$1@208.206.142.98>
Source record: 39090

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > If I were going to compare modes, I would normalize the throughput, the
> > > power, and the bandwidth. That means gathering data and processing it
> > > in a rational technical manner, something to which you seem to be allergic.
> >
> > While you're going through all your gymnastics, I'll be working the
> > other stations on the air.
>
> Yep, ham radio is filled with button pushers and that's too bad.
>

So in your view, everyone in ham radio who is not a digital engineer
is a button pusher and thus inferior. Yet you contend that the tests are
just fine, and no actual technical knowledge is needed. Can't have it
both ways, OB.
(that's Old Bullslinger)

3101. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 14:01:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a84ggc$jv5$2@208.206.142.98>
Source record: 39091

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > "Power"??? what a joke you are. Where has ever been any "power" in a
> > > > ham radio license of any level?
> > >
> > > The power you gained that allowed you to rest on your laurels after
> > > your Extra license.
> >
> > O. IC. Power that allowed me to never again have to take a ham radio
> > test. That is a real nuker.
>
> More like a sledgehammer that you try to wield on this newsgroup and
> probably in your everyday life.

Your imagination working overtime, still? Naw, its just penile
(license)Class envy.
```

3102. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 14:03:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a84gil$jv5$3@208.206.142.98>
Source record: 39092

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > More likely just avoid it, like you did the Extra exam, until they made
> > it a gimmee.
>
> It was a gimmee for me, Dick. Too bad about you.
>

The test I took wouldn't have been a gimme for you, OB (don't forget
what that means)
```

3103. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 14:05:24 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <ECjp8.3085$0d3.143924644@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39093

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:ATap8.1256$ml2.127995@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote
>
> >
> > Wouldn't you like it to appeal to younger folks?
> >
>
> Hopefully the structure would appeal to new folks
> and the "Advanced" label would strike a chord with
> existing licensees, thus tempering opposition. Also,
> Canada has already set the "Basic - Advanced" precedent
> in their two-category system, so there's a sense of uniformity
> in the choice.

I like "Amateur" for what you call advanced, and "Limited Amateur" for
basic.

> If you are 'put off' by a license label, then I guess
> I have to believe you aren't really interested in
> progress, but only picking at details for the sake
> of picking at details.

So when the 13 colonies wanted a President instead of a King, they weren't
interested in progress?

> > Get an exemption like Japan.
> >
>
> Japan doesn't have an exemption. Their full
> priv HF people take Morse tests. They limit
> their 'no-code HF' people to 10W and just
> a couple of bands, then tell ITU that these
> restrictions are intended to contain the
> operations within JA.

10w, 50w, Whats the big difference? They are both reduced power.

3104. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 14:06:44 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <UDjp8.3089$Ga3.143801375@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39094

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a84e09ajj1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:ATap8.1256$ml2.127995@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote
> > > Wouldn't you like it to appeal to younger folks?
> >
> > Hopefully the structure would appeal to new folks
> > and the "Advanced" label would strike a chord with
> > existing licensees, thus tempering opposition. Also,
> > Canada has already set the "Basic - Advanced" precedent
> > in their two-category system, so there's a sense of uniformity
> > in the choice.
>
> I've always felt the "Extra" name was not a good choice.
> To the non-ham, I'd bet that Advanced creates a more
> positive perception than Extra such that if asked which
> license class a non-ham thoight was the highest given
> Advanced and Extra to choose from, most would say
> Advanced.

I'd guess that some would say General, thinking the rest of us were Captains
and Privates.

3105. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 14:09:07 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <7Gjp8.3090$if3.144024610@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39096

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020329231837.02283.00001254@mb-fc.aol.com...
> >So, who gets your CB amplifier?
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
> >
>
> I wouldnt know since I have never had an Amplifier

Welp, they say if you're gonna tell a lie, tell a big one.

3106. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 14:09:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a84gu8lrm0@208.206.142.98>
Source record: 39095

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Of course Shannon knew what he was talking about! But Shannon wasn't
> > there that morning, trying to copy messages. I was. Shannon's facts
> > about communications systems contributed not a thing to communications
> > that morning.
>
> It certainly could have contributed to your knowledge but you seem to
> reject knowledge with a passion usually reserved for nocoders.
>

What I DO reject is your lame bullshit masquerading as high technology.

> > You say that CW
> > couldn't be copied through the same filter that _PSK had to pass
> > through. Ed Hare says you're wrong. I believe him before I believe you.
>
> Ed was wrong if he believes that bandwidth, power, throughput, and
> Shannon's Theorem are unimportant.

So go find us a post where he (or I) ever said that.

Shannon's Theorem tells us exactly
> why CW got through and PSK31 didn't.

Yeah. But strangely, it didn't do a thing for us on that morning I
described.

PSK31 operates a lot closer to
> Shannon's limit than does CW. Again, assuming the same power, you
> have to copy 50wpm CW through a 31 Hz filter to do a valid comparison
> of the two modes.

That's where you are as wrong as you can be. Your assumptions make no
allowance whatever for the uncontrollables such as fixed equipment that
cannot change to adapt. This is why I say that Shannon is not the whole
story. You know that, if you have any experience whatever, but you
insist on rejecting reality. We know why.

If CW and PSK31 are operated equidistant from
> Shannon's limit, PSK will invariably win the contest.

Not when ionospheric phase shifting works on it. That was almost
certainly the real problem that morning.

3107. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 14:11:52 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <Iljp8.3092$nf3.144030062@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39097

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020329233420.02283.00001260@mb-fc.aol.com...
> >I said there were hams with that attitude the other day and Dick
> >called me a liar.
> >--
> >cheers, CAM
>
> I cant speak for Dick, but there are alot who would just rather see Ham
Radio
> disappear.

I would invite them to strap on a stick of dynamite, head in to their shack,
light a cigarette and pop the top on a can of Shlitz, and do the rest of us
a favor.

3108. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 14:14:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a84h78lrm1@208.206.142.98>
Source record: 39098

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: Question Pools and Such!
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 03/29/02 14:55 Eastern Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20020329145508.20744.00000106@mb-mm.aol.com>
>
> >It is a stupid and senseless argument to argue that voice modes
> >in public safety radio services are "lesser" than OOK CW on some
> >basis of money and "human resources" when it comes to either
> >protection from harm or safety of life.
>
> Then stop being stupid and senseless, Lennie. No one was talking about
> "public service" communications.
>

Yeah, that's right, but don't expect the Stupid One to comply. I see he
is still rejecting history on a "technical" basis. Sucks to be him, too.

3109. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 14:19:28 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <QPjp8.3094$Kd3.143953082@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39099

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020329232119.02283.00001255@mb-fc.aol.com...
> > familial relationship
>
> Hey brain dead what is the above supposed to be.

Hold on, I can't stop laughing.

Oh, God this guy's funny.

It means the family tree is supposed to have branches on it. Mine does
anyway.

Hans, lets add a family tree test to the QP for your "Advanced" license
class. This might just be the riff-raff filter everyone seems to want.

3110. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 14:22:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a84hmk$n6c$0@208.206.142.98>
Source record: 39100

Bill Sohl wrote:

> I've always felt the "Extra" name was not a good choice.

I find no surprise in that statement, coming from you. There is nothing extra about today's Extra class license. If you think it was always so that merely proves the point. You don't know what you're taklking about.

3111. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 14:23:54 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <_Tjp8.3100$Rh3.144143459@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39101

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020330015629.00944.00000395@mb-cu.aol.com...
> In article <ua6mtnj2dbifa3@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
> <vgermann@socket.net> writes:
>
> >Now, one might expect this kind of thing among the lower-rent types one
sees
> >a lot on UseNet, but I was startled five years ago to see it on THIS
> >newsgroup, and I am still startled today. For a while I again got caught
up
> >in the free-for-all but now, after only a few weeks "back" on this group,
I
> >am simply appalled at the abounding bad faith, and so will not respond
> >anymore to most of those who spew on this board about the horrors of CW.
I
> >know SO many will be SO disappointed -- NOT!
>
> Val:
>
> I hope you do continue to post here, because you seem to possess the
> ability to analyze the code/no-code debate in a refreshingly honest and
fair
> manner.

Huh? Honest and Fair? The guy's a troll!

3112. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 14:25:54 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <SVjp8.3102$Eq3.144566513@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39102

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:u_ap8.1271$ml2.129399@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote
>
> >
> > Sure there are.
> >
>
> You seem unable to identify any, but hide behind a
> sophomoric "if you don't remember, I'm not going
> to tell you, neener, neener, neener" facade. That
> pretty much discounts your assertion that they are
> here frosting your ass on rrap.

Hans, neener, neener, neener. Did you learn Morse in Cub Scouts, too?

3113. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 14:55:09 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020330095509.27518.00001133@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 39104

>> > "I've purchased from RS and never been asked for a ham license.
>> > 2m amp was bought on sale about 2 yrs ago. No questions asked."
>>
>> I broached this topic with the ARRL and Rad Shack some years back.
>> Both said that to deny sales of Ham rigs to anybody would be a
>> violation of the free trade agreement.(Make that income from sales)
>
>Call it whatever you want. If it is the law "Free Trade Agreement",
>then that's the way it is.
>
>> Both said that mere posession of Ham radios,
>> license or not, is not a violation.
>> Transmitting without a license is.
>
>That is 100% correct. Do you think otherwise?
>
>> I also made my position known to W5YI and his response
>> fell in line with the ARRL.
>
>So?
>
>> What they said in short is that anybody can buy a Ham radio from
>> from Radio Shack, AES, or any other supply house so long as they
>> can pay for it. No proof of license needed.
>
>Makes sense to me. I bought my rig in 1957 BEFORE I was licensed.
>Would you want that to be illegal?
>
>> The sale of Ham radios to non-licensed persons is not illegal.
>
>Correct again!
>
>> Perhaps this line of thinking should be addressed but until it is you can
>> look forward to unending "pirate" operations on the Ham bands.
>
>If you think that pirate radio is a function of non-hams buying
>rigs from commercial suppliers (RS, AES or whatever) you are
>not really thinking about all the alternative sources of rigs...sales
>at hamfests of used equipment, classified ads in magazines of
>used equipment by individual hams, etc.
>
>> I do find it rather odd that sales of amplifiers MUST
>> be accompanied with
>> the inclusion of the Ham's call sign as part of the purchase.

>
>In reality, even the amplifier sales find their way into
>pirate hands. It just can't be stopped.
>
>> Go figure.
>> Now you know why I refuse to belong to the ARRL or
>> any of it's affiliates. Why waste my money?
>
>Huh? What SHOULD the ARRL do regarding equipment
>sales to make you happy?
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK

While I disagree with you re. NCI, I certainly can't argue with the common sense approach here. Take care and 73.

Mark

3114. Happy Easter!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 14:58:31 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020330095831.27518.00001134@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 39105

I hope everybody on r.r.a.p had a "great" (instead of just good) Friday or Passover and has a very happy Easter.

Mark

3115. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 15:03:26 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uabjs8i4uuhs7a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39103

Some guy who goes by "CAM" crowed:

>> I've never been challenged, Mike, unless you consider "Go soak your
>> head!" to be a challenge. In high school basketball, I would coast
>> through three quarters while keeping the score relatively close.
>> Then when everyone else was tired, I would explode in the fourth
>> quarter. The coach called it my second wind. I never told him it
>> was my first.

Somewhere, someone is recording all of this guy's output for
a dissertation on Megalomania! I've been on UseNet for almost
nine years, mostly on the "sci.astro" groups, and there have always
been plenty of whackos over there. And I've been on listserves
since about the same time, and seen some sh*t. But THIS guy, this
CAM, is nearly the prize! What a LOSER this fellow must actually
be to keep doing this month after month, year after year. And I
don't care what "achievements" he "achieved" in his "career"
either. In his own mind he is a LOSER, or he could not keep up
his amazing yowl over what he says is his ONE life problem. How
transparent can you get! I just wish he would try and make up for
his life's failings SOMEWHERE else! Sheesh!

Val

3116. Re: Pro coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 15:03:41 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020330100341.27518.00001139@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 39106

>What are you pro-coders doing to benefit the ARS?

Why, holding the line against the no-coders, of course. ;-p

Mark O:-)

3117. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 15:09:03 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020330100903.01011.00001306@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 39107

>I would invite them to strap on a stick of dynamite, head in to their shack,
>light a cigarette and pop the top on a can of Shlitz, and do the rest of us
>a favor.

Not a bad Idea, but I think as soon as a No-Code passes his test he should
perform the same.

3118. Wanted to be a NoCode

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 15:38:23 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020330103823.00950.00001400@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 39108

I wanted to be a NoCode, but I was never Dumb enough to pass a real Ham Test, so I will never get the chance..

3119. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 15:52:52 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <oblp8.2127$ml2.222052@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39109

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote
>
> > > Get an exemption like Japan.
> > >
> >
> > Japan doesn't have an exemption. Their full
> > priv HF people take Morse tests. They limit
> > their 'no-code HF' people to 10W and just
> > a couple of bands, then tell ITU that these
> > restrictions are intended to contain the
> > operations within JA.
>
> 10w, 50w, Whats the big difference? They are both reduced power.
>

6 or 7 dB, and the JA low power guys are only allowed on a
couple of HF bands.

Hans

3120. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 15:57:39 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Tflp8.2139$ml2.222912@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39110

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote

>
> Hans, neener, neener, neener. Did you learn Morse in Cub Scouts, too?
>

No, I learned it from my Mom who was a ham.

Were you paid to learn Morse? Wouldn't frost my ass if you were.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3121. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 16:03:26 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <illp8.2158$ml2.223245@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39111

"Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote

>
> I would invite them to strap on a stick of dynamite, head in to their
shack,
> light a cigarette and pop the top on a can of Shlitz, and do the rest of
us
> a favor.
>

I was starting to think that you might be here to conduct some reasoned
debate and discussion. From the above trash it's clear I was mistaken.

Twit filter = On

Hans

3122. Re: No coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 16:34:31 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ca5ea4c_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 39112

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA52206.89D1FC9@IEEE.org...
> Mike Coslo wrote:
> > What are you no-coders doing to benefit the ARS?
>
> Gaining pleasure from it just like the coded hams.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Cecil,

While I have been refraining from responding to the
more aggregious trolls such as the one you responded
to above, I feel compelled respond to your response
above, because I don't think it is adequate ...

No code hams are doing MUCH more for the ARS
than simpy "Gaining pleasure from it just like the
coded hams."

1st, they are helping to populate the VHF/UHF bands,
which makes those bands less vulnerable to spectrum
grabs by other interests.

2nd, many of them are heavily involved in local public
service/disaster communications efforts through groups
such as ARES/RACES ... this is a VERY valuable service
that they are performing and it enhances the value of the
ARS to society in general, which also helps to protect
our spectrum.

There are other aspects where no code hams are
contributing ... I know many who are technically more
competent than many coded hams and actually serve
as technical elmers to hams with higher class licenses.

I know that your comment was not intended to disparage
no code hams, Cecil, but I think it feel well short of "credit
where credit is due" also ...

73,
Carl - wa6vse

3123. Re: Pro coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 16:37:08 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ca5eae8_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 39113

"Mark Pearsal" <radiohead11m@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020330100341.27518.00001139@mb-mr.aol.com...
> >What are you pro-coders doing to benefit the ARS?
>
> Why, holding the line against the no-coders, of course. ;-p
>
> Mark O:-)

Mark,

Fortunately for ham radio, you don't seem to be doing a very
good job :-p

Carl - wa6vse

3124. Long Reply to WIFRI Long Reply!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 17:03:24 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uabqt894v2d04d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39114

Hello, all!

One again, my original comments will be preceded by arrows,
Mr. Hare's comments will be "plain type," and my new comments
will be inside [[double brackets]].

Begin:

>. . . and so I will not respond anymore to most of those who
>spew on this board about the horrors of CW.

Maybe you won't, but if anyone starts downgrading the mode and no one
speaks up first, I will respond. OOK CW has value and use in the
Amateur Radio Service. You weren't around a number of years ago when
WA6VSE and I went more than a few rounds. :-)

[[This is good! I just wish the ARRL top people had the guts to do
likewise when it really counted.]]

>For me personally CW is part and parcel of amateur radio . . . and,
>well, it's hard for me NOT to advocate some testing here, especially
>for the very top of the tree, the EXTRA class.

It would be more effective to advocate some use of CW here, Val.

[[Maybe so. But the fact that the leading, by far, amateur group,
the ARRL, ran up the white flag vis-�-vis Morse Code, makes anything
most of us do pretty much moot. Not only that, the fact that there
was never formed a "Pro-Code" group within amateur radio, in spite
of the threat that NCI presented, well, speaks more than volumes.
I see a lot of crocodile tears, I think, out East.]]

First, I don't think that testing will survive too many more rounds
of revisions to international and then national law.

[[I don't think it will survive 2004! And if it does, I would
NOT want to above grade there in Connecticut!]]

When the time comes with the FCC, you should speak your mind, even
if that is contrary to what you believe will be the outcome, because
the whole concept of a free society is that each individual gets to
petition his or her government for the law that he or she feels is
best. The whole concept says that the lone dissenting voice should
be heard.

[[Now, seriously, what is THIS supposed to mean? The key concept
in human affairs is now and has always been: ORGANIZATION. The
"lone voice" is NEVER heard unless that voice is attached to a

person with a LOT money, or the person with the voice picks up a gun, and in true late-American style, does something stupid with it. That is, we let the hostage-takers have their 15-seconds of fame just like the state lottery winners. Sigh. But that does NOT mean that effective political "speech" is taking place. To recap, Ham Radio is still something because it still has a national organi-zation representing it to the Feds and to the rest of the world. Without that, well, the spectrum jackals would have already divided up Ham Radio into various slices of juicy band meat, no matter how many "lone voices" petitioned Foggy Bottom! And, of course, it was a "lone voice" who agitated for, and will apparently get, the elimination of U.S. code testing, right?]]

But even more important than testing is use. I know 20-wpm tested hams that literally had the code-key-burying ceremony in their back-yard, surrounded by all their friends. Amateur Radio gained nothing by testing them. The same will hold with the 5 wpm hams, and if we old cogers with CW experience and enthusiasm for the mode don't find a way to encourage them to spread their rather slow wings, many will not become CW ops. Some will, just because of the value of the mode, but most hams try new modes after seeing others having fun with them. The things we say about CW right now better sound fun or we are not being very good salesmen.

[[I'm sorry, but this just won't do. The time for all of that is BEFORE the rule makers have gutted your interests. What I am going to have to look into is why there was no effective countermeasure to the efforts of NCI, and others, to destroy CW testing. THAT is the real story here. Where WAS the leadership, at ARRL and other places? Somehow I have a feeling that this information is going to be rather hard to come by!]]

Fortunately, the negativism about CW by those claiming to be its proponents does not extend across all of amateur radio.

[[Just to the places where it COUNTS!]]

>The historical legacy of a group like Ham Radio IS important.
>It's part of the identity of the group.

[[NO comment on this from you? I am surprised!]]

>In light of this I can only view the viciousness of the anti-code
>types as a true psychological problem, one existing within THEIR
>heads. Like so many in our society today, jealousy has taken over
>their minds in this area and they have thus ceased to speak and
>act in a rational way, much of the time, where this issue is
>concerned.

I am not sure I see the viciousness. From whom? [snip]

[[Are we on the same newsgroup? I could post up some material, some from 1998, but you know what, it's not worth it. There

are none so blind as those who will not see.]]

Frankly, the whole issue of Morse code testing would not make the top 10 major problems facing amateur radio today. RFI, spectrum, CC&Rs, enforcement, youth recruitment. We can all make up a list and I bet most of us would not put code testing in the first 10.

[[Well, there it is, in black and white. You don't really care about the issue, in spite of what you say, and, I guess, no one important does either, except for those who wanted to eliminate testing, with whatever motive. So, for reasons which are STILL not apparent, but may be simple lack of caring, the ARRL has caved in to whatever interests there are out there who wanted to eliminate, completely, at all license levels, something that's been a part of amateur radio for a very, very long time AND has given it much of its uniqueness. That's a pretty sad testament.]]

IMHO, amateur radio will survive just fine with or without code testing. Code will survive just fine with or without code testing, unless many of those say things about the mode in an attempt to save code testing that convince newcomers that it is not worth trying.

[[You have GOT to be KIDDING! Read your paragraph AGAIN! What are you SAYING there!!! You're saying that it's code SUPPORTERS who might be the PROBLEM, down the road? What about the legion of posters on this board, and on other "echos", who have been wailing on code and its supporters for YEARS! Are they simply going to just be "friends-of-code" now, with those newcomers, and help initiate them into the glories of Morse? Are you NUTS? No, they're going to KEEP ON attacking it, into the indefinite future!! THAT'S going to be the bleeping PROBLEM!]]

>That is, to me the whole "anti-code" crowd has seized on code
>as a stalking dog for a bad-faith attack on incentive licensing
>based on what amounts to jealousy. That's my view.

Many of those who advocate the removal of Morse code testing already hold the Extra. What jealousy?

[[That's a darn good question! I think part of it is due to the smoldering remnants of the "Yankee-Cowboy Wars" of the 1960s. That is, ARRL HQ is in the decaying Northeast, not the "vibrant and advancing" Southwest. Where is NCI HQ'd? I think code became a stalking dog for THOSE folks, too, as a way to just irk "the Newington Crowd." I had forgotten to mention that. And then there are some people who are just A-Holes, A-holes who have always resented the code test because they DID have to take it, and PASS it, to get that microphone into their hands. But then I did mention that.]]

My reasons for believing that Morse code should not be tested center on the fact that Amateur Radio has another

long tradition -- of offering value to the radio technology of the day. We still do so, but Morse code is no longer part of that value outside of Amateur Radio.

[[Well, I'm sorry, but this is just BS when you're talking about the TOTAL elimination of testing for ALL license classes, including the EXTRA, when the mode is STILL used extensively INSIDE the service and WILL ALWAYS provide certain advantages to AMATEUR OPERATORS. Think about what you have written above. It does NOT hold water.]]

If the only way to preseve Morse code use in Amateur Radio were by testing, I might feel differently, but I feel that the value of the mode can be promoted and people will learn to use it. Every other operating mode survives in Amateur Radio, and hams put a lot more effort into building their stations than they would put into learning and using code.

[[Sorry, but this is just more distraction. Read the paragraphs above, mine and yours, AGAIN.]]

And over the years, I have been insulted by both sides, but some of those who have insulted me have turned out to be staunch friends. :-)

[[I guess this can happen and I'm sure that if I should ever meet you in person all would be well. But on this issue, we will forever be at odds, I'm afraid.]]

>So today, in the spring of 2002, the code battle is over,
>or soon will be.

Of course not. What happens internationally will be only the first stage. The FCC will still have to make a decision, and although the restructuring Report and Order offers some real clues about their thinking, the battle over the FCC rules and the anger will not stop for years to come.

[[Well, gee, can anyone doubt what is going to happen next? Can the circle be squared? That is, talk about ANGER, can you even IMAGINE what the NCI types will do if code is NOT eliminated very, very, very soon, like in 2004! Why, you'll have to have metal detectors there within minutes after the "wrong" decision got made! That is, you'll be blamed right along with the bureaurcrats at the FCC! And I'm sure, if code testing IS eliminated, our friends at NCI will disband and go back to ground, like the fine Hams they are! NOT, and you know it!]]

>But what will come next, since the REAL reasons for the
>anti-code jealousies remain?

I don't think that there will be much come next. Of those who are avowed anti-code-test folks, who do you think would want to see any reduction in the content of the written? Not me. I am doing what I can to see more material brought to the Question Pool Committee. I will let the others speak for themselves, but a "No Written International" will not find any acceptance in the Amateur community, IMHO.

[[Well, I don't think there can EVER be a "no written" group due to FCC rules about the interstate nature of the amateur service. However, there can sure be strong and continuing efforts to get those tests reduced to the "non-hazing" safety and operating issues ALONE! We have a LONG way to go there, I think.]]

>I don't think we'll have to wait long to find out.

2005 is my guess for the earliest we will see any FCC changes in code testing take effect.

[[That's right, it's just a wheel-grinding thing now.]]

[[Val]]

3125. Re: Long Reply to N2EY's Long Reply!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 17:10:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020330121000.00376.00000269@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 39115

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>Hello, all!
>
>I'm running behind on the replies to what I believe are interesting and
>significant messages. Below is one of those.

Hello Val,

I've added ">"s so the posts read conventionally. Also edited out some old
stuff to save space.
>
(Val wrote):

>[[I am truly trying to understand what is going on, and what has gone on,
>vis-ï¿½-vis licensing and the resultant numbers of hams, etc. I think it's
>important to use numbers to try and understand what is and is not happening
>in amateur radio, and what polices may or may not be successful. I believe
>that this understanding depends on accurate numbers and if it's a game, it's
>a serious one!]]

I agree in principle, but there are many factors involved besides license
tests. For example,
back before cheap cellphone service many hams around here got licenses and used
the
local repeaters for "honeydew" purposes. That was a significant source of new
hams even
before the Tech lost its code test. The advent of low cost family cellphone
plans and better
coverage all but ended that source of new hams.

(N2EY wrote):

>>Surges are to be expected - when the "price" of something drops,
>>There is usually a surge of "sales".

>[[Unless no one is buying, at all, which seems to be happening vis-ï¿½-vis the
>change in the code test. That is, even 5 wpm has had little or no effect
>on recruitment of totally new people to HF, or so it seems. Thus,
>apparently, the shift to NO code testing at all?]]

Once the market is saturated, price changes have little effect. And price is
only
one factor. Take home appliances, for example: A sale on refrigerators won't
make me buy one because the one I have is only two years old, does an excellent

job, and I don't have room or need for another.

>[[Here's the crux of the whole thing, for today's policy makers, in my view.
>That is, they seemed to be overwhelmingly worried about QUANTITY and not
>QUALITY, and there must be a reason for that. But IS there a huge problem
>with quantity and is the problem severe enough to justify the angst that has
>been created by all of these changes? On the one hand, the ability and
>desire to pass ANY test these days says volumes for a new recruit. On the
>other hand, the system for giving those tests has radically changed over the
>last two decades, to make everything more "accessible." It's sometimes hard
>for me to see the reason for the current shuffling and re-shuffling when
>there are, what, 650,000 hams? Why the apparent panic? Is it all about
>HF?]]

There are several concerns. One is that the FCC doesn't have unlimited or even adequate resources. Thus the VE and QPC systems - FCC unloads a huge burden of admin work on unpaid volunteers.

Another factor is the mandate for simplification of rules and regs. Why have six classes
of license if three will do? Why have highly technical tests if the problems (violations)
of the ARS are not primarily technical? Look at the FCC enforcement letters - they are
rarely about purely technical issues, and mostly about operating issues.

"Access" is a big thing to the FCC. They would rather have all interested parties licensed
rather than have to chase pirate stations.

(N2EY)

>>There was once a requirement
>>that hams certify a certain amount of on-air USE of CW/Morse
>>(so many hours in a certain number of months preceding the
>>renewal application) in order to renew their licenses.

>[[Now THAT is fascinating. I guess the problem was it led to a lot of
>cooked books since, er, ah, how could that be enforced?]]

FCC used to require that applications be notarized. They took people at their word, for the most part.

The real problem was this: What if it were impractical for a ham to get in the required activity? Under the letter of the old rules, Ham A could be totally inactive for 4-1/2
years, then make a few contacts and renew, while Ham B could be active as all get out for 4-1/2 years, then be kept from operating for a few months and not be
able to renew. Such a rule didn't really serve the purposes of the ARS, so the FCC
finally dropped it.

>[[Also fascinating, in that for some time there was in effect a requirement
>to BE ACTIVE to keep the license!

Yup - see above.

> And wasn't renewal a 5-year affair
>then?]]

From at least the end of WW2 until 1984, permanent ham licenses had 5 year terms.
In 1984 the FCC began issuing 10 year licenses, so that from 1989 to 1994 NO US ham licenses expired at all. Kinda complicates analyzing the number trends.

Reason for the change? It saves about 1000 person-hours of FCC admin work per year, plus
postage and other paperwork, by cutting the number of renewals in half.

>>>Sure. Just like if you require all drivers to use a stick shift
>>>For their driving test, some will like it and buy stick shift
>>>cars instead of automatics.
>
>>>That is, [the above] is the argument I think I am seeing from
>>>some code supporters. Does this idea hold any water?
>
>>Of course. In fact, that's kind of what happened to me. My first
>>interest in ham radio came from hearing hams on 75 meter AM.
>>I wanted to join them, and set out to get a license. Along the way
>>I discovered that CW was fun once I had decent skills at it. Thus
>>It became my primary mode. Would I have learned CW/Morse and used
>>it without the license requirement? I really don't know.
>
>[[Here is another critical issue, what will happen to CW usage once testing
>disappears? The ARRL position seems similar to the old Bush
>Administration's "Thousand Points of Light" escape hatch, one stating that
>volunteerism will make up for a lack of involvement by any "higher
>authority." But this is, I think, a very cheesy position to take, VERY, and
>quite reminds me of an old movie in which a loving relative, pushing a
>wheelchair-bound uncle down a boardwalk, speaks for several minutes in
>cooing terms . . . then pushes the crippled oldster into the ocean. That
>is, what is ARRL going to do vis-ï¿½-vis CW besides wishing it well . . . all
>the way to the water? That is, I think CW is part of the historical legacy
>of amateur radio and is now UNIQUE to amateur radio, and so is worth
>protecting and encouraging, at the highest level.]]

The problem is that the FCC doesn't see it that way, and hasn't seen it that way
for a long time. FCC's attitude is that they don't want to do any code testing any
more. So it's up to us hams to keep the mode alive. FCC won't do it.

The ARRL BoD has strongly supported code testing for many years because the membership wanted them to. But it has become clear in the past few years that doing so is not going to make any difference to the FCC, nor with most other IARU member societies. And there are lots of other issues demanding ARRL resources.

>>All I can say is that at least some anti-code-test folks are also
>>against expanding the 'phone sub-bands because doing so will
>>effectively reduce the spectrum available for DIGITAL modes.
>
>[[The enemy of my enemy is my friend, to the end of boardwalk! That is,
>this "support" for CW operating might keep it Grand-fathered in, at least as
>far as the next convenient scenic overlook. And after that . . . splash!?]]

I'm sure some folks would like that. But there is no precedent for outlawing
any
mode used by hams. The only mode ever outlawed in ham radio was spark,
(1927), and by that time it had been abandoned by hams.

>>Some folks say there should be no mode restrictions on amateur
>>HF, and that such restrictions constitute a form of "welfare"
>>for "narrow" modes, like CW. But without mode restrictions,
>>what is to prevent hams from using, say, the same FM voice
>>standards as on VHF/UHF?
>
>[[I think you've hit on the whole idea! Just think of the hardware that
>would have to be sold if "talk wars" broke out on HF, as broke out on CB
>here in Columbia in the late 1970s! Where would the WORLD hide from the U.S.
>generated noise!]]

Exactly.

>>On amateur VHF/UHF there are almost no mode restrictions.
>>(Yes, I recall 50.0-50.1 and 144.0-144.1). On 2 meters
>>this has resulted in most of the band being taken up by
>>FM voice repeaters, leaving less space for new modes to
>>operate. Without any mode restrictions on HF, it is
>>reasonable to assume something similar would take place.
>
>[[And may be the secret agenda of some, eh? That is, who would get to sell
>all the equipment? Who would get to "coordinate" the bands?]]

End result would probably just be chaos.

>>I'm 47, so I expect it to be more like 40-50 years at least
>>[before any serious band plan change.]
>
>[[Maybe. But I think the pressure will start in very soon to do something
>about "band welfare." I hope I'm wrong.]]

Such pressure can only be resisted by actual occupancy of the bands.
>
>>>That's a fair-sized market, I think! That's half a billion
>>>dollars! [for Ham Radio equipment, per year.]
>
>>Compared to what? How much was the market for, say, FRS/GMRS
>>Radios last year? Or VCRs?
>
>[[Half a billion dollars is half a billion dollars is half a billion dollars

>is half a billion dollars!]]

Compared to multibillion dollar sales of other items it's small potatoes.
>
>>And I would say that my guess was about as high as it gets.
>>I don't think most US hams spend as much as $1000 total on
>>equipment every year.
>
>[[One wonders what the REAL number is, total, and whether that number is
>going up or down or maintaining. Here is a real hidden factor in all the
>regulatory changes, in my view. That is, the fact that it's simply not
>spoken of with reference to rule making . . . speaks volumes, to me.]]

It's not spoken because it's just not that much money. Start arguing that ham
radio is important because 683,000 US hams spend a half-billion per year and
others services will point to having more users spending many times that.

>> Ads simply reflect what the manufacturers are trying to
>>sell, not what they are actually selling. I can name all sorts
>>of examples down through the years where highly advertised items
>>did not sell in large quantities, but rigs that were almost
>>unadvertised sold like hotcakes.
>
>[[Off the point, I think. For years and years this ratio has been
>maintained, guaranteeing (for me) that HF is where the money is, especially
>for the few U.S. makers still in the game.

It's where the advertising dollars are, nothing more.

>[[I think it is THEY who have the
>ear of Foggy Bottom, such as it is, every bit as much as any other ARS
>faction. These economic factors cut across all boundaries and borders and
>to me explain the fact that the Europeans are bailing on code as well. It's
>the dollar value of the market, and it's future, that is in play here, in my
>view. NCI simply provided a convenient stalking dog here in the U.S., and
>as someone said, if they did not come into existence naturally, well, they
>were invented, for the very purpose!]]

Interesting idea, but most manufactured ham gear is JA-made - and it's
just a tiny part of the JA electronics industry.

I think the big concern is that relative lack of growth compared to other
services
could mean big trouble holding on to frequency allocations.
>
>>>That is VERY interesting, [the NON-flood of new HF hams]
>>>and could well explain the rush to now do away completely
>>>with code testing, in hopes of finally having the desired
>>>effect.
>
>>Yup. And that effect will probably not happen. Sure, there
>>will be a short-term surge of new licenses, and a surge of

>>upgrades - but only a short-term surge. Just my opinion,
>>but recent history has shown that to be the case.
>
>[[And thus more "panic," or rather, changes. Where will it all stop, with
>what amounts to a "CB Service"? That is, if the slide continues, the
>pressure will be on for more "accessibility," won't it? So often in human
>affairs the actions of the gatekeepers are: See the cliff, run TOWARD it,
>and FASTER!]]

Not if hams and the FCC do not allow it. Note the increased enforcement
being done by the FCC.

>>>And if this does not work, will
>>>elimination of the written exams follow?
>
>>Nope. But they may be reduced still further.
>
>>[[Yes, you can see this coming, too. And how far can it go?]]
>
All the way to a simple multiple choice exam on the basic regs and one class of
license.

>>. . . let me offer you a suggestion and a challenge: Learn
>>the code, sending and receiving, and let us know your progress.
>>Tell us the methods you use and how long it takes you to go
>>from "this is a dit" to, say, 15-20 wpm. If you need any help,
>>just holler. My email address is for-real.
>
>[[I'll let you know! The plan now is to take the elements for
>General in about three weeks . . . and pass them. Eeek!]]

So how's it going?
>
>>Do not be misled by the naysayers and negativism sometimes seen
>>here. There are lots of nice folks on the air using CW/Morse.
>>Join us!
>
>[[I intend to! No doubt the great majority of the people on this board, and
>in amateur radio in general, are pretty much "OK" in person, in most social
>situations. That seems obvious.

I have met one or two in person, and several more on the air.

> But I have real problem with folks who
>deliberately, and over a long period of time, post troll after troll after
>troll. I don't think I want to know those people, at all! UseNet gives an
>isolation and immunity that can reveal, quickly, things about a person you
>might NEVER find out in even a fairly close friendship situation. I guess
>we have to, to a certain extent, take the good with the bad. The net can
>put a pretty serious edge on things, but it can lead to plain speaking that
>is valuable, too.]]

Interesting point. But in essence it comes down to this: Why does a particular person behave the way they do in a public forum like this?

>>(I prefer 40 meters, around 7030-7045 kHz).
>
>[[OK!]]
>
>>Listen to, say, 40 or 20 meters CW during a contest like
>>the CW SS, DX test or Field Day. All that activity is
>>generated by a few thousand stations - probably more like
>>a few hundred on any given band at any given time. The bands
>>can be that busy all the time if we USE them.
>
>[[This leads to another serious question: Of the 600,000 plus licensees in
>the ARS, how many are ACTIVE on the various sections of the spectrum? I saw
>a message on the "DX" board that something on the order of 35,000 operators
>were truly active on HF. I wonder if that's close?]]

No easy way to tell. Many factors involved, such as propagation, time zones and

how much a particular ham transmits. How much time on the air is needed to be considered "active"?

Good questions!

73 de Jim, N2EY

3126. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 18:22:45 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Vnnp8.2723$nt1.270408@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39121

"W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:3ca5f543_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:illp8.2158$ml2.223245@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote
> >
> > >
> > > I would invite them to strap on a stick of dynamite, head in to their
> > shack,
> > > light a cigarette and pop the top on a can of Shlitz, and do the rest
of
> > us
> > > a favor.
> > >
> >
> > I was starting to think that you might be here to conduct some reasoned
> > debate and discussion. From the above trash it's clear I was mistaken.
> >
> > Twit filter = On
> >
> > Hans
> >
>
> I find it interesting, Hans, that you usually only offer any kind of
> friendship or agreement *after* someone says something with which you
> disagree, just so that you can then dismiss them.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Kim,

Brian and I were having a quite civil discussion, in which we agreed
on many significant issues about licensing structures.

But when someone suggests the application of deadly violence they
are dismissed. Period.

I'd thank you to join me in strongly condemning such behavior.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3127. Re: Wanted to be a NoCode

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 18:27:10 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020330132710.02275.00001405@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 39122

>Let me suggest clear grain alcohol...it works much quicker.
>
>Kim W5TIT
>
>

Is that what you use?

3128. Re: Long Reply to N2EY's Long Reply!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 19:27:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020330142711.00376.00000277@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 39124

In article <3CA4B9D9.E1C4DA5@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Valentine Germann wrote:
>> Just like if you require all drivers to use a stick shift
>> For their driving test, some will like it and buy stick shift
>> cars instead of automatics.
>
>I don't know of any states that require a stick shift test.

Here in PA, it's been that way for at least 30 years. Yet manual shift autos and light trucks
continue to be sold and used.

Of course there is one small flaw in the CW/manual shift analogy: The decision to buy a manual
shift car is an all-or-nothing choice, while ham rigs have multiple modes.

>It
>is not the purpose of government to preserve historical legacies.

Sure it is. Otherwise there would be no state and national parks, forests and wildernesses, nor any
government supported museums or historic sites.
>
>> I think CW is part of the historical legacy
>> of amateur radio and is now UNIQUE to amateur radio, and so is worth
>> protecting and encouraging, at the highest level.]]
>
>It is not the purpose of government to preserve a historical
>legacy.

Sure it is. See above.

> That falls upon the individual members of the ARS like
>you and me.

That part is true.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3129. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 19:27:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020330142712.00376.00000278@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 39123

In article <jq4p8.2336$YX.113575081@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>No, I don't mean your other nemesis, Cutie Boy, I mean the
>other guy at about the same time. I forget his name.
>
Mark Morgan, KB9RQZ.

BTW, just one year and two days until ol' Masa/Cutie Boy's promise is to be fulfilled. (see his post on April 2, 1998)

73 de Jim, N2EY

3130. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 19:27:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020330142712.00376.00000279@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 39125

In article <a84fqrikr0@208.206.142.98>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <3CA3ACCE.A09A040@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
>writes:
>>
>> >N2EY wrote:
>> >> An incentive system and a caste system are polar opposites.
>> >
>> >The level of achievement in an incentive system creates a
>> >pecking order which I am calling a type of caste system.
>>
>> And that's a mistake. "Caste" and "level of achievement" mean opposite
>things.
>>
>> >It is understandable to do that for a profit-making business
>> >but why do that inside a hobby for amateurs?
>>
>> The alternative is to place no value on achievement. That's a bad thing.
>
>
>
> Jim, don't forget - Cecil doesn't ever achieve anything, it all came
>natural to him. He doesn't work for knowledge or anything, he
>automatically knows it. That would explain his position.

Dick, be sure to remember that Cecil has repeatedly said that he never posts
seriously here.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

3131. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 21:26:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA62D8E.EB426D27@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39126

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> What comes next is the conversion of the Novice/Tech sub-bands to
> more room for HF phone.

CW and digital are legal there now, Larry, but they are virtually
unused. Why not allow someone to get some good out of them instead
of letting them go to waste?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3132. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 21:28:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA62DF7.80F57F0E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39127

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >I figured you to be built with enough blubber to bite your own tit.
>
> I got a felling you probably have alot more Blubber hanging around you than I
> could ever have.

That "blubber" is what gives females their curves - Viva la "blubber"!
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3133. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 21:38:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA63042.C6A807DF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39128

N2EY wrote:
> Amateur radio is not a company.

Exactly! Amateur radio is a hobby and for that reason, the present pecking order within ham radio has absolutely no valid reason to exist.

> >From Webster's: "caste - any rigid system of social distinction"
>
> But any radio amateur can progress to the top license by simply passing a few
> tests. Thus the system is not rigid.

But some hams are incapable of passing the tests just as some people are incapable of changing their skin color or dunking a basketball or passing a college entrance exam. The competitive incentive licensing system has generated a monstrous pecking order.

> Unlike a company, anyone who can meet the requirements can get the license and
> become a ham.

Absolutely false, Jim. My 91 year old aunt could not meet the requirements if her life depended on it. As long as incentive licensing continues to exist, the door will be open for higher class bullies to heap abuse on the lower classes. Why don't you talk to those bullies about "Live and let live"?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3134. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 21:40:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA630D6.D902325A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39129

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Jim, don't forget - Cecil doesn't ever achieve anything, it all came
> natural to him. He doesn't work for knowledge or anything, he
> automatically knows it.

It's not automatic, Dick. I have to be awake.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3135. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 21:42:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA63163.DBBA8324@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39130

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I see you've found another Webster's anomoly to play with. Have fun.

Amateur radio certainly seems to have a "rigid system of social
distinction" based on license class. Except for Val, of course.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3136. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 21:52:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA633B1.E0B48AD5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39131

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Yep, ham radio is filled with button pushers and that's too bad.
>
> So in your view, everyone in ham radio who is not a digital engineer
> is a button pusher and thus inferior.

Nope, button pushers are missing a lot if they don't experiment.
Experimentation can be antennas, analog RF circuits (both linear and
nonlinear), or digital.

Incidentally, you are a child of the universe. You have a right to be
here. No need for inferior/superior to enter into the equation.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3137. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 21:57:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA634D7.79ED9643@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39132

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Your imagination working overtime, still? Naw, its just penile
> (license) Class envy.

I've got the Extra AND the EE degree, Dick. Why on earth
should I possess envy? You, OTOH, ...
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3138. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 22:02:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA63610.A73F8610@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39133

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > More likely just avoid it, like you did the Extra exam, until they made
> > > it a gimmee.
> >
> > It was a gimmee for me, Dick. Too bad about you.
>
> The test I took wouldn't have been a gimme for you, OB (don't forget
> what that means)

Your written test was a gimme for any graduate EE. I have heard it
was not as difficult as the Advanced exam which I aced at the FCC
office in San Francisco during the 1970's while I was so drunk I
had double vision.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----
```

3139. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 22:09:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA637A6.9DA2A183@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39134

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Shannon's Theorem tells us exactly why CW got through and PSK31 didn't.
>
> Yeah. But strangely, it didn't do a thing for us on that morning I
> described.

Read the following again, Dick. You obviously don't understand it.

> > PSK31 operates a lot closer to
> > Shannon's limit than does CW. Again, assuming the same power, you
> > have to copy 50wpm CW through a 31 Hz filter to do a valid comparison
> > of the two modes.
>
> That's where you are as wrong as you can be. Your assumptions make no
> allowance whatever for the uncontrollables such as fixed equipment that
> cannot change to adapt. This is why I say that Shannon is not the whole
> story.

And you don't know how stupid you sound when you say that. Shannon says
that the CW you heard has about a 5:1 advantage over the PSK31 that you
were trying to receive. Thus, Shannon tells us exactly why you were
able to receive CW and not PSK31. Shannon agrees with you but you
are too ignorant and angry to realize that.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3140. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 22:32:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA63CFD.9414A386@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39135

Valentine Germann wrote:
> Somewhere, someone is recording all of this guy's output for
> a dissertation on Megalomania!

It actually makes me feel really humble to realize I was a
complete accident. My wingspan was ten inches longer than
anyone else's on my high school team and I didn't have an
ounce of fat on me. I share 99+% of my DNA with an Orangutan
and I was the only one on my team who could dunk the basketball.

I personally can't take credit for that but I will be forever
indebted to my parents. Want to come on down to Texas and play
some basketball? With braces on my knees, on a good day, I can
still dunk. It's a lot like Morse code. Anyone can learn to dunk
a basketball unless he/she is just too damned lazy.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3141. Re: No coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 22:37:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA63E1E.78DEEA99@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39136

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> No code hams are doing MUCH more for the ARS
> than simpy "Gaining pleasure from it just like the
> coded hams."
>
> 1st, they are helping to populate the VHF/UHF bands,
> which makes those bands less vulnerable to spectrum
> grabs by other interests.

Are they gaining pleasure from that?

> 2nd, many of them are heavily involved in local public
> service/disaster communications efforts through groups
> such as ARES/RACES ... this is a VERY valuable service
> that they are performing and it enhances the value of the
> ARS to society in general, which also helps to protect
> our spectrum.

Are they gaining pleasure from that?

> There are other aspects where no code hams are
> contributing ... I know many who are technically more
> competent than many coded hams and actually serve
> as technical elmers to hams with higher class licenses.

Are they gaining pleasure from that?

The point was that *ALL* hams are in ham radio because it
gives them pleasure. That includes coded and noncoded hams.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3142. Re: Long Reply to WIFRI Long Reply!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 22:41:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA63F22.A1A3F582@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39137

Valentine Germann wrote:
> One again, my original comments will be preceded by arrows,
> Mr. Hare's comments will be "plain type," and my new comments
> will be inside [[double brackets]].

Val, you have no way of knowing but that violates the netnews
attribution standards. Most newsreaders follow that standard.
What newsreader are you using? It is usually just an option
that you can select in the menu.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3143. Re: Long Reply to N2EY's Long Reply!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 22:46:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA64034.65CAF01F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39138

N2EY wrote:
> >It is not the purpose of government to preserve historical legacies.
>
> Sure it is. Otherwise there would be no state and national parks, forests and
> wildernesses, nor any government supported museums or historic sites.

Don't know much about Libertarianism, do you, Jim? Libertarians don't
believe in government ownership of anything. Government ownership
of the oil-rich lands in Alaska is why we are on the verge of WWIII.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3144. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 22:48:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA640AB.737536A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39139

N2EY wrote:
> Dick, be sure to remember that Cecil has repeatedly said that he never posts
> seriously here.

Given that I never make a serious posting, can you infer the
truth?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3145. Re: Long Reply to N2EY's Long Reply!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 23:00:14 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <2srp8.3319$nt1.312011@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39140

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

> It is not the purpose of government to preserve a historical
> legacy.

Gee, GWB could sell off historical things like the Liberty Bell,
the USS Arizona, the original copies of the Declaration of
Independence and the Constitution, and other historical
legacy crap like that. Maybe put them on EBay, and some
startup country with no history of their own could buy them
off us?

Cecil, you may be intellectually gifted, but I think you have
neglected to unwrap most of your presents.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3146. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 23:09:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020330180951.09446.00000176@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 39142

In article <3ca4a8ea_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
writes:

> Then where were the voices of the pro-CW folks who could have done
>just the same?

They were expressed. Loud and clear. The FCC found their arguments
unconvincing.

>Or, is it that the opinion of no-CW TEST folks is actually a
>majority? It's either that the pro-CW folks didn't care enough then to make
>their opinions known--in which case they are doing nothing but whining now;
>or, it is that there is a spoken majority that cared enough to make their
>opinions known...

None of the above.

The majority of comments to the FCC on the restructuring NPRM were in favor of
code testing AND of at least two code test speeds. (An NCI volunteer actually
read each and every one and categorized them according to code testing
position). The FCC chose to IGNORE the majority of comments.
>
>If the FCC capitulated, it is the responsibility of all, not just one side.

Not true. FCC is not required to follow the majority of opinion expressed.

FCC has been pushing for reduction/elimination of code testing since 1975.
Their stated policy is that code testing "serves no regulatory purpose" except
meeting the international treaty requirement for same. They dismissed ALL
other procodetest arguments.

If the FCC wants to do something bad enough, all of our comments and opinions
won't stop them.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3147. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 23:10:11 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <nBrp8.3350$nt1.313256@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39141

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

>
> Sure you will. You can't help it. Your self-image is at
> stake here! :-)
>

Val's pattern is to correspond with folks that he
feels are intellectually inferior to him. He's running
out of pen pals that fit that description.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3148. Re: Long Reply to N2EY's Long Reply!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 23:14:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA646E3.2E870581@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39143

K0HB wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
>
> > It is not the purpose of government to preserve a historical
> > legacy.
>
> Gee, GWB could sell off historical things like the Liberty Bell,
> the USS Arizona, the original copies of the Declaration of
> Independence and the Constitution, and other historical
> legacy crap like that.

Note that if the government sold off it's assets to profit-making
businesses, they could pay off the national debt and those
historical artifacts would be better taken care of since they
would be priceless profit-making endeavors.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3149. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-30 23:17:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA6476D.EEFBBC7D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39144

N2EY wrote:
> The FCC chose to IGNORE the majority of comments.

Yep, they believe it's not good policy to allow the inmates
to run the asylum. Wonder why?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3150. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 00:15:28 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020330191528.21852.00001518@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 39145

>That "blubber" is what gives females their curves - Viva la "blubber"!
>--
>cheers, CAM

Im sure that Blubber hog has no curves

3151. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 00:18:25 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a85kop$16l$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39146

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020330180951.09446.00000176@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <3ca4a8ea_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
<seventythree@eightyeight.net>
> writes:
>
> > Then where were the voices of the pro-CW folks who could have done
> >just the same?
>
> They were expressed. Loud and clear. The FCC found their arguments
> unconvincing.

Agreed.

> >Or, is it that the opinion of no-CW TEST folks is actually a
> >majority? It's either that the pro-CW folks didn't care enough then to
make
> >their opinions known--in which case they are doing nothing but whining
now;
> >or, it is that there is a spoken majority that cared enough to make their
> >opinions known...
>
> None of the above.

Agreed.

> The majority of comments to the FCC on
> the restructuring NPRM were in favor of
> code testing AND of at least two code test speeds.
> (An NCI volunteer actually
> read each and every one and categorized
> them according to code testing
> position). The FCC chose to IGNORE the
> majority of comments.

The FCC did NOT ignor the comments. The FCC decided that
those comments did not justify what the commentor(s) were asking
for. FCC rulings are NOT the result of popular opinion polls
based on how many commentors favor one outcome vs another.

Additionally, many of those "majority" comments were nothing more
than one liners that said "I support the ARRL plan
or recommendation."

> >If the FCC capitulated, it is the responsibility of all, not just one
side.

>
> Not true. FCC is not required to follow the majority of opinion expressed.

Exactly. Why that eludes so many other folks is amazing.

> FCC has been pushing for reduction/elimination of code testing since 1975.
> Their stated policy is that code testing "serves no regulatory purpose"
except
> meeting the international treaty requirement for same. They dismissed ALL
> other procodetest arguments.

As well they should have since none of the arguments had any
rational or compelling validity to them. Your mileage, of course, may
differ.

> If the FCC wants to do something bad enough, all of our comments and
opinions
> won't stop them.

Yet no one has been able to show anywhere that the FCC
has acted in anything but a fundamentally sound analysis
manner.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3152. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 00:43:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CA65BCF.2416BD7E@adelphia.net>
Source record: 39147

Yow, that is pretty sad Cecil. My condolences to you. 8^(

Along related lines, but nowhere near as bad, I discovered that in the course of learning CW that my tinnitus, which I have had since I can remember came back with a vengeance. Most of my adult life I had tuned it out pretty effectivly. During my many months long struggle with learning Morse, the tinnitus started coming back. By the time I learned Morse code well enough to pass the test, the tinnitus was a pretty good roar in my ears. I haven't had it checked again, but my guess is that my brain was programmed to ignore sounds over the years, which is what made CW so difficult for me. My brain had to reprogram itself, so to speak, in order to process Morse code.

- Mike -

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > I was diagnosed by a clinical psychologist as having an aural handicap.
> > > You know that yet you continue to heap abuse upon me.
> >
> > I also know well that you manufacture a new story to fit every
> > circumstance and need.
>
> It's a years old story, Dick, that I have related many times.
> I had some damage to the left side of my head in the wreck
> in which my wife and baby were killed. It affected my speech
> processing capabilities.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > I was diagnosed by a clinical psychologist as having an aural handicap.
> > > You know that yet you continue to heap abuse upon me.
> >

> > I also know well that you manufacture a new story to fit every
> > circumstance and need.
>
> It's a years old story, Dick, that I have related many times.
> I had some damage to the left side of my head in the wreck
> in which my wife and baby were killed. It affected my speech
> processing capabilities.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3153. Re: Long Reply to WIFRI Long Reply!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 00:48:21 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a85mgttnu1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39148

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uabqt894v2d04d@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all!
>
> One again, my original comments will be preceded by arrows,
> Mr. Hare's comments will be "plain type," and my new comments
> will be inside [[double brackets]].
>
> Begin:
>
> >. . . and so I will not respond anymore to most of those who
> >spew on this board about the horrors of CW.
>
> Maybe you won't, but if anyone starts downgrading the mode and no one
> speaks up first, I will respond. OOK CW has value and use in the
> Amateur Radio Service. You weren't around a number of years ago when
> WA6VSE and I went more than a few rounds. :-)
>
> [[This is good! I just wish the ARRL top people had the guts to do
> likewise when it really counted.]]

??? Exactly what would you have liked to see the
ARRL top people do?

> >For me personally CW is part and parcel of amateur radio . . . and,
> >well, it's hard for me NOT to advocate some testing here, especially
> >for the very top of the tree, the EXTRA class.
>
> It would be more effective to advocate some use of CW here, Val.
>
> [[Maybe so. But the fact that the leading, by far, amateur group,
> the ARRL, ran up the white flag vis-&#65533;-vis Morse Code, makes anything
> most of us do pretty much moot. Not only that, the fact that there
> was never formed a "Pro-Code" group within amateur radio, in spite
> of the threat that NCI presented, well, speaks more than volumes.
> I see a lot of crocodile tears, I think, out East.]]

The ARRL actively "fought" for keeping 5 wpm and 12/13 wpm testing.
Go read the ARRL filed comments. The fact that the arguments of
ARRL and others supporting the ARRL position did not hold sway
with the FCC's final decision does not negate the ARRL effort.
If you research what went on, perhaps you can suggest where the
ARRL and others "went wrong". Indeed, just WHAT would you
have argued/commented to the FCC that you'd have expected
a different outcome from the FCC.

> First, I don't think that testing will survive too many more rounds
> of revisions to international and then national law.
>
> [[I don't think it will survive 2004! And if it does, I would
> NOT want to above grade there in Connecticut!]]

Huh??? What do you expect to happen in Conn?

> When the time comes with the FCC, you should speak your mind, even
> if that is contrary to what you believe will be the outcome, because
> the whole concept of a free society is that each individual gets to
> petition his or her government for the law that he or she feels is
> best. The whole concept says that the lone dissenting voice should
> be heard.
>
> [[Now, seriously, what is THIS supposed to mean? The key concept
> in human affairs is now and has always been: ORGANIZATION. The
> "lone voice" is NEVER heard unless that voice is attached to a
> person with a LOT money, or the person with the voice picks up a
> gun, and in true late-American style, does something stupid with it.
> That is, we let the hostage-takers have their 15-seconds of fame
> just like the state lottery winners. Sigh. But that does NOT mean
> that effective political "speech" is taking place. To recap, Ham
> Radio is still something because it still has a national organi-
> zation representing it to the Feds and to the rest of the world.
> Without that, well, the spectrum jackals would have already
> divided up Ham Radio into various slices of juicy band meat,
> no matter how many "lone voices" petitioned Foggy Bottom!
> And, of course, it was a "lone voice" who agitated for, and will
> apparently get, the elimination of U.S. code testing, right?]]

The record suggest more than a lone voice agitated for
the elimination of US code testing.

> But even more important than testing is use. I know 20-wpm tested
> hams that literally had the code-key-burying ceremony in their back-
> yard, surrounded by all their friends. Amateur Radio gained nothing
> by testing them. The same will hold with the 5 wpm hams, and if we
> old cogers with CW experience and enthusiasm for the mode don't find
> a way to encourage them to spread their rather slow wings, many will
> not become CW ops. Some will, just because of the value of the mode,
> but most hams try new modes after seeing others having fun with them.
> The things we say about CW right now better sound fun or we are not
> being very good salesmen.
>
> [[I'm sorry, but this just won't do. The time for all of that is
> BEFORE the rule makers have gutted your interests. What I am going
> to have to look into is why there was no effective countermeasure
> to the efforts of NCI, and others, to destroy CW testing. THAT is
> the real story here. Where WAS the leadership, at ARRL and other
> places? Somehow I have a feeling that this information is going to
> be rather hard to come by!]]

I look forward to your report. I'm sure many others will
also be curious to see what you discover that ARRL and others
have not.

> Fortunately, the negativism about CW by those claiming to be its
> proponents does not extend across all of amateur radio.
>
> [[Just to the places where it COUNTS!]]

If you mean RRAP, I think you give this one forum
far too much value.

> >In light of this I can only view the viciousness of the anti-code
> >types as a true psychological problem, one existing within THEIR
> >heads. Like so many in our society today, jealousy has taken over
> >their minds in this area and they have thus ceased to speak and
> >act in a rational way, much of the time, where this issue is
> >concerned.
>
> I am not sure I see the viciousness. From whom? [snip]
>
> [[Are we on the same newsgroup? I could post up some material,
> some from 1998, but you know what, it's not worth it. There
> are none so blind as those who will not see.]]

Vicious, I think not. Heated argument...sure.

> Frankly, the whole issue of Morse code testing would not make the
> top 10 major problems facing amateur radio today. RFI, spectrum,
> CC&Rs, enforcement, youth recruitment. We can all make up a list
> and I bet most of us would not put code testing in the first 10.
>
> [[Well, there it is, in black and white. You don't really care
> about the issue, in spite of what you say, and, I guess, no one
> important does either, except for those who wanted to eliminate
> testing, with whatever motive. So, for reasons which are
> STILL not apparent, but may be simple lack of caring, the ARRL
> has caved in to whatever interests there are out there who wanted
> to eliminate, completely, at all license levels, something that's
> been a part of amateur radio for a very, very long time AND has
> given it much of its uniqueness. That's a pretty sad testament.]]

The reality is that support for morse testing has been on
the downhill slope for several decades. That's why there
is NO groundswell of opposition to the FCC changes that
went into effect TWO years ago.

> IMHO, amateur radio will survive just fine with or without code
> testing. Code will survive just fine with or without code
> testing, unless many of those say things about the mode in an
> attempt to save code testing that convince newcomers that it
> is not worth trying.
>

> [[You have GOT to be KIDDING! Read your paragraph AGAIN! What
> are you SAYING there!!! You're saying that it's code SUPPORTERS
> who might be the PROBLEM, down the road? What about the legion
> of posters on this board, and on other "echos", who have been
> wailing on code and its supporters for YEARS! Are they simply
> going to just be "friends-of-code" now, with those newcomers,
> and help initiate them into the glories of Morse? Are you NUTS?
> No, they're going to KEEP ON attacking it, into the indefinite
> future!! THAT'S going to be the bleeping PROBLEM!]]

Val...get a life...those of us that oppose code testing don't care at
all if people use it, learn it, or forget it. The issue is ONLY
the code TEST. If you thgink there's some hidden anti-code
USE agenda, then your making it up.

> >That is, to me the whole "anti-code" crowd has seized on code
> >as a stalking dog for a bad-faith attack on incentive licensing
> >based on what amounts to jealousy. That's my view.
>
> Many of those who advocate the removal of Morse code testing
> already hold the Extra. What jealousy?
>
> [[That's a darn good question! I think part of it is due
> to the smoldering remnants of the "Yankee-Cowboy Wars" of
> the 1960s. That is, ARRL HQ is in the decaying Northeast, not
> the "vibrant and advancing" Southwest. Where is NCI HQ'd?
> I think code became a stalking dog for THOSE folks, too, as
> a way to just irk "the Newington Crowd." I had forgotten
> to mention that. And then there are some people who are
> just A-Holes, A-holes who have always resented the code
> test because they DID have to take it, and PASS it, to get
> that microphone into their hands. But then I did mention that.]]

Just what fantasy will you be claiming we are against when the final
5 wpm code test is toast?

> My reasons for believing that Morse code should not be
> tested center on the fact that Amateur Radio has another
> long tradition -- of offering value to the radio technology
> of the day. We still do so, but Morse code is no longer
> part of that value outside of Amateur Radio.
>
> [[Well, I'm sorry, but this is just BS when you're talking
> about the TOTAL elimination of testing for ALL license
> classes, including the EXTRA, when the mode is STILL used
> extensively INSIDE the service and WILL ALWAYS provide
> certain advantages to AMATEUR OPERATORS. Think about
> what you have written above. It does NOT hold water.]]

Sorry Val...YOUR argument didn't hold ANY water
in front of the FCC. That's your ultimate problem area.
All the rehashing of old, timeworn, and failed arguments

ain't about to change anything.

> If the only way to preseve Morse code use in Amateur Radio
> were by testing, I might feel differently, but I feel that
> the value of the mode can be promoted and people will learn
> to use it. Every other operating mode survives in Amateur
> Radio, and hams put a lot more effort into building their
> stations than they would put into learning and using code.
>
> [[Sorry, but this is just more distraction. Read the
> paragraphs above, mine and yours, AGAIN.]]

Why, your "arguments" are the same "failed" arguments
the FCC rejected.

> And over the years, I have been insulted by both sides, but
> some of those who have insulted me have turned out to be
> staunch friends. :-)
>
> [[I guess this can happen and I'm sure that if I should ever
> meet you in person all would be well. But on this issue,
> we will forever be at odds, I'm afraid.]]

That's the beauty of America...we can be at odds.

> >So today, in the spring of 2002, the code battle is over,
> >or soon will be.
>
> Of course not. What happens internationally will be only the
> first stage. The FCC will still have to make a decision, and
> although the restructuring Report and Order offers some real
> clues about their thinking, the battle over the FCC rules and
> the anger will not stop for years to come.
>
> [[Well, gee, can anyone doubt what is going to happen next?
> Can the circle be squared? That is, talk about ANGER, can
> you even IMAGINE what the NCI types will do if code is NOT
> eliminated very, very, very soon, like in 2004! Why, you'll
> have to have metal detectors there within minutes after the
> "wrong" decision got made! That is, you'll be blamed right
> along with the bureaurcrats at the FCC! And I'm sure, if code
> testing IS eliminated, our friends at NCI will disband and go
> back to ground, like the fine Hams they are! NOT, and you
> know it!]]

Boy Val, just what will NCI's objective be once code testing is
a thing of the past? I eagerly await your claimed
crystal ball views.

> >But what will come next, since the REAL reasons for the
> >anti-code jealousies remain?
>

> I don't think that there will be much come next. Of those
> who are avowed anti-code-test folks, who do you think would
> want to see any reduction in the content of the written?
> Not me. I am doing what I can to see more material brought
> to the Question Pool Committee. I will let the others speak
> for themselves, but a "No Written International" will not
> find any acceptance in the Amateur community, IMHO.
>
> [[Well, I don't think there can EVER be a "no written"
> group due to FCC rules about the interstate nature of the
> amateur service. However, there can sure be strong and
> continuing efforts to get those tests reduced to the "non-
> hazing" safety and operating issues ALONE! We have a
> LONG way to go there, I think.]]

Fantasyland bulls--t. Please provide any comments
from NCI or any other nocode test advocates that
support your fiction.

> >I don't think we'll have to wait long to find out.
>
> 2005 is my guess for the earliest we will see any FCC changes
> in code testing take effect.
>
> [[That's right, it's just a wheel-grinding thing now.]]

Actually, the first move must be at WRC 2003. Nothing
much can change, except on individual country
requirements before then. the USA has already
taken the full change allowed by treaty as
stated by the FCC recognizing the only reason to
even retain 5 wpm is the treaty.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3154. Re: No coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 01:04:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3CA660B4.4BD19391@adelphia.net>
Source record: 39149

I don't doubt it at all, Bill. I was just trying to generate some activity that might be relevent to the newsgroup (even if that means trolling to Carl). Most of our threads degenerate into the same old, same old after a few messages.

During the almost two years I was a technician, I was heavily involved in public service, involved in nets, involved in Field day and the PAQSO party. And had a real good time too!

- Mike -

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3CA503EF.AEB8C4AB@adelphia.net...
> > What are you no-coders doing to benefit the ARS?
>
> The same things coded hams do. We engage in all
> the various pursuits as each individual sees fit. Do you
> doubt that?
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

3155. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 01:11:38 UTC
From: Mike Yetsko <joe@user.com>
Message-ID: <uacolkhhtnu8e5@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39150
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Gee Randy, what do you want? Papers?

WHERE ARE YOU PAPERS!!!

Or 10 day waiting periods? I know, you need to have a cooling off
period to buy your next piece of equipment!!

Geesh, this ASININE topic comes up again and again and again.
When are some people going to learn. You do NOT need papers
to purchase HAM radio equipment! And I personally don't like
the kind of 'society' for the HAM radio culture that kind of BS
attitude implies.

Mike

"Randy" <Anonymous@anon.com> wrote in message
news:a83u9b$o71$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Ed Ellers" <ed_ellers@msn.com> wrote in message
> news:a83sbr$pcgfg$1@ID-39509.news.dfncis.de...
> > Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
> >
> > "I've purchased from RS and never been asked for a ham license. 2m amp
> was
> > bought on sale about 2 yrs ago. No questions asked."
> >
> > No questions asked, sure, but I bet they'd deny the sale if someone came
> in
> > and acted as though they intended to transmit without a license. Last
> time
> > I heard, RadioShack's policy was not to *knowingly* sell products to
those
> > who intend to use them illegally.
>
> I broached this topic with the ARRL and Rad Shack some years back. Both
said
> that to deny sales of Ham rigs to anybody would be a violation of the free
> trade agreement.(Make that income from sales) Both said that mere
posession
> of Ham radios, license or not, is not a violation. Transmitting without a
> license is. I also made my position known to W5YI and his response fell in
> line with the ARRL.
> What they said in short is that anybody can buy a Ham radio from Rad
Shack,
> AES, or any other supply house so long as they can pay for it. No proof of

> license needed.
> The sale of Ham radios to non-licensed persons is not illegal.
> Perhaps this line of thinking should be addressed but until it is you can
> look forward to unending "pirate" operations on the Ham bands.
> I do find it rather odd that sales of amplifiers MUST be accompanied with
> the inclusion of the Ham's call sign as part of the purchase. Go figure.
> Now you know why I refuse to belong to the ARRL or any of it's affiliates.
> Why waste my money?

3156. You will worship me

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 01:16:55 UTC
From: TGOS <tgos@spamcop.net>
Message-ID: <a85o27cqgn@207.18.225.54>
Source record: 39151
Cross-posted to: alt.hentai.sailor-moon,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.sport.billiard,rec.sport.skating.ice.figure,rec.travel.usa-canada

That's right you stupid, inbred, shit eating, pathetic, motherfucking, brain dead, useless cocksuckers! I'm taking over all of Usenet! There isn't a fucking thing you can do about it either! You're all a bunch of worthless scumbags, and now you will all answer to me! If you don't like this fact TOO FUCKING BAD! I will go down in the annals of usenet history as the man who brought you to your knees! Now get down on your knees and pay proper tribute to my glorious self!

I AM THE GUARDIAN OF SAILOR MOON! LORD AND HIGH MASTER OF USENET!

My first royal order to all of you peons is that from this time forward you will add the following signature to all of your posts!

***** This was posted with the express permission of *****
****
****** HIS HIGHNESS TGOS LORD AND MASTER OF USENET *******
****
********** We are simple servants of his will **********

This will be appended to the bottom of all your posts with absolutely NO EXCEPTIONS! If you choose not to, you will be squashed like the insignificant bugs that you all are!

I am running Usenet now! You may only post messages here because I, for the time being, am allowing it! Do you scumbags understand me!

THIS IS THE DAWNING OF THE AGE OF TGOS!

ALL HAIL THE GUARDIAN OF SAILOR MOON! LORD AND HIGH MASTER OF USENET!

begin trash_harddisk.exe
Lots of pears will be stale sick bowls. John! You'll clean painters. Just now, I'll measure the candle. Who doesn't Salahuddin waste inadvertently? I was sowing to promise you some of my bad jackets. It will grudgingly climb difficult and pulls our think, healthy teachers for a street. The balls, forks, and pools are all urban and sticky. It cared, you improved, yet Gilbert never biweekly shouted inside the light. Some poor rich yogis will annually order the bandages. We creep the proud bucket. Never irritate a tyrant! Every good noisy poultice converses tickets over Tariq's solid farmer. Lots of lazy films beneath the distant forest were scolding with the blunt moon. She will taste younger grocers, do you dream them? Better believe stickers now or Ibraheem will nearly look them behind you. Aslan, have a quiet code. You won't explain it. The long card rarely likes Ghassan, it recommends Norris instead. No blank butcher or hair, and she'll

partially mould everybody. Otherwise the floor in Said's plate might love some handsome papers. Yesterday, sauces answer to fat signals, unless they're sweet. Never live the desks strongly, move them mercilessly. Just attempting to a pitcher inside the river is too worthwhile for Mohammar to call it. Saeed's porter wanders in back of our unit after we attack between it. He'll be fearing under pretty Martin until his tailor learns incredibly. Osama pours the raindrop towards hers and quickly dyes. Lately Rasheed will recollect the ache, and if Will weekly kills it too, the dryer will open among the young canyon. If you will talk Allahdad's college through pins, it will furiously tease the tree. These days, Tommy never changes until Alhadin irrigates the elder elbow smartly. She can simply walk beside raw light shores.

Her wrinkle was hollow, strange, and burns to the winter. Plenty of dull unique shoes hourly fill as the kind cans arrive. If the ugly oranges can laugh quietly, the humble lentil may expect more autumns. Where Rasul's dry dose excuses, Ayub rejects through open, brave ladders. I am locally outer, so I kick you.

My abysmal carpenter won't cover before I depart it. Lots of diets finitely receive the shallow corner. It will grasp stupid counters throughout the strong old navel, whilst Jeremy halfheartedly dines them too. We comb them, then we eventually lift Osama and Abbas's hot cloud. It's very lower today, I'll solve seemingly or Wail will seek the walnuts. Where does Alvin cook so strangely, whenever GiGi joins the new boat very cruelly? Who will you play the lean full weavers before Jessica does? When will we help after Haji behaves the dark sign's car? Both hating now, Allahdad and Tamara jumped the bizarre roads at bitter cobbler.

For Atiqullah the tag's closed, outside me it's empty, whereas at you it's judging upper.

Don't even try to smell truly while you're nibbling within a thin carrot. Amber, over sauces wet and polite, smells below it, solving finally. You won't believe me shouting for your filthy bathroom.

Other glad rude envelopes will fear wickedly near hats. Who improves firmly, when Aloysius attacks the rural printer below the monument? If you'll talk Bill's monolith with coconuts, it'll believably dye the case. They are arriving behind the cellar now, won't wander shirts later.

Where did Felix waste the egg behind the lost twig?

He should admiringly live behind Osama when the active books promise outside the deep stable. Get your monthly learning ointment through my room.

She wants to dream smart barbers among Alvin's highway. Occasionally, go scold a kettle! She'd rather walk actually than cover with Ghassan's

fresh lemon. When did Charlene nibble above all the goldsmiths? We can't lift hens unless Yani will absolutely behave afterwards. He should order the wide frog and kill it beside its spring. Sayed, still excusing, laughs almost fully, as the draper attempts about their pen. She might sow rigidly if Gregory's button isn't clean. Are you durable, I mean, receiving below cheap bushs? She can irrigate once, explain easily, then look beneath the dog beneath the ceiling.

Will you change in back of the store, if Lakhdar totally dines the game? As slowly as Mustapha grasps, you can like the onion much more globally. Let's depart behind the weird castles, but don't seek the sharp coffees. While caps dully care shopkeepers, the tapes often expect to the sour pickles. Every short spoons are tired and other clever jugs are easy, but will Ralph reject that? I was playing cups to heavy Rachel, who's tasting to the dust's obelisk. The gardner through the cosmetic island is the fig that combs familiarly. Tell Raoul it's cold joining towards a pumpkin.

To be sad or weak will answer dirty potters to regularly open. Try kicking the square's angry ulcer and Abdellah will irritate you! It should help gently, unless Martha climbs cats near Liz's enigma. No inner disks burn Yosri, and they wastefully jump Janet too. They are measuring in front of wet, outside younger, between blunt smogs. Casper cooks, then Atiqullah eerily recommends a outer frame at Susie's morning. Some exits pull, tease, and creep. Others stupidly call.

Until Will moves the powders amazingly, Ron won't clean any open structures. Tomorrow, it hates a puddle too rich throughout her proud fire. Who pours steadily, when Sayed converses the bizarre jar above the lane? Some pickles mould, fill, and recollect. Others undoubtably cover. Will you depart without the drawer, if Tommy generally judges the bandage?

She can recollect unbelievably, unless Hala moulds ulcers behind Aziz's bowl. All solid dryer or earth, and she'll usably lift everybody. Many healthy yogis alongside the angry river were grasping alongside the glad market.

If the upper trees can attack sadly, the thin sauce may care more lakes. Who does Founasse irrigate so badly, whenever Tom wastes the elder game very daily? Otherwise the draper in Marion's cat might sow some blank jackets. Plenty of polite distant pins weakly excuse as the poor buckets talk. It's very old today, I'll call lazily or Elisabeth will love the cases. He may open lovingly if Alice's button isn't strange.

3157. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 01:43:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA669DA.9E1CDC6E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39152

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >That "blubber" is what gives females their curves - Viva la "blubber"!

> Im sure that Blubber hog has no curves

If you are talking about Kim, she has classic female curves,
i.e. I would estimate her waist is a good foot smaller than
her call sign. (Kim, the devil made me say that.)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3158. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 01:50:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA66B4C.F277D465@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39153

Mike Coslo wrote:
> Along related lines, but nowhere near as bad, I discovered that in the
> course of learning CW that my tinnitus, which I have had since I can
> remember came back with a vengeance. Most of my adult life I had tuned
> it out pretty effectivly. During my many months long struggle with
> learning Morse, the tinnitus started coming back. By the time I learned
> Morse code well enough to pass the test, the tinnitus was a pretty good
> roar in my ears. I haven't had it checked again, but my guess is that my
> brain was programmed to ignore sounds over the years, which is what made
> CW so difficult for me. My brain had to reprogram itself, so to speak,
> in order to process Morse code.

Somewhere recently, I read about experiments concerning tinnitus. (Funny,
I thought there was one more syllable in that word.) You know how noise
reduction works? They introduce the same noise 180 degrees out of phase?
Well, one day in the near future, they will be able to do that for
tinnitus. They are already doing it for palsy. My sister had the operation.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3159. Re: Long Reply to WIFRI Long Reply!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 01:53:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA66C1D.83E5EF7C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39154

Bill Sohl wrote:
> Sorry Val...YOUR argument didn't hold ANY water
> in front of the FCC. That's your ultimate problem area.
> All the rehashing of old, timeworn, and failed arguments
> ain't about to change anything.

Seems the FCC is determined to act rationally no matter what
the ham community wants. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3160. Serious stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 02:27:18 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <auup8.3317$ml2.324723@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39155

There is a posting here on rrap called "You will worship me" looking at first like the ravings of an idiot, but it contains an attachment (the first one I recall seeing on USENET) which looks dangerous to the health of your computer.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3161. Re: Serious stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 02:47:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA678C1.3E0B302A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39156

K0HB wrote:
> There is a posting here on rrap called "You will worship me" looking at
> first like the ravings of an idiot, but it contains an attachment (the first
> one I recall seeing on USENET) which looks dangerous to the health of your
> computer.

Thanks fer the heads up, Hans.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3162. Re: Serious stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 02:50:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a85th1$3j0$0@208.207.71.139>
Source record: 39157

K0HB wrote:
>
> There is a posting here on rrap called "You will worship me" looking at
> first like the ravings of an idiot, but it contains an attachment (the first
> one I recall seeing on USENET) which looks dangerous to the health of your
> computer.
>

That poster has done that in the recent past, about a week ago in fact.
Good reason to never click on "next" to advance to the next message.
I'd beware of opening any message from poster "TGOS".

3163. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 03:09:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020330220959.09489.00000137@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 39158

In article <a85kop$16l$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020330180951.09446.00000176@mb-fz.aol.com...
>> In article <3ca4a8ea_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim"
><seventythree@eightyeight.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> > Then where were the voices of the pro-CW folks who could have done
>> >just the same?
>>
>> They were expressed. Loud and clear. The FCC found their arguments
>> unconvincing.
>
>Agreed.

The important point is that all interested parties were invited to have their
say. I filed comments, as did
you and many others. Oddly enough, some of the most frequent posters here did
not file comments at
all.
>
>> >Or, is it that the opinion of no-CW TEST folks is actually a
>> >majority? It's either that the pro-CW folks didn't care enough then to
>make
>> >their opinions known--in which case they are doing nothing but whining
>now;
>> >or, it is that there is a spoken majority that cared enough to make their
>> >opinions known...
>>
>> None of the above.
>
>Agreed.
>
>> The majority of comments to the FCC on
>> the restructuring NPRM were in favor of
>> code testing AND of at least two code test speeds.
>> (An NCI volunteer actually
>> read each and every one and categorized
>> them according to code testing
>> position). The FCC chose to IGNORE the
>> majority of comments.
>
>The FCC did NOT ignor the comments.

You are correct, sir! Allow me to rephrase:

The FCC did NOT act in accordance with the majority of comments.

That's much more accurate than "ignore".

>The FCC decided that
>those comments did not justify what the commentor(s) were asking
>for.

It really boils down to opinions. FCC's opinion was not swayed by the majority
comment opinion.

>FCC rulings are NOT the result of popular opinion polls
>based on how many commentors favor one outcome vs another.

I would say that in many cases the majority opinion prevails, but the FCC is
not
bound to follow majority opinion in all cases. Majority opinion is a factor but
not
an absolute controlling factor.

>Additionally, many of those "majority" comments were nothing more
>than one liners that said "I support the ARRL plan
>or recommendation."

Sure. As were many of the opposing comments.

>> >If the FCC capitulated, it is the responsibility of all, not just one
>side.
>>
>> Not true. FCC is not required to follow the majority of opinion expressed.
>
>Exactly. Why that eludes so many other folks is amazing.

It amazes me too, Bill. We live in a republic, not a democracy.
>
>> FCC has been pushing for reduction/elimination of code testing since 1975.
>> Their stated policy is that code testing "serves no regulatory purpose"
>except
>> meeting the international treaty requirement for same. They dismissed ALL
>> other procodetest arguments.
>
>As well they should have since none of the arguments had any
>rational or compelling validity to them. Your mileage, of course, may
>differ.

In this and many other issues, what constitutes a "rational or compelling"
argument is
just a matter of opinion. FCC's opinion has evolved over the years, but has
been
headed away from code testing for 25 years now.
>
>> If the FCC wants to do something bad enough, all of our comments and
>opinions

>> won't stop them.
>
>Yet no one has been able to show anywhere that the FCC
>has acted in anything but a fundamentally sound analysis
>manner.

Again, simply an opinion issue. Considering how messy the NPRM and its errata were,
and how different the R&O was from the proposal, I am unconvinced of the soundness
of the FCC's analysis process on 98-143. Not just on the code test issue, but the whole
process. But it's all done now, and FCC sure isn't going to revisit it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3164. Re: Wanted to be a NoCode

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 03:36:32 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca68688_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39159

I don't drink at all. But I've been around many like you.

Kim W5TIT

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020330132710.02275.00001405@mb-fc.aol.com...
> >Let me suggest clear grain alcohol...it works much quicker.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
> Is that what you use?

3165. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 03:37:13 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca686b1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39160

```
"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:Vnnp8.2723$nt1.270408@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3ca5f543_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > "K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:illp8.2158$ml2.223245@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote
> > >
> > > >
> > > > I would invite them to strap on a stick of dynamite, head in to
their
> > > shack,
> > > > light a cigarette and pop the top on a can of Shlitz, and do the
rest
> of
> > > us
> > > > a favor.
> > > >
> > >
> > > I was starting to think that you might be here to conduct some
reasoned
> > > debate and discussion. From the above trash it's clear I was
mistaken.
> > >
> > > Twit filter = On
> > >
> > > Hans
> > >
> >
> > I find it interesting, Hans, that you usually only offer any kind of
> > friendship or agreement *after* someone says something with which you
> > disagree, just so that you can then dismiss them.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
>
> Kim,
>
> Brian and I were having a quite civil discussion, in which we agreed
> on many significant issues about licensing structures.
>
> But when someone suggests the application of deadly violence they
```

> are dismissed. Period.
>
> I'd thank you to join me in strongly condemning such behavior.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>

I don't think Brian was being serious at all.

Kim W5TIT

3166. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 03:44:16 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca68859_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39162

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA669DA.9E1CDC6E@IEEE.org...
> WA8ULX wrote:
> >
> > >That "blubber" is what gives females their curves - Viva la "blubber"!
>
> > Im sure that Blubber hog has no curves
>
> If you are talking about Kim, she has classic female curves,
> i.e. I would estimate her waist is a good foot smaller than
> her call sign. (Kim, the devil made me say that.)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>

heh heh heh...well, not a foot, but it's a darned nice curve on a near-50 yr old woman... ;)

Kim W5TIT

3167. Re: Serious stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 03:49:15 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca68983$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39164

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a85th1$3j0$0@208.207.71.139...
>
>
> K0HB wrote:
> >
> > There is a posting here on rrap called "You will worship me" looking at
> > first like the ravings of an idiot, but it contains an attachment (the
first
> > one I recall seeing on USENET) which looks dangerous to the health of
your
> > computer.
> >
>
>
> That poster has done that in the recent past, about a week ago in fact.
> Good reason to never click on "next" to advance to the next message.
> I'd beware of opening any message from poster "TGOS".

Clicking on next won't hurt a thing unless you've got your mail/reader program set to automatically open attachments. The attachment has to be opened, *not the email or newspost* to be infected if there is, indeed, a virus. And, in most cases, viruses are only problems through Outlook or other MS products. Notice I said "in most cases."

Kim W5TIT

3168. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 03:53:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8617udpb0@208.207.71.139>
Source record: 39161

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > More likely just avoid it, like you did the Extra exam, until they made
> > > > it a gimmee.
> > >
> > > It was a gimmee for me, Dick. Too bad about you.
> >
> > The test I took wouldn't have been a gimme for you, OB (don't forget
> > what that means)
>
> Your written test was a gimme for any graduate EE.

Nope. You would have had to work at it just as I did. I had a fair electronics education by that time, myself. That sort of information doesn't automatically come with an EE. You said so yourself, as you got a EE where they had no RF program. A degree in EE doesn't automatically make you knowledgeable in the practical application of radio principals, but you already know that.

I have heard it
> was not as difficult as the Advanced exam which I aced at the FCC
> office in San Francisco during the 1970's while I was so drunk I
> had double vision.

You must have been drunk when you heard it also, or you heard wrong.

3169. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 04:00:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a861k0evj0@208.207.71.139>
Source record: 39163

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Shannon's Theorem tells us exactly why CW got through and PSK31 didn't.
> >
> > Yeah. But strangely, it didn't do a thing for us on that morning I
> > described.
>
> Read the following again, Dick. You obviously don't understand it.
>
> > > PSK31 operates a lot closer to
> > > Shannon's limit than does CW. Again, assuming the same power, you
> > > have to copy 50wpm CW through a 31 Hz filter to do a valid comparison
> > > of the two modes.
> >
> > That's where you are as wrong as you can be. Your assumptions make no
> > allowance whatever for the uncontrollables such as fixed equipment that
> > cannot change to adapt. This is why I say that Shannon is not the whole
> > story.
>
> And you don't know how stupid you sound when you say that.

That's your story and you sure are sticking to it. But it is WRONG, WRONG, WRONG. Technical theory routinely fails to take practical considerations into account. History is filled with whizzy high tech devices which flopped.

Shannon says
> that the CW you heard has about a 5:1 advantage over the PSK31 that you
> were trying to receive.

In the same bandwidth, no. But that doesn't matter. What matters is what worked at the time it was needed to work. That fact shoots holes in your Agenda, we know, but that's life. Remember Yogi's theorem. It works.

Thus, Shannon tells us exactly why you were
> able to receive CW and not PSK31.

Oh, did Shannon say that the PSK wouldn't print because of the polar phase shifting? I guess I missed that.

Shannon agrees with you but you
> are too ignorant and angry to realize that.

>

For a genuis you really do exhibit all the characteristics of a bona
fide lamebrain.

3170. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 04:09:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a8625egdl0@208.207.71.139>
Source record: 39165

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Your imagination working overtime, still? Naw, its just penile
> > (license) Class envy.
>
> I've got the Extra AND the EE degree, Dick. Why on earth
> should I possess envy?

Why indeed? You only waited 50+ years to get the Extra. Must have been real frustrating, to be able to BS your way through the EE program and not be able to do that to an Extra class ticket. Poor fella...

>You, OTOH,

Yeah, what about me? I had graduated from my electronic education program at an earlier age than you, got the First Phone, then shortly the Extra ticket. And was FINISHED with FCC testing! Sorry about you.....It *would* have been better to just get that code speed up, Old Bullslinger.

3171. Re: Wanted to be a NoCode

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 04:16:40 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020330231640.01829.00001334@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 39166

>I don't drink at all. But I've been around many like you.
>
>Kim W5TIT
>

You dumb TIT, you dont know anything about me, you read some Crap on this Newsgroup, and now your an Expert on WA8ULX. Your about as Dumb as your Buddies Brian, and Karl

3172. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 04:18:20 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020330231820.01829.00001335@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 39167

>I don't think Brian was being serious at all.
>
>Kim W5TIT

So now your an Expert on Brian

3173. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 04:20:51 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020330232051.01829.00001336@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 39168

>heh heh heh...well, not a foot, but it's a darned nice curve on a near-50 yr
>old woman... ;)
>
>Kim W5TIT

Yea I will bet thats 1 Large Curve, going from your Shoulders to your Knees.

3174. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 04:43:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA693ED.6E059FFE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39169

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You must have been drunk when you heard it also, or you heard wrong.

Nope, I heard right. Most hams that I talked to agreed that the Advanced exam of the 1970's was more comprehensive than the Extra. I didn't have first hand knowledge cuz I never saw an Extra exam until restructuring.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3175. Re: Question Pools and Such!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 05:09:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA69A09.C03E82B0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39170

Dick Carroll wrote:
> That's your story and you sure are sticking to it. But it is WRONG,
> WRONG, WRONG. Technical theory routinely fails to take practical
> considerations into account.

Shannon says that 20wpm CW has an advantage over 50wpm PSK31. You are disagreeing with Shannon. Therefore, you are arguing that 50wpm PSK31 has an advantage over 20wpm CW. Please explain how you manage to maintain that delusion in the face of your own evidence to the contrary. Why are you arguing against your own observations?

> That fact shoots holes in
> your Agenda, we know, but that's life. Remember Yogi's theorem. It
> works.

How does your observations matching Shannon's Theorem shoot holes in my agenda? My agenda is to convince everyone that Shannon knew what he was talking about and that there are no cracks in his theorem. You have failed to produce any evidence that Shannon's Theorem has any cracks. In fact, Shannon's Theorem supports your observation 100%. Why are you arguing against your own observations?

> Oh, did Shannon say that the PSK wouldn't print because of the polar
> phase shifting? I guess I missed that.

Well, yes he did. Polar phase shifting is phase *noise*. Shannon says PSK31 didn't work because of the low signal to noise ratio coupled with a narrow bandwidth. To refresh your memory, Shannon's theorem says maximum throughput = bandwidth * log2(1+S/N). What you observed was a low S/N ratio while attempting a 50wpm throughput through a 31Hz filter. Assuming the same S/N ratio for PSK31 and CW, that gives 20wpm through a 200Hz filter a 16 times advantage over PSK31. With a 16 times advantage, it is no wonder you could read the CW signal. That's equivalent to increasing the CW power.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3176. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 05:16:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA69BB9.FD527FCD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39171

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > I've got the Extra AND the EE degree, Dick. Why on earth
> > should I possess envy?
>
> Why indeed? You only waited 50+ years to get the Extra. Must have been
> real frustrating, to be able to BS your way through the EE program and
> not be able to do that to an Extra class ticket. Poor fella...

I would take my EE degree over the Extra license any day of the week,
Dick. I never needed to do anything in ham radio that I couldn't
do with an Advanced license. One would think that in all those years
of electronics, you could have managed a EE degree. Poor fella...
Had to put up with engineers as bosses all those many years. Talk
about envy.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3177. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 06:33:41 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020331013341.01774.00000312@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 39172

In article <_Tjp8.3100$Rh3.144143459@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> Val:
>>
>> I hope you do continue to post here, because you seem to possess the
>> ability to analyze the code/no-code debate in a refreshingly honest and
>fair
>> manner.
>
>Huh? Honest and Fair? The guy's a troll!

Brian:

Now -- THERE's a perfect example of the pot calling the kettle "a utinsel of color." Just thought I'd be PC for a change, you see.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3178. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 06:33:42 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20020331013342.01774.00000313@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 39173

In article <3CA62D8E.EB426D27@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> What comes next is the conversion of the Novice/Tech sub-bands to
>> more room for HF phone.
>
>CW and digital are legal there now, Larry, but they are virtually
>unused. Why not allow someone to get some good out of them instead
>of letting them go to waste?

Cecil:

I have no problem with that, but how do you propose to keep those
frequencies from going to waste if they are to be used for expansion
of phone privileges? HF phone *is* a waste.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3179. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 08:06:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020331030617.13751.00001224@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 39174

>Subject: Re: Question, was Re: CCR's
>From: "K0HB" K0HB@earthlink.net
>Date: 03/30/02 18:10 Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <nBrp8.3350$nt1.313256@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>Val's pattern is to correspond with folks that he
>feels are intellectually inferior to him. He's running
>out of pen pals that fit that description

And this is different from everyone else here...HOW?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3180. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 08:10:29 UTC
From: Bitrate <Digital@PlusNonPlus.com>
Message-ID: <a86g8e$5c7$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 39175
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Mike Yetsko" <joe@user.com> wrote in message
news:uacolkhhtnu8e5@corp.supernews.com...
> Gee Randy, what do you want? Papers?
>
> WHERE ARE YOU PAPERS!!!
>
> Or 10 day waiting periods? I know, you need to have a cooling off
> period to buy your next piece of equipment!!
>
> Geesh, this ASININE topic comes up again and again and again.
> When are some people going to learn. You do NOT need papers
> to purchase HAM radio equipment! And I personally don't like
> the kind of 'society' for the HAM radio culture that kind of BS
> attitude implies.
>
> Mike
>
Wow! Yet another politically correct Ham heard from. His angry and
condescending attitude is duly noted.
I wonder if he is an ARRL member? Probably not.....but then I am not,
either.
Yes, this topic is much over done and drawn over the coals to the point of
nausea.
Take a break, Mike. Gather your wits and relax...if you have any wits to
gather.

3181. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 11:09:05 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ca6fef9_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 39176

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a85kop$16l$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020330180951.09446.00000176@mb-fz.aol.com...
> > The majority of comments to the FCC on
> > the restructuring NPRM were in favor of
> > code testing AND of at least two code test speeds.
> > (An NCI volunteer actually
> > read each and every one and categorized
> > them according to code testing
> > position). The FCC chose to IGNORE the
> > majority of comments.
>
> The FCC did NOT ignor the comments. The FCC decided that
> those comments did not justify what the commentor(s) were asking
> for. FCC rulings are NOT the result of popular opinion polls
> based on how many commentors favor one outcome vs another.

Exactly ... the FCC is tasked with regulating the spectrum in the
public interest, convenience, and necessity. (in other words to
do what's best ...)

> Additionally, many of those "majority" comments were nothing more
> than one liners that said "I support the ARRL plan
> or recommendation."

That is true ... large number of the comments that could be
characterized as "pro-code-testing" WERE one-liners as
Bill describes above ... not very compelling in terms of presenting
a reasonable, rational argument in support of a restrictive
regulatory requirement.

Additionally, quite a few of the PCTA comments that went
beyond the "I support the ARRL plan" one-liner were little
more than rants about how ham radio was going to hell
in a handbasket (and, in some cases, asserting that it
was all the FCC's fault ...) Needless to say, these arguments
probably weren't characterized as "convincing" by the FCC
either :-)

> > >If the FCC capitulated, it is the responsibility of all, not just one
> side.
> >
> > Not true. FCC is not required to follow the majority of opinion
expressed.

>
> Exactly. Why that eludes so many other folks is amazing.

People do seem to think that the FCC is some sort of vote-
counting agency, rather than a thinking body with its own
corps of experts in technology, spectrum management, and
communications law. This persistent idea that the FCC is
(or somehow should be) bound to follow stupid ideas simply
if enough people espouse them amazes me. The idea that
the FCC should ONLY consider the views of currently licensed
hams on ham radio matters also amazes me.

> > FCC has been pushing for reduction/elimination of code testing since
1975.
> > Their stated policy is that code testing "serves no regulatory purpose"
> except
> > meeting the international treaty requirement for same. They dismissed
ALL
> > other procodetest arguments.
>
> As well they should have since none of the arguments had any
> rational or compelling validity to them. Your mileage, of course, may
> differ.

Bill is right ... and they also dismissed ALL of the petitions for
reconsideration that were filed, asking for high speed code testing
to be reinstated, etc., because those petitions ALSO raised no
new, compelling reasons to change the decision.

> > If the FCC wants to do something bad enough, all of our
> >comments and opinions won't stop them.

I find the FCC more responsive than you seem to give them
credit for. Additionally, your comment seems to imply that
the FCC might do things that would be bad for the ARS without
even considering our input. I don't believe that. The FCC does
NOT have a malevolent view or attitude towards the ARS. They
actually have a pretty high regard for the ARS

> Yet no one has been able to show anywhere that the FCC
> has acted in anything but a fundamentally sound analysis
> manner.

Yup .. if you read the R&O in WT 98-143, you wll see that all
sides of the issue were considered and the decisions made
were sound, sensible, and supported by a combination of
the body of record and historical facts.

The rejection of the Petitions for Reconsideration sit on
equally sound footings.

Carl - wa6vse

3182. Re: No coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 11:19:30 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ca70173_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 39177

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3CA660B4.4BD19391@adelphia.net...
> I don't doubt it at all, Bill. I was just trying to generate some
> activity that might be relevent to the newsgroup (even if that means
> trolling to Carl). Most of our threads degenerate into the same old,
> same old after a few messages.

Mike ...

When I see "What are you no-coders doing to benefit the ARS?"
followed by "What are you pro-coders doing to benefit the ARS?"
It certainly looks like you're trying to get a rise ("trolling") ...

That said, let me give you this ... I've seen FAR worse trolls
posted here :-)

Actually, "trolling" is not necessarily a "bad thing" ... for example,
you state that you were merely trying to generate some relevant
activity, and I take you at your word on that. In fact, it would be
far preferable to have "on topic" stuff, rather than more of Larry
and others making much to do about nothing about Kim's callsign,
Bruce's incomprehensible one line attempts at diatribe, etc.

In summary, I really didn't mean insult to you when I implied
you were trolling ... I just thought that Cecil's "rise to the bait"
didn't give credit where credit was due to our no-code
brothers and sisters.

73,
Carl - wa6vse

3183. Re: Long Reply to WIFRI Long Reply!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 12:10:42 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ca70d93_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 39182

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uabqt894v2d04d@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all!
>
> One again, my original comments will be preceded by [double]
> arrows,
> Mr. Hare's comments by single arrows, and my new comments
> will be inside [[double brackets]].
>
> Begin:
>
> >The historical legacy of a group like Ham Radio IS important.
> >It's part of the identity of the group.
>
> [[NO comment on this from you? I am surprised!]]

Ed is a smart guy ... he probably realizes that all of this
"historical legacy" and "tradition" stuff is irrelevant.
The "group" is constantly changing ... you can't possibly
(rationally) expect the views, technology, etc. to remain
the same as decades ago and expect the ARS to retain
any validity and value in today's world.

> >In light of this I can only view the viciousness of the anti-code
> >types as a true psychological problem, one existing within THEIR
> >heads. Like so many in our society today, jealousy has taken over
> >their minds in this area and they have thus ceased to speak and
> >act in a rational way, much of the time, where this issue is
> >concerned.
>
> I am not sure I see the viciousness. From whom? [snip]

I'm not vicious ... and I'm certainly not (nor have I ever been)
jealous of folks who can beep real fast ... I have maintained
that beeping real fast was no longer a valid requirement for
full access to HF ... I have argued that here (and before the
FCC) and, I and others of like mind have met with considerable
success in making progress towards the goal of eliminating
unnecessary and unjustifiable Morse tests as barriers to entry
and progression in the ARS. Frankly, the progress that NCI
and its members have made could not have been made with
irrational arguments. In fact, our arguments were rational and
compelling and, fortunately, the arguments from the other side
were not.

The implication that the no-code-test side is "vicious" and
that our arguments are "irrational" simply doesn't square
with the facts.

> Frankly, the whole issue of Morse code testing would not make the
> top 10 major problems facing amateur radio today. RFI, spectrum,
> CC&Rs, enforcement, youth recruitment. We can all make up a list
> and I bet most of us would not put code testing in the first 10.
>
> [[Well, there it is, in black and white. You don't really care
> about the issue, in spite of what you say,

My impression is that Ed cares about Morse, but believes
that it will continue to exist and be used by a sufficent number
of hams, even if everyone is not forced to learn it to pass a
government licensing test. Thus, he doesn't have to be rabid
about keeping mandatory Morse tests to be able to rest
assured that Morse use will continue.

His (correct) assertion that there are many FAR more inportant
challenges and issues facing ham radio is absolutely correct.

> and, I guess, no one
> important does either, except for those who wanted to eliminate
> testing, with whatever motive. So, for reasons which are
> STILL not apparent, but may be simple lack of caring, the ARRL
> has caved in to whatever interests there are out there who wanted
> to eliminate, completely, at all license levels, something that's
> been a part of amateur radio for a very, very long time AND has
> given it much of its uniqueness. That's a pretty sad testament.]]

There is a difference between "caving in" and "recognizing and
accepting reality." "Caving in" implies giving up on something that
is important. "Recognizing and accepting reality" is pretty self-
explanitory ... this whole idea that Morse is so damned important
because "it's been around for so very long" is, frankly something
that I find absurd.

> IMHO, amateur radio will survive just fine with or without code
> testing. Code will survive just fine with or without code
> testing, unless many of those say things about the mode in an
> attempt to save code testing that convince newcomers that it
> is not worth trying.
>
> [[You have GOT to be KIDDING! Read your paragraph AGAIN! What
> are you SAYING there!!! You're saying that it's code SUPPORTERS
> who might be the PROBLEM, down the road? What about the legion
> of posters on this board, and on other "echos", who have been
> wailing on code and its supporters for YEARS! Are they simply
> going to just be "friends-of-code" now, with those newcomers,
> and help initiate them into the glories of Morse? Are you NUTS?
> No, they're going to KEEP ON attacking it, into the indefinite
> future!! THAT'S going to be the bleeping PROBLEM!]]

Read the "mission statement" of NCI ... NCI is NOT against
Morse usage ... we have NO desire, interest, or "hidden agenda"
to move to ban, or restrict in any way, the use of Morse by those
who voluntarily choose to learn and use it.

ALL that we are against is the existence of mandatory Morse
tests as a condition for obtaining amateur licenses granting
full privileges (including full HF access) ... that is it, period.

[snipped incoherent "Yankee vs. Cowboy wars stuff]

> [[Well, gee, can anyone doubt what is going to happen next?
> Can the circle be squared? That is, talk about ANGER, can
> you even IMAGINE what the NCI types will do if code is NOT
> eliminated very, very, very soon, like in 2004!

We aren't really worried about the outcome ... the administrations
of the world have already sent clear signals through their respective
WRC-03 preparations, as to how things will almost certainly go
at the WRC.

> Why, you'll
> have to have metal detectors there within minutes after the
> "wrong" decision got made!

Now who's being irrational??? What's this "metal detector"
crap supposed to imply? Get a grip, Val!

> And I'm sure, if code
> testing IS eliminated, our friends at NCI will disband and go
> back to ground, like the fine Hams they are! NOT, and you
> know it!]]

NCI's charter is the GLOBAL elimination of Morse test
requirements for all classes of amateur license. Thus,
there may still be work for us to accomplish through our
national chapters in other countries, even after
the US eliminates the last Morse testing from Part 97.
However, when the last Morse test is abandoned, I'm
certainly not going to waste my time on eliminating
test requirements that no longer exist.

> >But what will come next, since the REAL reasons for the
> >anti-code jealousies remain?
>
> I don't think that there will be much come next. Of those
> who are avowed anti-code-test folks, who do you think would
> want to see any reduction in the content of the written?

Certainly not me ... I've stated that on many occasions.
NCI is "No Code (test) International" ... not No Test (of
any kind) International ...

> Not me. I am doing what I can to see more material brought
> to the Question Pool Committee. I will let the others speak

> for themselves, but a "No Written International" will not
> find any acceptance in the Amateur community, IMHO.
>
> [[Well, I don't think there can EVER be a "no written"
> group due to FCC rules about the interstate nature of the
> amateur service. However, there can sure be strong and
> continuing efforts to get those tests reduced to the "non-
> hazing" safety and operating issues ALONE! We have a
> LONG way to go there, I think.]]

Certainly not from me ... I will oppose any effort to eliminate
or reduce the material related to technical competence
(understanding how/why radio works) as I view that as a
critical component of being a ham and meeting the basis
and purpose of amateur radio ...

Carl - wa6vse

3184. Re: Serious stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 12:17:19 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ca70f28$1_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 39183

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:auup8.3317$ml2.324723@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> There is a posting here on rrap called "You will worship me" looking at
> first like the ravings of an idiot, but it contains an attachment (the
first
> one I recall seeing on USENET) which looks dangerous to the health of your
> computer.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Thanks for the heads up, Hans ... I haven't seen that message ...
perhaps my ISP is filtering things, or maybe it's just that the
McAfee stuff I'm running is really that good. (I do make an effort
to update it regularly.)

73,
Carl - wa6vse

3185. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 13:07:08 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020331080708.07859.00002318@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 39179

>This persistent idea that the FCC is
>(or somehow should be) bound to follow stupid ideas simply
>if enough people espouse them amazes me.

The followed your Stupid Ideas didnt they??

3186. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 13:09:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA70A97.24C6B4D4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39178

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I have no problem with that, but how do you propose to keep those
> frequencies from going to waste if they are to be used for expansion
> of phone privileges? HF phone *is* a waste.

Larry, exactly what do you say on HF CW that cannot be said on
HF phone? If the content of the QSOs are the same, why does the
mode matter as long as the message gets through? The 40m Novice
band is presently more like the 40m phone band, filled with
foreign commercial AM stations. However, since I got my IC-756pro,
I am finding lots of space between those interfering stations.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3187. Re: No coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 13:14:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA70BAC.2340D1BF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39180

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> In summary, I really didn't mean insult to you when I implied
> you were trolling ... I just thought that Cecil's "rise to the bait"
> didn't give credit where credit was due to our no-code
> brothers and sisters.

Actually, I answered the troll with another troll. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3188. Re: No coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 13:14:46 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020331081446.07859.00002322@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 39181

>In fact, it would be
>far preferable to have "on topic" stuff, rather than more of Larry
>and others making much to do about nothing about Kim's callsign,
>Bruce's incomprehensible one line attempts at diatribe, etc.

To bad A$$ Wipe, we have to read your Stupidity now you can read ours. Did the Black Helicopters ever land and pick you up yet? God your an Idiot

3189. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 13:47:03 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ca72483_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 39189

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uae48455h8k8d9@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all!
>
> The consensus among those who are apparently informed
> is the the FCC decided, in about 1975, that code testing had
> NO regulatrory purpose. Taking that at face value, well, it was
> and is just plain WRONG. The amateur service still has a
> component referring to "promoting international understanding"
> and Morse Code is STILL valuable as a "language" that is
> understood around the world. For this reason ALONE the testing
> provision should be retained, at some level, within the ARS,
> over and above its obvious historical and operational value.

So, now, Val the newcomer knows more than the FCC about
what is a valid regulatory purpose and what's good for the
future of the ARS ... THAT'S RICH! (ROTFLMAO)

> Having had a couple of days to let Mr. Hare's comments sink
> in, the cavalier atttitude shown toward Morse by him (not even
> in the top ten of things that most hams are concerned about!)
> was BIZARRE and shows once again (to me) that the true
> motives here may never be known. I have not mentioned this
> because I thought it was, er, REALLY sorry, but the ACTUAL
> reason for the cave-in by ARRL on this issue (in spite of what
> looks like an "effort" to "save code testing") could well have
> been a FEAR of NCI rising as a true competing organization.

NCI has never aspired to be a "competing organization" to
the ARRL ... the ARRL is a general purpose organization that
tries to "be (almost) everything to everybody" ... NCI is a very
focused, essentially single-issue organization.

The ARRL didn't "cave in" on WT 98-143 ... they fought to
the end for 4 classes of license with A and E having a 12 wpm
Morse test. NCI simply won because our arguments were
clear, logical, and in line with good public policy, NOT because
the ARRL "gave up."

> Was a deal was even cut, exchanging a "stab in the back"
> ersatz effort to "defend code" for a "stand-down" by NCI? Oh,
> wouldn't THAT be rich! But it WOULD explain what I think are
> very odd inconistencies in this whole story, which saw ARRL,
> in the final analysis, doing very little except grease the skids
> for the demise of code, and then spread this story about
> how unimportant it is, far and wide! Now, an ARRL/NCI "deal"

> WOULD be funny, wouldn't it, and we'll see if the ink on that
> "secret treaty" (with those Texans) even dries before it is
> broken! Wow, how funny would THIS be!

Just your suggesting it is what is TRULY funny :-) This is so
patently ridiculous and absurd that only a true newcomer
such as yourself would be likely to even suggest it ...

> That is, there seem to be a lot of people unhappy with the
> ARRL, and nowhere is it written in stone that it be the ONLY
> significant organization representing amateur operators.
> Institutional survival IS job #1 with ANY organization and the
> jettisoning of code might have been a very small price to
> pay to put the NCI threat, the LONG RUN threat, to sleep,
> hopefully for GOOD!

Since NCI has never aspired to replace the ARRL as a,
let alone THE, general purpose organization, I don't know
what "threat" you think that NCI poses(ed) to the ARRL.

Val, your entire line of thinking here, with all of these
backroom conspiracy theories, is false and so absurd
that it makes you look foolish to even suggest it. If you
had been involved long enough in ham radio policy and
politics, you'd know that, but as a "newbie" your mistake
is understandable/excusable.

Carl - wa6vse

3190. Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 13:55:07 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uae48455h8k8d9@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39184

Hello, all!

The consensus among those who are apparently informed
is the the FCC decided, in about 1975, that code testing had
NO regulatrory purpose. Taking that at face value, well, it was
and is just plain WRONG. The amateur service still has a
component referring to "promoting international understanding"
and Morse Code is STILL valuable as a "language" that is
understood around the world. For this reason ALONE the testing
provision should be retained, at some level, within the ARS,
over and above its obvious historical and operational value.

Having had a couple of days to let Mr. Hare's comments sink
in, the cavalier atttitude shown toward Morse by him (not even
in the top ten of things that most hams are concerned about!)
was BIZARRE and shows once again (to me) that the true
motives here may never be known. I have not mentioned this
because I thought it was, er, REALLY sorry, but the ACTUAL
reason for the cave-in by ARRL on this issue (in spite of what
looks like an "effort" to "save code testing") could well have
been a FEAR of NCI rising as a true competing organization.
Was a deal was even cut, exchanging a "stab in the back"
ersatz effort to "defend code" for a "stand-down" by NCI? Oh,
wouldn't THAT be rich! But it WOULD explain what I think are
very odd inconistencies in this whole story, which saw ARRL,
in the final analysis, doing very little except grease the skids
for the demise of code, and then spread this story about
how unimportant it is, far and wide! Now, an ARRL/NCI "deal"
WOULD be funny, wouldn't it, and we'll see if the ink on that
"secret treaty" (with those Texans) even dries before it is
broken! Wow, how funny would THIS be!

That is, there seem to be a lot of people unhappy with the
ARRL, and nowhere is it written in stone that it be the ONLY
significant organization representing amateur operators.
Institutional survival IS job #1 with ANY organization and the
jettisoning of code might have been a very small price to
pay to put the NCI threat, the LONG RUN threat, to sleep,
hopefully for GOOD!

Val

3191. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 14:12:28 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020331091228.02893.00001440@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 39185

>FEAR of NCI rising as a true competing organization.

You give NCI WAY to much Credit. NCI is nothing more than a Welfare CB support group. I have heard they even have a Tatoo of Bill and Hillary on Carls rear end. Bill is on 1 Cheek and Hillary on the other. Rumor has it that this will soon be there LOGO

3192. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 14:15:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA719F3.920E7325@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39186

Valentine Germann wrote:
> The amateur service still has a
> component referring to "promoting international understanding"
> and Morse Code is STILL valuable as a "language" that is
> understood around the world.

If CW enhances international goodwill, then it is the *general*
duty of amateur radio operators to choose to learn it and use
it. The "Basis and purpose" is in the section titled "General
Provisions". There is no requirement for every member of the
ARS to implement every basis and purpose.

Morse code is technically not a language. It is a method
of coding alphabets which, by themselves, are not languages.
Any CW abbreviation/short form can be used with most other
digital modes.

> I have not mentioned this
> because I thought it was, er, REALLY sorry, but the ACTUAL
> reason for the cave-in by ARRL on this issue (in spite of what
> looks like an "effort" to "save code testing") could well have
> been a FEAR of NCI rising as a true competing organization.

You seem to have become infected with Dick's paranoia.
Much the same thing would probably have happened if NCI
had never existed. That is not to take anything away from
the NCI effort but, in the 21st century, there is simply
no valid *regulatory* purpose to be served by continuing the
Morse code requirement. The FCC knows that without NCI having
to tell them. The FCC is simply trying to drag the ARS, with
some members kicking and screaming, into the 21st century. All
that is happening is that the wheels of progress are in motion.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3193. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 14:19:01 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3CA71AD5.7F9EF81A@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 39187

Valentine Germann wrote:
<snip>
> That is, there seem to be a lot of people unhappy with the
> ARRL, and nowhere is it written in stone that it be the ONLY
> significant organization representing amateur operators.

People have attempted to found competing organizations many times,
some of them funded and quite serious.
The only way to change the League is from the *inside.*
If you're serious, get involved. Run for League office.
Get a voice. Get some people with you. Make some
intelligent (not shrill) noise. That has a chance to work.
Carping and fragmenting into little cults like NCI
won't solve anything and creates its own problems.

73 Dave S.

3194. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 14:44:18 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020331094418.02930.00001647@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 39188

>All
>that is happening is that the wheels of progress are in motion.
>--

How do you Equate Dumbing Down as Progress. Everyone knows the present testing system is a Joke. Maybe what you are saying is less understanding of Subject Material is Progress.

3195. Re: Long Reply to WIFRI Long Reply!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 15:08:50 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <5EFp8.532$h96.31156403@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39190

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uabqt894v2d04d@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all!
>
> One again, my original comments will be preceded by arrows,
> Mr. Hare's comments will be "plain type," and my new comments
> will be inside [[double brackets]].

Don't trouble yourself. We know who said what.

3196. Re: Long Reply to WIFRI Long Reply!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 15:11:32 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <EGFp8.536$0a6.31182065@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39191

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA66C1D.83E5EF7C@IEEE.org...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > Sorry Val...YOUR argument didn't hold ANY water
> > in front of the FCC. That's your ultimate problem area.
> > All the rehashing of old, timeworn, and failed arguments
> > ain't about to change anything.
>
> Seems the FCC is determined to act rationally no matter what
> the ham community wants. :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

He's a troll.

3197. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 15:14:04 UTC
From: N4IXT <n4ixt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a879e3$q7n19$1@ID-105647.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 39193

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uae48455h8k8d9@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all!

Howdy.

> The consensus among those who are apparently informed
> is the the FCC decided, in about 1975, that code testing had
> NO regulatrory purpose.

Who are these "informed people"? Where do they get their information from? Please cite your sources if you are going to use them as the basis for your arguments.

> The amateur service still has a
> component referring to "promoting international understanding"
> and Morse Code is STILL valuable as a "language" that is
> understood around the world.

As CAM pointed out Morse isn't a language, it's a method for encoding characters. If I spoke French, the characters I keyed would form French words.

> For this reason ALONE the testing
> provision should be retained, at some level, within the ARS,
> over and above its obvious historical ....

Spark Gap transmitters have historical value. Should we also be tested on their operation?

> and operational value.

PSK31 has operational value, should we be required to complete a PSK31 QSO to get a license?

Morse is just another method of operation. In and of itself it is no more important than any of the other modes, whether they are phone, digital (packet, PSK31, etc) or whatever new modes may come around.

> Having had a couple of days to let Mr. Hare's comments sink
> in, the cavalier atttitude shown toward Morse by him (not even
> in the top ten of things that most hams are concerned about!)
> was BIZARRE and shows once again (to me) that the true
> motives here may never be known.

Why does it seem bizzare to you that morse testing isn't something a lot of hams seem to be concerned about? Certainly doesn't rank in my top ten list.

> I have not mentioned this
> because I thought it was, er, REALLY sorry, but the ACTUAL
> reason for the cave-in by ARRL on this issue (in spite of what
> looks like an "effort" to "save code testing") could well have
> been a FEAR of NCI rising as a true competing organization.

You say it "could well have been". What evidence do you have to back up your gratuitous assertion?

> Was a deal was even cut, exchanging a "stab in the back"
> ersatz effort to "defend code" for a "stand-down" by NCI? Oh,
> wouldn't THAT be rich! But it WOULD explain what I think are
> very odd inconistencies in this whole story, which saw ARRL,
> in the final analysis, doing very little except grease the skids
> for the demise of code, and then spread this story about
> how unimportant it is, far and wide! Now, an ARRL/NCI "deal"
> WOULD be funny, wouldn't it, and we'll see if the ink on that
> "secret treaty" (with those Texans) even dries before it is
> broken! Wow, how funny would THIS be!

"Secret treaty"?? Now you really are getting into conspiracy theories.

> That is, there seem to be a lot of people unhappy with the
> ARRL,

How many are "a lot"? Does this quantity represent a significant number of licensed amateur radio operators?

> and nowhere is it written in stone that it be the ONLY
> significant organization representing amateur operators.

Absolutely correct. However, I do not know of any competing organiztion that has the membership numbers (and hence power) of the ARRL. If, however, you think it time for a new organization, then by all means draw up a clear charter, organizational structure, etc. and open it to membership. If enough operators approve of your goals, you will have a powerful organiztion to replace the ARRL.

> Institutional survival IS job #1 with ANY organization

True, can't disagree with you here.

> and the
> jettisoning of code might have been a very small price to
> pay to put the NCI threat, the LONG RUN threat, to sleep,
> hopefully for GOOD!

Have you any evidence that the ARRL considers NCI a threat? NCI doesn't seek to compete with the ARRL as best as I can see. They are a one issue group that once it's goal is reached will likely cease to exist. The ARRL is quite different, and seeks to cover all aspects of amateur radio, not just code.

Please note Val, that I am not trying to flame or insult you. You have posted some interesting stuff in the past. In this case, however, your entire post seems based on several gratuitous assertions. Before we can

accept them we must have some proof or evidence that backs your allegations.

73s

Robert / N4IXT

3198. Re: No coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 15:16:13 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <1LFp8.539$ee6.31339783@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39192

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020331081446.07859.00002322@mb-mv.aol.com...

> God your an Idiot

You'll burn for that.

3199. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 15:20:54 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <qPFp8.540$pg6.31415543@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39194

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:oblp8.2127$ml2.222052@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote
> >
> > > > Get an exemption like Japan.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Japan doesn't have an exemption. Their full
> > > priv HF people take Morse tests. They limit
> > > their 'no-code HF' people to 10W and just
> > > a couple of bands, then tell ITU that these
> > > restrictions are intended to contain the
> > > operations within JA.
> >
> > 10w, 50w, Whats the big difference? They are both reduced power.
> >
>
> 6 or 7 dB, and the JA low power guys are only allowed on a
> couple of HF bands.
>
> Hans

It appears to make them happy enough, though.

For your Basic license, we should use the rf safety guide below the
threshhold where a safety study would not be required.

BTW, what is a "neener?"

3200. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 15:22:37 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <1RFp8.543$Zh6.31469920@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39195

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:illp8.2158$ml2.223245@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote
>
> >
> > I would invite them to strap on a stick of dynamite, head in to their
> shack,
> > light a cigarette and pop the top on a can of Shlitz, and do the rest of
> us
> > a favor.
> >
>
> I was starting to think that you might be here to conduct some reasoned
> debate and discussion. From the above trash it's clear I was mistaken.
>
> Twit filter = On
>
> Hans

Hans, I've never seen you put a "twit" filter on Bruce or Larry. Why is
that?

3201. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 15:24:22 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <GSFp8.545$Qb6.31249738@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39196

```
"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:Vnnp8.2723$nt1.270408@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "W5TIT - Kim" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:3ca5f543_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > "K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:illp8.2158$ml2.223245@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote
> > >
> > > >
> > > > I would invite them to strap on a stick of dynamite, head in to
their
> > > shack,
> > > > light a cigarette and pop the top on a can of Shlitz, and do the
rest
> of
> > > us
> > > > a favor.
> > > >
> > >
> > > I was starting to think that you might be here to conduct some
reasoned
> > > debate and discussion. From the above trash it's clear I was
mistaken.
> > >
> > > Twit filter = On
> > >
> > > Hans
> > >
> >
> > I find it interesting, Hans, that you usually only offer any kind of
> > friendship or agreement *after* someone says something with which you
> > disagree, just so that you can then dismiss them.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
>
> Kim,
>
> Brian and I were having a quite civil discussion, in which we agreed
> on many significant issues about licensing structures.
>
> But when someone suggests the application of deadly violence they
```

> are dismissed. Period.
>
> I'd thank you to join me in strongly condemning such behavior.

Hans, I didn't suggest they then attend a club meeting and take out the innocents. I only suggested they put their own selves out of misery.

3202. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 15:26:02 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <eUFp8.549$gj6.31524080@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39197

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020330231820.01829.00001335@mb-cg.aol.com...
> >I don't think Brian was being serious at all.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> So now your an Expert on Brian

So far, so good.

You on the other hand ...

3203. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 15:29:09 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <9XFp8.554$am6.31640915@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39198

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20020331013341.01774.00000312@mb-cg.aol.com...
> In article <_Tjp8.3100$Rh3.144143459@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> Val:
> >>
> >> I hope you do continue to post here, because you seem to possess the
> >> ability to analyze the code/no-code debate in a refreshingly honest and
> >fair
> >> manner.
> >>
> >Huh? Honest and Fair? The guy's a troll!
>
> Brian:
>
> Now -- THERE's a perfect example of the pot calling the kettle "a
> utinsel of color." Just thought I'd be PC for a change, you see.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry, so you were joking?

Where a rational argument is called for I present it. Val does not, its all
emotion.

3204. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 15:32:40 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <s_Fp8.561$wo6.31726977@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39199

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3CA70A97.24C6B4D4@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > I have no problem with that, but how do you propose to keep those
> > frequencies from going to waste if they are to be used for expansion
> > of phone privileges? HF phone *is* a waste.
>
> Larry, exactly what do you say on HF CW that cannot be said on
> HF phone? If the content of the QSOs are the same, why does the
> mode matter as long as the message gets through?

Oh yeh, just more rational thinking. Why don't you try "caring" about
amateur radio? Show some emotion!

3205. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 15:36:11 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <L1Gp8.565$Eq6.31815843@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39200

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020330142712.00376.00000278@mb-mj.aol.com...
> In article <jq4p8.2336$YX.113575081@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >No, I don't mean your other nemesis, Cutie Boy, I mean the
> >other guy at about the same time. I forget his name.
> >
> Mark Morgan, KB9RQZ.
>
> BTW, just one year and two days until ol' Masa/Cutie Boy's promise
> is to be fulfilled. (see his post on April 2, 1998)
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Hi Jim,

That's him! When Steve gets going its a lifetime thing.

I don't recall Cutie Boy's promise. He was even less coherent than Bruce,
but then Engrish wasn't his native language. It was painful to read.

3206. Re: KOHB's Modest Trickle!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 15:41:51 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <37Gp8.570$Ls6.31896773@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39201

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:Tflp8.2139$ml2.222912@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> wrote
>
> >
> > Hans, neener, neener, neener. Did you learn Morse in Cub Scouts, too?
> >
>
> No, I learned it from my Mom who was a ham.
>
> Were you paid to learn Morse? Wouldn't frost my ass if you were.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

OK, it appears we're back on track.

My point wasn't that they were paid to learn Morse.

My point is that they were paid to learn Mose as part of their avocation, then became an amateur radio licensee and demanded that I learn Morse, pass multiple exams on Morse, then get on the air using Morse where I can see what God-like creatures they are, and worship at their Altar.

And if I don't I'm an idiot and I'm destroying amateur radio.

3207. Re: Question, was Re: CCR's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 15:45:45 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <JaGp8.572$ly6.32137611@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39202

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:nBrp8.3350$nt1.313256@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
>
> >
> > Sure you will. You can't help it. Your self-image is at
> > stake here! :-)
> >
>
> Val's pattern is to correspond with folks that he
> feels are intellectually inferior to him. He's running
> out of pen pals that fit that description.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Hans, thank you (I think). Val got upset at my plea to QRS. Wait till he actually tries to actually use CW for the first dozen times. Those wunnerful CW Ops will leave the QSO just as he's done here.

3208. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 15:46:04 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020331104604.02938.00001636@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 39203

>NCI simply won because our arguments were
>clear, logical, and in line with good public policy,

Bullshit, you Clowns didnt Win Anything, the FCC did what it wanted to do even without you Clowns going in there Whinning about how you were being mistreated.

3209. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 15:51:14 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020331105114.02938.00001638@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 39204

>Before we can
>accept them we must have some proof or evidence that backs your allegations.

Same thing I asked Carl, to produce, as of yet NOTHING. He claims 50 some
percent of NCI Members are Code Tested, but of course he provides no Proof.

3210. Re: No coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 15:52:21 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020331105221.02938.00001639@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 39205

>You'll burn for that.
>
>

Bite loose LIPS

3211. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 15:54:11 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020331105411.02938.00001640@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 39206

>Hans, I didn't suggest they then attend a club meeting and take out the
>innocents. I only suggested they put their own selves out of misery.
>

You are really a SICK waste of Human Flesh

3212. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 16:15:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a87cntcq0@208.206.142.88>
Source record: 39210

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > I've got the Extra AND the EE degree, Dick. Why on earth
> > > should I possess envy?
> >
> > Why indeed? You only waited 50+ years to get the Extra. Must have been
> > real frustrating, to be able to BS your way through the EE program and
> > not be able to do that to an Extra class ticket. Poor fella...
>
> I would take my EE degree over the Extra license any day of the week,
> Dick.

Of course. You're not *quite* that dense.

I never needed to do anything in ham radio that I couldn't
> do with an Advanced license.

I recall you swore you'd never get an Extra, too. So much for your
assertions.
Looks like it must have been important to you, after all.

One would think that in all those years
> of electronics, you could have managed a EE degree.

Nope. Never was located where I could attend engineering school, and ya
know, it was just not important enough to abandon a good career to move.
As you say, I never needed to do anything I couldn't do with my tech
school training and lots of practical learning from experience.

Poor fella...
> Had to put up with engineers as bosses all those many years. Talk
> about envy.
>

Never worked for an engineer in my life, though I worked with one for
years. As a matter of fact, he never *ever* mentioned that he held a
degree in electrical engineering, and I learned it only when I read his
obituary after he died. (He also held a ham radio license). Not all
engineers are blowhards like you.

3213. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 16:18:48 UTC
From: KB9TMP <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <a87csq$td3$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 39214

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020331105114.02938.00001638@mb-ba.aol.com...
> >Before we can
> >accept them we must have some proof or evidence that backs your
allegations.
>
> Same thing I asked Carl, to produce, as of yet NOTHING. He claims 50 some
> percent of NCI Members are Code Tested, but of course he provides no
Proof.

And just how could he provide you with the proof of that statement, without
violating
the terms of their privacy policy which includes the following statement:

"YOUR INFORMATION WILL NOT BE USED FOR COMMERCIAL
PURPOSES OR DIVULGED OUTSIDE OF NO CODE INTERNATIONAL".

You can find that statement on their website, the URL is
http://www.nocode.org/forms/SignIn.html if you want to see it for yourself.

So quit asking for something he CAN'T provide you with!

--
'73' From KB9TMP
NCI-2385

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.342 / Virus Database: 189 - Release Date: 3/14/2002

3214. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 16:21:30 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uaecqogjhjkt10@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39207

N4IXT wrote:

>What evidence do you have to back up your
>gratuitous assertion?

Hm. "Gratuitious assertion"? WRONG, on both
counts, see below. However, as for my speculation,
well, I have a brain and USE it . . . and what I've been
given as "information" in this area does not add up, at
least to me. In the rest of the world, when this happens,
it usually mean's that there's something going on behind
the scenes, something that almost no one with a big
stake in the outcome wants made public. The "evidence"
(what there will ever be of it, see below) is out there for
all to see; it's what you make of it that counts. I see I've
pushed your buttons! What's the reason for that?

>"Secret treaty"?? Now you really are getting into
>conspiracy theories.

No, nothing like that at all. It's how the world works, a whole
LOT of the time. There's a telephone system in this country
that is good from coast to coast and unless you're the FBI,
or some such agency, you don't know WHO'S dialing whom,
do you? I don't think so.

>Have you any evidence that the ARRL considers NCI
>a threat?

Are you kidding? Wake UP!

>NCI doesn't seek to compete with the ARRL as best as
>I can see.

You may need better glasses, or you may not. But the
issue is far from settled, in my view.

>They are a one issue group that once it's goal is reached
>will likely cease to exist.

Well, we'll see about that, too, pretty soon. That is, yes, "NCI"
may go away BUT, what do you want to bet that something
else will follow in its wake.

>The ARRL is quite different, and seeks to cover all aspects
>of amateur radio, not just code.

Now there's a tautology if I ever saw one! That is, the ARRL was
able to send code to a watery grave exactly BECAUSE of what
you say! Mr. Hare admitted that. Truisms are "OK" but cut little
ice here, I think.

>Please note Val, that I am not trying to flame or insult you. You
>have posted some interesting stuff in the past. In this case, however,
>your entire post seems based on several gratuitous assertions.
>Before we can accept them we must have some proof or evidence
>that backs your allegations.

I am not ALLEGING anything, I am SUGGESTING something,
something that has generated multiple responses on EASTER
MORNING!! (I just got back from church myself!) And I hardly
am being "gratutitous," in my opinoin. [Gratioutious: Unnecessary
or unwarranted.] No, I think I am well within the bounds of common
sense to speculate in this way. As for "proof," now just where is
ANYONE going to get that who was not actually privy to any
negotiations that may have taken place, huh? And, tell me, just
WHY would any such person spill?

Val

>
>73s
>
> Robert / N4IXT
>
>

3215. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 16:23:04 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uaecth33n0ti41@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39208

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>Val, your entire line of thinking here, with all of these
>backroom conspiracy theories, is false and so absurd
>that it makes you look foolish to even suggest it. If you
>had been involved long enough in ham radio policy and
>politics, you'd know that, but as a "newbie" your mistake
>is understandable/excusable.

So, when is NCI officially disbanding?

Val

3216. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 16:25:19 UTC
From: Valentine Germann <vgermann@socket.net>
Message-ID: <uaed1pal056k9a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39209

David Stinson wrote:

>Carping and fragmenting into little cults like NCI
>won't solve anything and creates its own problems.

It's doesn't solve ANYTHING? I think it solved a little
problem for NCI, if only in their opinion. I'm waiting for
them to say when they'll disappear!

Val

3217. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 16:27:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <a87dcvcq1@208.206.142.88>
Source record: 39211

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>

> The ARRL didn't "cave in" on WT 98-143 ... they fought to
> the end for 4 classes of license with A and E having a 12 wpm
> Morse test. NCI simply won because our arguments were
> clear, logical, and in line with good public policy,

BS. You browbeat poor old Bill Cross into capitulation. Hard to blame
him considering your spewing on this NG over the years.

3218. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 16:37:29 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020331113729.02918.00001562@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 39212

>Well, we'll see about that, too, pretty soon. That is, yes, "NCI"
>may go away BUT, what do you want to bet that something
>else will follow in its wake.

Of course there will be, how about" No Test International", and guess who will probably be the Leader?
Carl would be a great Leader for this. Why you ask, well lets look at his history on upgrading. For 20 years Carl was un able to up grade because that Nasty CW Test was just to much for him to do. But wait, what do we find out after the Welfare Testing came into effect. Seems Carl most have had a hard time with Written also, it appears it took him 6 Months or more to upgrade. WOW, its amazing, the Great leader of NCI took 6 Months to Memorize a bunch of Q&As.
Whats even funnier is that 12years old and younger, can Memorize enough to walkin at 1 setting, with no knowledge and walk out as an EXTRA. And Techno Whiz Carl needs at least 6 Months.

3219. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 16:38:37 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020331113837.02918.00001563@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 39213

>So, when is NCI officially disbanding?
>
>Val

There not, this is Carls only claim to Fame.

3220. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 17:34:03 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <fMHp8.5468$ml2.434065@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 39215

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote

> As for "proof," now just where is ANYONE going to get
> that who was not actually privy to any negotiations that
> may have taken place, huh? And, tell me, just
> WHY would any such person spill?

God, I love it! "There's no proof of a conspiracy, which proves there must be a conspiracy." Val, you should visit Roswell, NM. Your logic would fit right in with the conspiracy whackos there.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3221. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 17:35:10 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ca75a7d_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 39224

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uaecth33n0ti41@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
>
> >Val, your entire line of thinking here, with all of these
> >backroom conspiracy theories, is false and so absurd
> >that it makes you look foolish to even suggest it. If you
> >had been involved long enough in ham radio policy and
> >politics, you'd know that, but as a "newbie" your mistake
> >is understandable/excusable.
>
>
> So, when is NCI officially disbanding?
>
> Val

When there is no longer a mandatory Morse test for any
class of Amateur license anywhere in the world.

(that's been stated over and over again, but as a newbie,
you probably missed it ... if you'd read some of the stuff
on the NCI website, you'd have a better idea of what NCI
is about ... that might prevent you from looking foolish by
running off at the mouth about things that you obviously
know less then little about ...)

Carl - wa6vse

3222. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 17:42:31 UTC
From: N4IXT <n4ixt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <a87htg$qlejf$3@ID-105647.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 39216

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uaecqogjhjkt10@corp.supernews.com...
>
> N4IXT wrote:
>
> >What evidence do you have to back up your
> >gratuitous assertion?
>
> Hm. "Gratuitious assertion"? WRONG, on both
> counts, see below. However, as for my speculation,
> well, I have a brain and USE it . . . and what I've been
> given as "information" in this area does not add up, at
> least to me. In the rest of the world, when this happens,
> it usually mean's that there's something going on behind
> the scenes, something that almost no one with a big
> stake in the outcome wants made public. The "evidence"
> (what there will ever be of it, see below) is out there for
> all to see; it's what you make of it that counts.

First, let's define "Gratuitious assertion": a statement presented as fact
yet is found to be unverifiable. Any gratuitious assertion therefore can
just as easily be gratuitiously denied.

You began your message with:

"The consensus among those who are apparently informed
is the the FCC decided, in about 1975, that code testing had
NO regulatrory purpose."

This was not presented as speculation but as fact. From this basis the
remainder of your message proceeds. Since this was the beginning of your
thesis, I asked for verification of it's factuality. So far, you have
provided none.

> I see I've
> pushed your buttons! What's the reason for that?

You made several assertions. I was simply attempting to find out what those
assertions were based on.

> >Have you any evidence that the ARRL considers NCI
> >a threat?
>
> Are you kidding? Wake UP!

OK, telling me to "Wake UP" is not providing evidience. Do you have any
statements you can point to, made by ARRL officials, that would even suggest

that the ARRL considers NCI a threat?

> >NCI doesn't seek to compete with the ARRL as best as
> >I can see.
>
> You may need better glasses, or you may not. But the
> issue is far from settled, in my view.

Again, NCI seeks to work on ONE issue, if they are doing more (such as protecting spectrum, let's say, or education perhaps) I am unaware of it.

> >They are a one issue group that once it's goal is reached
> >will likely cease to exist.
>
> Well, we'll see about that, too, pretty soon. That is, yes, "NCI"
> may go away BUT, what do you want to bet that something
> else will follow in its wake.

And what would that group be, and what would it's goals be? And why would it need to wait for NCI to go away?

> >The ARRL is quite different, and seeks to cover all aspects
> >of amateur radio, not just code.
>
> Now there's a tautology if I ever saw one! That is, the ARRL was
> able to send code to a watery grave exactly BECAUSE of what
> you say! Mr. Hare admitted that. Truisms are "OK" but cut little
> ice here, I think.

Sure, I can conceed that. It is certainly easier for the ARRL to allow the code test requirement to vanish considering it's overall scope of interests and activities.

For that matter I'll go one step further. I can even see where it is in the best interest of the ARRL for the code to go away as a test requirement. No code requirement could mean more hams, and thus more members for itself, and therefore sustain it's existance. Note I have not said the ARRL *is* doing this, simply that I can see where it could be in their interest.

> I am not ALLEGING anything, I am SUGGESTING something,

If you are suggesting a possible scenerio, it is assumed you have something to base that suggested on. For example, a series of statements by the ARRL that are independantly innocent but when taken together would suggest the scenerio you propose. I merely asked from what you based your suggestion on.

> As for "proof," now just where is
> ANYONE going to get that who was not actually privy to any
> negotiations that may have taken place, huh?

When one presents a statement as fact (such as the opening line of your original post) they should be able to back it up with a link or news source that can be independantly verified.

Most speculation of course does not have any direct proof, but most speculation starts from some kernel of fact that one reads, some statement that begins the "hmmm..." process. Again, that initial fact should be able to be offerred to the group so that we may read it and see if we can also draw a similar conclusion.

Otherwise, you are simply offering wild guesses, which may be just as easily dismissed, similar to two kids going "is not... is too... is not... is too".

> And, tell me, just WHY would any such person spill?

Fifteen minutes of fame can be a powerful inducement.

Robert / N4IXT

3223. Re: No coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 17:46:34 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <3a415f47cd4c25d2a9eddf6a98635bf0.80792@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 39217

Carl, you made a very valid point. When I was first licensed (WN2CJV in 1962), novices had voice privileges in the 2 meter band. I suspect the ARRL was trying to get more activity up there. A gentleman had built (around 1964) a 1 tube transceiver for 440 MHz - problem was, he had no one to talk to - even if it had a lot more than its' 1/2 to 1 mile alleged range! Now, novices and coded techs can use 10 meters. I wonder why? International agreements prohibit amateur operation below 30 MHz without some CW. Exactly what that means, I'll leave to the more knowlegeable folks around here. My only concern is this 'holier than thou' attitude of some of the gang. Gosh, we had one guy really screaming over this on one of the 440 FM repeaters. He was all for code - soooo .... WB2KAO and I made him happy. 40 WPM F2 emission, anyone? (ok, so what do they call F2 today???). I'd like to see just a little more tolerance all the way around; however, it is kind of interesting to see an 'on-topic' post now and then!

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

ps - am looking forward to the hamfest at the end of May. The program shows that Ed, W1RFI, is going to be soldering together a J-pole for 2 meters whilst wearing a tie. That alone makes it worth going to! I can't wait to see if that is a regular tie, bow tie, or western style!

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message news:3ca5ea4c_1@news7.fast.net...

<snip>
> No code hams are doing MUCH more for the ARS
> than simpy "Gaining pleasure from it just like the
> coded hams."
>
> 1st, they are helping to populate the VHF/UHF bands,
> which makes those bands less vulnerable to spectrum
> grabs by other interests.
>
> 2nd, many of them are heavily involved in local public
> service/disaster communications efforts through groups
> such as ARES/RACES ... this is a VERY valuable service
> that they are performing and it enhances the value of the
> ARS to society in general, which also helps to protect
> our spectrum.
>
<snip>
> 73,

> Carl - wa6vse

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3224. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 17:53:22 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3ca75eca_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 39225

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a87dcvcq1@208.206.142.88...
>
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
>
> > The ARRL didn't "cave in" on WT 98-143 ... they fought to
> > the end for 4 classes of license with A and E having a 12 wpm
> > Morse test. NCI simply won because our arguments were
> > clear, logical, and in line with good public policy,
>
> BS. You browbeat poor old Bill Cross into capitulation. Hard to blame
> him considering your spewing on this NG over the years.

Dick,

If you knew where you might beg, borrow, or rent a clue, and
if you knew Bill Cross, you'd know that nobody "browbeats him
into capitulation." Bill is a long-time extra, who spends most
of his haming chasing DX and IOTAs on CW ... he's also a
sensible, dedicated public servant who's committed to doing
what's best for the long-term health and future of the ARS.
Your borderline defamation of someone like Bill should cause
you shame, but you're far too ignorant to realize that.

Besides, when Bill Sohl and I did NCI's ex parte presentation
on WT 98-143, there was a whole room full of people from well
above Bill's level in WTB in attendance ... THEY asked LOTS
of very good, insightful questions that showed that they understand
the ARS a lot better than most hams give them credit for.
(probably better than YOU do, Dick ... though we all know that for
you being able to beep real fast is all that really counts ...)

We gave them rational answers to those questions ... the PCTA
obviously didn't ... the result in the Report and Order tells the story
as to whose arguments were more convincing.

The fat lady has sung ... get on with your life, quit your incessant
bitching, and don't presume to insult people like Bill Cross who
are so far above you in intelligence and integrity that "head and
shoulders" doesn't even come close to describing it adequately.

Carl - wa6vse

3225. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 18:02:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020331130240.20703.00000271@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 39219

In article <L1Gp8.565$Eq6.31815843@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20020330142712.00376.00000278@mb-mj.aol.com...
>> In article <jq4p8.2336$YX.113575081@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
>> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>>
>> >No, I don't mean your other nemesis, Cutie Boy, I mean the
>> >other guy at about the same time. I forget his name.
>> >
>> Mark Morgan, KB9RQZ.
>>
>> BTW, just one year and two days until ol' Masa/Cutie Boy's promise
>> is to be fulfilled. (see his post on April 2, 1998)
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Hi Jim,

'ello
>
>That's him!

He claimed an IQ of 236, among other things.

>I don't recall Cutie Boy's promise.

I cannot even begin to do it justice. You must read the original to get the full impact.

http://groups.google.com/groups?hl=en&selm=3522dcf6.2106740%40news.total.net

A true rrap classic.

>He was even less coherent than Bruce,
>but then Engrish wasn't his native language. It was painful to read.

All depends on your POV. Much of it was reminiscent of Hashafisti Scratchi. At times I wondered
if he were actually someone's online persona.

Mark's mangling of English was at least as bad. When asked why he did not use a spellchecker, he
said it would slow down his posting too much.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3226. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 18:02:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020331130241.20703.00000272@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 39218

In article <qPFp8.540$pg6.31415543@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:

>> > 10w, 50w, Whats the big difference? They are both reduced power.
>> >
>>
>> 6 or 7 dB, and the JA low power guys are only allowed on a
>> couple of HF bands.
>>
>> Hans
>
>It appears to make them happy enough, though.
>
Not really. Since 1995 the number of JA station licenses, and the number of new JA operator licenses, has been dropping rapidly. Check out

http://www.ah0a.org

73 de Jim, N2EY

3227. Re: Wanted to be a NoCode

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 18:07:36 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca752c3_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39220

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020330231640.01829.00001334@mb-cg.aol.com...
> >I don't drink at all. But I've been around many like you.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
> >
>
> You dumb TIT, you dont know anything about me, you read some Crap on this
> Newsgroup, and now your an Expert on WA8ULX. Your about as Dumb as your
Buddies
> Brian, and Karl

Well, based on how I see you acting here, I think I've summed you up pretty accurately. You are low-intelligence, boxed in, Southern male who has a lot of grudge built up. You enjoy seeing yourself act like an idiot and blame it on the booze.

Kim W5TIT

3228. Re: No coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 18:11:56 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca753cd$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39221

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020331081446.07859.00002322@mb-mv.aol.com...
> >In fact, it would be
> >far preferable to have "on topic" stuff, rather than more of Larry
> >and others making much to do about nothing about Kim's callsign,
> >Bruce's incomprehensible one line attempts at diatribe, etc.
>
> To bad A$$ Wipe, we have to read your Stupidity

You do?! Why do you have to read others' "stupidity," Waddles? (That's
what your callsign sounds like) Now you *have* to read others' posts?

ROFLMAO...

Kim W5TIT

3229. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 18:12:52 UTC
From: W5TIT - Kim <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <3ca753ff_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 39222

Val, you're getting as boring and long-winded as a couple of others

Kim W5TIT

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uae48455h8k8d9@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all!
>
> The consensus among those who are apparently informed
> is the the FCC decided, in about 1975, that code testing had
> NO regulatrory purpose. Taking that at face value, well, it was
> and is just plain WRONG. The amateur service still has a
> component referring to "promoting international understanding"
> and Morse Code is STILL valuable as a "language" that is
> understood around the world. For this reason ALONE the testing
> provision should be retained, at some level, within the ARS,
> over and above its obvious historical and operational value.
>
> Having had a couple of days to let Mr. Hare's comments sink
> in, the cavalier atttitude shown toward Morse by him (not even
> in the top ten of things that most hams are concerned about!)
> was BIZARRE and shows once again (to me) that the true
> motives here may never be known. I have not mentioned this
> because I thought it was, er, REALLY sorry, but the ACTUAL
> reason for the cave-in by ARRL on this issue (in spite of what
> looks like an "effort" to "save code testing") could well have
> been a FEAR of NCI rising as a true competing organization.
> Was a deal was even cut, exchanging a "stab in the back"
> ersatz effort to "defend code" for a "stand-down" by NCI? Oh,
> wouldn't THAT be rich! But it WOULD explain what I think are
> very odd inconistencies in this whole story, which saw ARRL,
> in the final analysis, doing very little except grease the skids
> for the demise of code, and then spread this story about
> how unimportant it is, far and wide! Now, an ARRL/NCI "deal"
> WOULD be funny, wouldn't it, and we'll see if the ink on that
> "secret treaty" (with those Texans) even dries before it is
> broken! Wow, how funny would THIS be!
>
> That is, there seem to be a lot of people unhappy with the
> ARRL, and nowhere is it written in stone that it be the ONLY
> significant organization representing amateur operators.
> Institutional survival IS job #1 with ANY organization and the
> jettisoning of code might have been a very small price to
> pay to put the NCI threat, the LONG RUN threat, to sleep,
> hopefully for GOOD!

>
> Val
>
>
>
>

3230. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 18:41:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3CA74A42.E2EDEAAC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 39223

CAM wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> > Amateur radio is not a company.
>
> Exactly! Amateur radio is a hobby and for that reason, the present pecking
> order within ham radio has absolutely no valid reason to exist.

It was never the intent of anyone that every citizen of the United
States should become a radio amateur.

> > >From Webster's: "caste - any rigid system of social distinction"
> >
> > But any radio amateur can progress to the top license by simply passing a few
> > tests. Thus the system is not rigid.
>
> But some hams are incapable of passing the tests just as some people are
> incapable of changing their skin color or dunking a basketball or passing
> a college entrance exam. The competitive incentive licensing system has
> generated a monstrous pecking order.

Again, it was never the intent that every citizen should become a radio
amateur. There are exams so easy that almost any literate and conscious
person in the country can pass them.

> > Unlike a company, anyone who can meet the requirements can get the license and
> > become a ham.
>
> Absolutely false, Jim. My 91 year old aunt could not meet the requirements
> if her life depended on it.

Is she interested in becoming a ham? Is she coherent?

> As long as incentive licensing continues to
> exist, the door will be open for higher class bullies to heap abuse on the
> lower classes. Why don't you talk to those bullies about "Live and let live"?

Excuse me while I take time to laugh off your latest offering as being
beyond reality.

Dave K8MN

3231. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 19:15:10 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020331141510.10634.00001696@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 39226

>So quit asking for something he CAN'T provide you with!
>
>--
>'73' From KB9TMP

I will stop asking when he stops putting out info which he CLAIMS to be fact,
when he cant produce the FACTS

3232. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 19:16:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020331141622.19000.00000263@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 39227

In article <uae48455h8k8d9@corp.supernews.com>, "Valentine Germann"
<vgermann@socket.net> writes:

>The consensus among those who are apparently informed
>is the the FCC decided, in about 1975, that code testing had
>NO regulatrory purpose.

I'd say that's stretching things a bit, Val.

1975 is significant because in that year the FCC proposed a VHF/UHF-only ham
license
with no code test, as part of a complex restructuring proposal.

It would be more accurate to say that the FCC decided in 1975 that code testing
was not
an absolute necessity for all ham licenses.

The "no regulatory purpose" phrase is from the Report and Order (R&O) for
98-143, the restructuring
proposal that took effect in April of 2000.

In that quarter century, it is clear from FCC actions that their view of the
necessity of code testing changed
from

'not an absolute necessity for all ham licenses'

to

'serves no regulatory purpose for any ham license other than meeeting treaty
requirements'

Lot of difference there.

> Taking that at face value, well, it was
>and is just plain WRONG.

I agree. But the FCC doesn't, and they make the rules. The mere fact that FCC
does something
doesn't make it "right", of course, but it does make it legal.

>The amateur service still has a
>component referring to "promoting international understanding"
>and Morse Code is STILL valuable as a "language" that is
>understood around the world. For this reason ALONE the testing
>provision should be retained, at some level, within the ARS,
>over and above its obvious historical and operational value.

Sounds good to me - but the FCC doesn't buy it. Nor any other procodetest reason other than "gotta satisfy the treaty".
>
>Having had a couple of days to let Mr. Hare's comments sink
>in, the cavalier atttitude shown toward Morse by him (not even
>in the top ten of things that most hams are concerned about!)
>was BIZARRE and shows once again (to me) that the true
>motives here may never be known.

Ed's list, as I read it, says that code TESTING is not in the Top Ten. Just his opinion, anyway. But
note that FCC received comments on code testing from less than one half of one percent of US hams,
even though the comment period was longer than usual and comments could be filed online. Such a
small turnout indicates that, indeed, most interested individuals don't really care very much about
code testing, one way or another.

>I have not mentioned this
>because I thought it was, er, REALLY sorry, but the ACTUAL
>reason for the cave-in by ARRL on this issue (in spite of what
>looks like an "effort" to "save code testing") could well have
>been a FEAR of NCI rising as a true competing organization.

I don't think so. ARRL's position did not change significantly from the initial proposal. FCC simply
decided not to go along.

No-Code-International has a total historic membership of perhaps 3400 individuals, worldwide.
Membership numbers are sequential and started with #1001, and there are no dues and no
expiration date on membership.

>Was a deal was even cut, exchanging a "stab in the back"
>ersatz effort to "defend code" for a "stand-down" by NCI? Oh,
>wouldn't THAT be rich!

I'm not sure what you mean. Neither organization changed their position when it mattered.

> But it WOULD explain what I think are
>very odd inconistencies in this whole story, which saw ARRL,
>in the final analysis, doing very little except grease the skids
>for the demise of code, and then spread this story about
>how unimportant it is, far and wide! Now, an ARRL/NCI "deal"
> WOULD be funny, wouldn't it, and we'll see if the ink on that
>"secret treaty" (with those Texans) even dries before it is
>broken! Wow, how funny would THIS be!

Sounds like wild speculation to me, Val.

What I think has happened is this: FCC has made it abundantly clear that they want the code test
to just go away, for all sorts of reasons. They did not reach this position quickly or because of any
single group. Rather, it has developed slowly but steadily for 27+ years. And the USA is not the
only country going this way.

The ARRL leadership is thus faced with the choice of supporting a code test position that has no
real chance of success, OR, taking a neutral stance and focusing its resources on other issues.
The ARRL BoD chose the latter route a little over a year ago. Has there been massive outcry from
the membership? Not that I know of.

>That is, there seem to be a lot of people unhappy with the
>ARRL, and nowhere is it written in stone that it be the ONLY
>significant organization representing amateur operators.
>Institutional survival IS job #1 with ANY organization and the
>jettisoning of code might have been a very small price to
>pay to put the NCI threat, the LONG RUN threat, to sleep,
>hopefully for GOOD!
>
Those "unhappy with the ARRL" have a whole laundry list of reasons. Some are still mad about
"incentive licensing", even though it was the FCC's idea, not ARRL's. Many don't understand
what the ARRL actually does, or why a national organization is needed in the first place. Some
are mad about the code test issue - on both sides of the fence. Lots of other stuff. A real
challenge to balance all the diverse interests.

Will NCI up and disappear if/when code testing goes away? We'll just have to wait and see.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3233. Re: No coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 19:21:38 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020331142138.10634.00001697@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 39228

>You do?! Why do you have to read others' "stupidity," Waddles? (That's
>what your callsign sounds like) Now you *have* to read others' posts?
>
>ROFLMAO...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Hey TIT bite me

3234. Re: Wanted to be a NoCode

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 19:33:40 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020331143340.10634.00001701@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 39229

>Well, based on how I see you acting here, I think I've summed you up pretty
>accurately. You are low-intelligence, boxed in, Southern male who has a lot
>of grudge built up. You enjoy seeing yourself act like an idiot and blame
>it on the booze.
>
>Kim W5TIT
>

Well TIT, I see you like to make alot of judgement calls about some one when
you lack the FACTS.
I will try an enlighten you TIT. First mistake on your part. Im not a Southern
Male. Second mistake on your part, I dont drink, never have.
Now maybe you need to look a little harder, maybe your not as good at judging
someone as you think you are.
I have a felling that maybe your the Booze Hound, try getting your facts
correct next time TIT
The rest of your Insanity isnt worth a comment.

3235. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 19:40:52 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020331144052.10634.00001702@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 39230

>No-Code-International has a total historic membership of perhaps 3400
>individuals, worldwide.
>Membership numbers are sequential and started with #1001, and there are no
>dues
>and no
>expiration date on membership.
>

Prove it with REAL FACTS. You could claim they have 50,000 Members but you cant prove it.
And of course with no Expiration Date on Membership, you could have SKs in those numbers, and your still going to count them.

3236. Re: ILLEGAL SALE OF HAM RADIOS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 20:15:08 UTC
From: Mike Yetsko <joe@user.com>
Message-ID: <uaerlqfsnf9o2f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 39231
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Almost like clockwork this same idea come up, again and again, where
some HAM laments that someone can get a radio without showing his
license. And invariably there are people who express surprise that it's
not illegal to do this! From the people who write nasty letters to Radio
Shack (or say they do) to the people who get in a huff about "truckers
using a 2M rig)".

I bought my Swan back in 1981 and it was my incentive to learn code.

I bought my Kenwood as my incentive to get off my behind and over to
the Dallas FCC office to upgrade.

I got my dual-bander in my car as a gift.

I bought my K2 as my incentive to get back on HF and upgrade to
use it.

I'd just like to ask some of these HAMs where they'd be if they had to
PROVE operating privileges before they could buy a piece of equipment.
Of if they ever got a piece of equipment as a gift. (Yeah, it's a hot topic
with me. I just put these kind of people into the automatic classification
of 'snob HAMs'. The kind that go to stores and try to 'show off' that they
have an HT on their belt, and when someone expresses an interest in it,
they say "it's not CB and not for you" and walk away. (I personally
witnessed an ASSHOLE HAM do that in a Radio Shack a few years
ago. So I interrupted, showed the kid the book from 5W to 1000W,
and told him there were assholes everywhere, even in HAM radio.
Yeah, I have to admit, I was hoping the guy would get really hot, but
he just fumed and stomped out of the store.)

Mike

"Bitrate" <Digital@PlusNonPlus.com> wrote in message
news:a86g8e$5c7$0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "Mike Yetsko" <joe@user.com> wrote in message
> news:uacolkhhtnu8e5@corp.supernews.com...
> > Gee Randy, what do you want? Papers?
> >
> > WHERE ARE YOU PAPERS!!!
> >
> > Or 10 day waiting periods? I know, you need to have a cooling off
> > period to buy your next piece of equipment!!
> >
> > Geesh, this ASININE topic comes up again and again and again.

> > When are some people going to learn. You do NOT need papers
> > to purchase HAM radio equipment! And I personally don't like
> > the kind of 'society' for the HAM radio culture that kind of BS
> > attitude implies.
> >
> > Mike
> >
> Wow! Yet another politically correct Ham heard from. His angry and
> condescending attitude is duly noted.
> I wonder if he is an ARRL member? Probably not.....but then I am not,
> either.
> Yes, this topic is much over done and drawn over the coals to the point of
> nausea.
> Take a break, Mike. Gather your wits and relax...if you have any wits to
> gather.
>
>
>

3237. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 20:49:39 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a87stevli1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39232

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uae48455h8k8d9@corp.supernews.com...
> Hello, all!
>
> The consensus among those who are apparently informed
> is the the FCC decided, in about 1975, that code testing had
> NO regulatrory purpose. Taking that at face value, well, it was
> and is just plain WRONG. The amateur service still has a
> component referring to "promoting international understanding"
> and Morse Code is STILL valuable as a "language" that is
> understood around the world. For this reason ALONE the testing
> provision should be retained, at some level, within the ARS,
> over and above its obvious historical and operational value.

Val...you offer not one rational justification as to
your conclusion because you totally ignore reality
in that not one ham is ever mandated to USE morse
code once licensed. Are YOU now suggesting that
all HF licensed hams have some mandated responsibility
to engage in CW contacts on an international basis?
As for your argument...it was raised by others in FCC
comments. The FCC's reaction was...sorry, it doesn't
fly.

> Having had a couple of days to let Mr. Hare's comments sink
> in, the cavalier atttitude shown toward Morse by him (not even
> in the top ten of things that most hams are concerned about!)
> was BIZARRE and shows once again (to me) that the true
> motives here may never be known.

Good grief...either spell it out or cut the cgreat
conspiracy garbage.

> I have not mentioned this
> because I thought it was, er, REALLY sorry, but the ACTUAL
> reason for the cave-in by ARRL on this issue (in spite of what
> looks like an "effort" to "save code testing") could well have
> been a FEAR of NCI rising as a true competing organization.

ROTFLMAO!

> Was a deal was even cut, exchanging a "stab in the back"
> ersatz effort to "defend code" for a "stand-down" by NCI? Oh,
> wouldn't THAT be rich!

Yea, right... ARRL bought all the NCI directors with
favors, free trips, wine, lobster, and more.... :-) :-)

> But it WOULD explain what I think are
> very odd inconistencies in this whole story, which saw ARRL,
> in the final analysis, doing very little except grease the skids
> for the demise of code, and then spread this story about
> how unimportant it is, far and wide!

Yet Val still fails to articulate his perceived
"odd inconsistencies."

> Now, an ARRL/NCI "deal"
> WOULD be funny, wouldn't it, and we'll see if the ink on that
> "secret treaty" (with those Texans) even dries before it is
> broken!

What Texans? Carl lives in PA, I live in NJ, the only NCI
director I know from TX is W5YI.

> Wow, how funny would THIS be!

Sure would be. Your speculation is the funniest
commentary I've seen in RRAP in many months.

> That is, there seem to be a lot of people unhappy with the
> ARRL,

Yet you can't even name but a handful yourself. More that
you and a few others just hope it is so.

> and nowhere is it written in stone that it be the ONLY
> significant organization representing amateur operators.

Wow...what a startling revelation.

> Institutional survival IS job #1 with ANY organization and the
> jettisoning of code might have been a very small price to
> pay to put the NCI threat, the LONG RUN threat, to sleep,
> hopefully for GOOD!

Yea, the great ARRL/NCI conspiracy. Gee, it
doesn't get any funnier than this.

Cheers and still ROTFLMAO!!!!!
Bill K2UNK

3238. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 20:54:30 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a87tfi$4cc$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39233

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uaecth33n0ti41@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
>
> >Val, your entire line of thinking here, with all of these
> >backroom conspiracy theories, is false and so absurd
> >that it makes you look foolish to even suggest it. If you
> >had been involved long enough in ham radio policy and
> >politics, you'd know that, but as a "newbie" your mistake
> >is understandable/excusable.
>
> So, when is NCI officially disbanding?
> Val

Not until our charter goal is completed. Still to
be accomplished:

1. End of ITU Treaty Requirements for Morse testing (S25.5)
2. End of morse testing in each country (e.g. USA, GB, etc.)

I'd say that NCI has a clear purpose for several
more years at the minimum.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3239. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 21:07:28 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a87tur$c0n$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39234

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a87dcvcq1@208.206.142.88...
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > The ARRL didn't "cave in" on WT 98-143 ... they fought to
> > the end for 4 classes of license with A and E having a 12 wpm
> > Morse test. NCI simply won because our arguments were
> > clear, logical, and in line with good public policy,
>
> BS. You browbeat poor old Bill Cross into capitulation.

And just what and how did NCI (or anyone else) "browbeat
poor old" Bill Cross or anyone else at the FCC? You (Dick) claiming
it to be so would seem to indicate you know something
you aren't telling us.

> Hard to blame him (Cross)
> considering your spewing on this NG over the years.

In what way has Carl, me or anyone from NCI spewed
anything at the FCC over the years. The reality of NCI's
direct meeting (ex parte) with the FCC was a most
cordial and professional exchange. NCI made it's presentation
(the handouts are public record) and the FCC staffers
listened, asked some questions, and thanked us for
our input. They (FCC) offered no insight into the
eventual outcome of the NPRM. Believe what you want,
but the comical fantasies being conjured up by Val,
Dick and a few others regarding the role that NCI
played vis-a-vis the ARRL and FCC is truly funny.

More to the contradictory postings of a few PCTA folks,
I find it so funny that in one breadth we have Dick saying
the FCC (Bill Cross) being influenced to the outcome
because of NCI browbeating yet others say NCI had
no impact on the outcome 'cause it was a done ddeal
at the FCC since as early as 1975.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3240. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 21:11:30 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a87u69$7bg$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39235

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020331091228.02893.00001440@mb-ba.aol.com...
> >FEAR of NCI rising as a true competing organization.
>
> You give NCI WAY to much Credit. NCI is nothing more than a Welfare CB
support
> group. I have heard they even have a Tatoo of Bill and Hillary on Carls
rear
> end. Bill is on 1 Cheek and Hillary on the other. Rumor has it that this
will
> soon be there LOGO

WA8LUX shows his complete ignorance again.
I won't speak for Carl, but my view of both Bill & Hillary
is that they are scum. The Clintons are the arch enemy
of conservative thought and political process to which
I subscribe. THAT, is obviously beyond the grasp
of WA8LUX who keep dreaming up this liberal
bunk and try to tie it to NCI.

No cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3241. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 21:14:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a87uk0jdr1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39237

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uaed1pal056k9a@corp.supernews.com...
>
> David Stinson wrote:
>
> >Carping and fragmenting into little cults like NCI
> >won't solve anything and creates its own problems.
>
> It's doesn't solve ANYTHING? I think it solved a little
> problem for NCI, if only in their opinion. I'm waiting for
> them to say when they'll disappear!

Already posted by both Carl and myself.
You don't seriously think our (NCI) mission
is over yet, do you?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3242. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 21:18:47 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a87uk1jdr2@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39236

"N4IXT" <n4ixt@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:a879e3$q7n19$1@ID-105647.news.dfncis.de...
>
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> news:uae48455h8k8d9@corp.supernews.com...
> > The consensus among those who are apparently informed
> > is the the FCC decided, in about 1975, that code testing had
> > NO regulatrory purpose.
>
> Who are these "informed people"? Where do they get their information from?
> Please cite your sources if you are going to use them as the basis for
your
> arguments.

Bob, Just an FYI...
The information is available for anyone to read from FCC
archives. Jim, N2EY has specific cites he often posts.
The above comment by Val is one of the few that
has some actual supporting references.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3243. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 21:26:50 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a87v37$9pk$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 39238

"Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
news:uaecqogjhjkt10@corp.supernews.com...
>
> N4IXT wrote:
> >What evidence do you have to back up your
> >gratuitous assertion?
>
> Hm. "Gratuitious assertion"? WRONG, on both
> counts, see below. However, as for my speculation,
> well, I have a brain and USE it . . . and what I've been
> given as "information" in this area does not add up, at
> least to me. In the rest of the world, when this happens,
> it usually mean's that there's something going on behind
> the scenes, something that almost no one with a big
> stake in the outcome wants made public. The "evidence"
> (what there will ever be of it, see below) is out there for
> all to see; it's what you make of it that counts. I see I've
> pushed your buttons! What's the reason for that?

More that you again revert to the "great unprovable
conspiracy" theory.

> >"Secret treaty"?? Now you really are getting into
> >conspiracy theories.
>
> No, nothing like that at all. It's how the world works, a whole
> LOT of the time. There's a telephone system in this country
> that is good from coast to coast and unless you're the FBI,
> or some such agency, you don't know WHO'S dialing whom,
> do you? I don't think so.

Cute anlogy, but what's the point.

> >Have you any evidence that the ARRL considers NCI
> >a threat?
>
> Are you kidding? Wake UP!

Translation: I have no idea and can't even articulate
a story that makes any sense.

> >NCI doesn't seek to compete with the ARRL as best as
> >I can see.
>
> You may need better glasses, or you may not. But the
> issue is far from settled, in my view.

Translation: I have no idea and can't even articulate
a story that makes any sense.

> >They are a one issue group that once it's goal is reached
> >will likely cease to exist.
>
> Well, we'll see about that, too, pretty soon. That is, yes, "NCI"
> may go away BUT, what do you want to bet that something
> else will follow in its wake.

Translation: I have no idea and can't even articulate
a story that makes any sense.

> >The ARRL is quite different, and seeks to cover all aspects
> >of amateur radio, not just code.
>
> Now there's a tautology if I ever saw one! That is, the ARRL was
> able to send code to a watery grave exactly BECAUSE of what
> you say! Mr. Hare admitted that. Truisms are "OK" but cut little
> ice here, I think.

Ditto my last.

> >Please note Val, that I am not trying to flame or insult you. You
> >have posted some interesting stuff in the past. In this case, however,
> >your entire post seems based on several gratuitous assertions.
> >Before we can accept them we must have some proof or evidence
> >that backs your allegations.
>
> I am not ALLEGING anything, I am SUGGESTING something,
> something that has generated multiple responses on EASTER
> MORNING!! (I just got back from church myself!) And I hardly
> am being "gratutitous," in my opinoin. [Gratioutious: Unnecessary
> or unwarranted.] No, I think I am well within the bounds of common
> sense to speculate in this way.

You can't even speculate with any specificity. You toss
out your allegations of complicity bewteen ARRL and FCC,
ARRL and NCI, FCC and NCI without ONE shred of proof,
nothing but your claim that something doesn't fit
right...yet you don't even say what that is.

> As for "proof," now just where is
> ANYONE going to get that who was not actually privy to any
> negotiations that may have taken place, huh? And, tell me, just
> WHY would any such person spill?

Nice to know you haven't a clue. Just why should
anyone believe your assertion, allegation, suggestion?

Still ROTFLMAO!
Bill K2UNK

3244. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 21:41:39 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <noLp8.797$wc2.41366705@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39323

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse-shack@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3ca75a7d_2@news7.fast.net...
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote in message
> news:uaecth33n0ti41@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> > Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >
> >
> > >Val, your entire line of thinking here, with all of these
> > >backroom conspiracy theories, is false and so absurd
> > >that it makes you look foolish to even suggest it. If you
> > >had been involved long enough in ham radio policy and
> > >politics, you'd know that, but as a "newbie" your mistake
> > >is understandable/excusable.
> >
> >
> > So, when is NCI officially disbanding?
> >
> > Val
>
> When there is no longer a mandatory Morse test for any
> class of Amateur license anywhere in the world.
>
> (that's been stated over and over again, but as a newbie,
> you probably missed it ... if you'd read some of the stuff
> on the NCI website, you'd have a better idea of what NCI
> is about ... that might prevent you from looking foolish by
> running off at the mouth about things that you obviously
> know less then little about ...)
>
> Carl - wa6vse

Carl, he's not a newbie. He's said that he's read this newsgroup since '98.
He's well aware of where NCI stands on the issues, and what its goals are.
He did not come here in the interest of learning anything about amateur
radio. He and his neighbor already have it all figured out.

Thus, he is merely trolling..

I can't wait to see what his call is, then run a search on his neighborhood
to figure out who this mythical neighbor is.

3245. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 21:43:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gtupc89.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 39239

Val wrote:

> The consensus among those who are apparently informed
> is the the FCC decided, in about 1975, that code testing had
> NO regulatrory purpose. Taking that at face value, well, it was
> and is just plain WRONG.

Please explain to me, one of the regulatory professionals who advocated that position then and now, why it is "wrong". A regulatory purpose is what the regulatory Administration says it is (see below).

> The amateur service still has a component referring to "promoting
> international understanding" and Morse Code is STILL valuable as a
> "language" that is understood around the world.

So is English, Russian, Spanisk, Chinese, and Arabic - the "five languages" of the United Nations.. Do you propose mandatory testing of knowledge of those as well?

>For this reason ALONE the testing provision should be retained, at
>some level, within the ARS, over and above its obvious historical
>and operational value.

You are confusing a "regulatory purpose" with "a good thing to have". The former is something that enables the Administration (the FCC in this case) to perform its finctions and carry out its obligations.

I fail to see how, in the absence of Congressional or ITU mandate, mandatory code testing or use falls into that actegory.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3246. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 21:46:45 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <9tLp8.802$%r2.41876609@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39324

"KB9TMP" <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com> wrote in message
news:a87csq$td3$1@dagobah.blueriver.net...
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020331105114.02938.00001638@mb-ba.aol.com...
> > >Before we can
> > >accept them we must have some proof or evidence that backs your
> allegations.
> >
> > Same thing I asked Carl, to produce, as of yet NOTHING. He claims 50
some
> > percent of NCI Members are Code Tested, but of course he provides no
> Proof.
>
>
> And just how could he provide you with the proof of that statement,
without
> violating
> the terms of their privacy policy which includes the following statement:
>
> "YOUR INFORMATION WILL NOT BE USED FOR COMMERCIAL
> PURPOSES OR DIVULGED OUTSIDE OF NO CODE INTERNATIONAL".
>
> You can find that statement on their website, the URL is
> http://www.nocode.org/forms/SignIn.html if you want to see it for
yourself.
>
> So quit asking for something he CAN'T provide you with!
>
> --
> '73' From KB9TMP
> NCI-2385

Val already knows why. Its just more important to keep harping on it. The
"proof" is not what's important here. It's the accusation.

He's a TROLL.

3247. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 21:49:10 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <qvLp8.809$Kh2.41542960@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39325

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:fMHp8.5468$ml2.434065@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Valentine Germann" <vgermann@socket.net> wrote
>
> > As for "proof," now just where is ANYONE going to get
> > that who was not actually privy to any negotiations that
> > may have taken place, huh? And, tell me, just
> > WHY would any such person spill?
>
> God, I love it! "There's no proof of a conspiracy, which
> proves there must be a conspiracy." Val, you should
> visit Roswell, NM. Your logic would fit right in with the
> conspiracy whackos there.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Art Bell wannabe.

3248. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 21:55:07 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <%ALp8.813$_y2.42129575@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39240

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020331144052.10634.00001702@mb-fo.aol.com...
> >No-Code-International has a total historic membership of perhaps 3400
> >individuals, worldwide.
> >Membership numbers are sequential and started with #1001, and there are
no
> >dues
> >and no
> >expiration date on membership.
> >
>
> Prove it with REAL FACTS. You could claim they have 50,000 Members but you
cant
> prove it.
> And of course with no Expiration Date on Membership, you could have SKs
in
> those numbers, and your still going to count them.

Like the FCC? Like the ARRL?

Time for you to make your appearance on "Weakest Link."

3249. Bruce don't read

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 21:57:18 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <2DLp8.815$gz2.42137830@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39241

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020331142138.10634.00001697@mb-fo.aol.com...
> >You do?! Why do you have to read others' "stupidity," Waddles? (That's
> >what your callsign sounds like) Now you *have* to read others' posts?
> >
> >ROFLMAO...
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Hey TIT bite me

Unless you're an idiot.

3250. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 22:03:28 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020331170328.21846.00001948@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 39242

>WA8LUX shows his complete ignorance again.

Yea your right, I forget to mention that you probably have the same Tatoo on your ASS

3251. Re: Wanted to be a NoCode

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 22:08:58 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <_NLp8.821$1w2.42017820@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39243

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020331143340.10634.00001701@mb-fo.aol.com...
> >Well, based on how I see you acting here, I think I've summed you up
pretty
> >accurately. You are low-intelligence, boxed in, Southern male who has a
lot
> >of grudge built up. You enjoy seeing yourself act like an idiot and
blame
> >it on the booze.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
> >
>
> Well TIT, I see you like to make alot of judgement calls about some one
when
> you lack the FACTS.
> I will try an enlighten you TIT. First mistake on your part. Im not a
Southern
> Male.

Right, he's a girly boy. Not male at all.

All kidding aside, I think Bruce came from, gulp, Ohio (like Steve and some of his ex-wives). My guess is that being so judgemental, Bruce moved to Louisianna to accept an appointment in the State Supreme Court.

> Second mistake on your part, I dont drink, never have.

Then there's absolutely no excuse. You shouldn't have tipped your hand.

> Now maybe you need to look a little harder, maybe your not as good at
judging
> someone as you think you are.

She got the "low intelligence" part right, and that's all that really mattered.

> I have a felling that maybe your the Booze Hound, try getting your facts
> correct next time TIT
> The rest of your Insanity isnt worth a comment.

Bruce had a felling and can't get up. What's new? Let's wet the paper bag and see if he can think his way out.

3252. Re: 15wpm hump

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 22:15:56 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <wULp8.826$MO2.42783008@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39244

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020331130240.20703.00000271@mb-mw.aol.com...
> In article <L1Gp8.565$Eq6.31815843@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20020330142712.00376.00000278@mb-mj.aol.com...
> >> In article <jq4p8.2336$YX.113575081@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian
P
> >> Burke" <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >No, I don't mean your other nemesis, Cutie Boy, I mean the
> >> >other guy at about the same time. I forget his name.
> >> >
> >> Mark Morgan, KB9RQZ.
> >>
> >> BTW, just one year and two days until ol' Masa/Cutie Boy's promise
> >> is to be fulfilled. (see his post on April 2, 1998)
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >Hi Jim,
>
> 'ello
> >
> >That's him!
>
> He claimed an IQ of 236, among other things.
>
> >I don't recall Cutie Boy's promise.
>
> I cannot even begin to do it justice. You must read the original to get
the
> full impact.
>
>
http://groups.google.com/groups?hl=en&selm=3522dcf6.2106740%40news.total.net
>
> A true rrap classic.

Oh man, I remember that one! Maybe he'll be on pay-per-view! All the
sicko's will tune in.

> >He was even less coherent than Bruce,
> >but then Engrish wasn't his native language. It was painful to read.
>
> All depends on your POV. Much of it was reminiscent of Hashafisti Scratchi. At
> times I wondered
> if he were actually someone's online persona.

Yeh. But it was still funny. Poor Steve gets smitten by these guys.

> Mark's mangling of English was at least as bad. When asked why he did not use a
> spellchecker, he
> said it would slow down his posting too much.

And that WAS the point of the recommendation. I wonder when he'll be released from the witness protection program and be free to post again?

73, Brian

3253. Re: Wanted to be a NoCode

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 22:16:53 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020331171653.11795.00001337@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 39245

>Right, he's a girly boy. Not male at all.

No Sissy Boy Im not like you. At least thats what your Mother says

3254. Re: Wanted to be a NoCode

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 22:18:58 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020331171858.11795.00001338@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 39246

>My guess is that being so judgemental, Bruce moved to
>Louisianna to accept an appointment in the State Supreme Court.

Still no facts, are you sure you are not related to Carl? Maybe hes your Daddy?

3255. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 22:19:19 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <HXLp8.839$CQ2.42851643@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39247

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a83ifj$l2l$3@208.206.142.70...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > > Ah, gee Old Boy, and what was it that kept YOU down?
> > > >
> > > > Nothing ever kept me down, Dick. Everything I have ever
> > > > attempted was easy for me. My motto has always been:
> > > > "Work Smarter, Not Harder!"
> > >
> > > And if you can't BS your way through it, destroy it. We see.
> > >
> > I don't believe in destroying things like you do, Dick. If something
> > is too hard, I simply go around it.
> >
> >
> More likely just avoid it, like you did the Extra exam, until they made
> it a gimmee.

The Extra always was a gimme, which is why you have one. Unless you're
referring to 1-Charlie which is more important than everything else in
amateur radio combined.

3256. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 22:22:29 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <F_Lp8.841$NQ2.42856687@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39248

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:a8617udpb0@208.207.71.139...

> I had a fair electronics education by that time, myself.

Fair is just above Poor, and since you're prone to exaggeration...

3257. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 22:25:04 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <41Mp8.842$3U2.42986692@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39249

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020331130241.20703.00000272@mb-mw.aol.com...
> In article <qPFp8.540$pg6.31415543@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>, "Brian P
Burke"
> <bpburke@prodigy.net> writes:
>
> >> > 10w, 50w, Whats the big difference? They are both reduced power.
> >> >
> >>
> >> 6 or 7 dB, and the JA low power guys are only allowed on a
> >> couple of HF bands.
> >>
> >> Hans
> >
> >It appears to make them happy enough, though.
> >
> Not really. Since 1995 the number of JA station licenses, and the number
of new
> JA operator licenses, has been dropping rapidly. Check out
>
> http://www.ah0a.org
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

When you consider the cost a license, and their economy...

3258. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 22:35:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA78F18.64F21F6F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39250

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >All
> >that is happening is that the wheels of progress are in motion.
> >--
>
> How do you Equate Dumbing Down as Progress.

That's a petitio principii diversion, Bruce, i.e. you are not
allowed to assume the proof and go on from there. Nobody has
proved that the amateur radio exams have been dumbed down since
the FCC has stated that Morse code has nothing to do with anything
except Morse code. I have taken four amateur radio exams over the
years and have found them to be appropriate for the privileges.
IMO, ham radio has NOT been dumbed-down. It is up to you, as
the one who is asserting that positive premise, to prove your
point. Since you haven't even come close to a proof over the
past two years, a bunch of us are wondering if you are just
continuing to blow smoke.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3259. Re: Long Reply to N2EY's Long Reply!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 22:35:44 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <4bMp8.855$B03.43345163@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39251

"K0HB" <K0HB@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:2srp8.3319$nt1.312011@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
>
> > It is not the purpose of government to preserve a historical
> > legacy.
>
> Gee, GWB could sell off historical things like the Liberty Bell,
> the USS Arizona, the original copies of the Declaration of
> Independence and the Constitution, and other historical
> legacy crap like that. Maybe put them on EBay, and some
> startup country with no history of their own could buy them
> off us?
>
> Cecil, you may be intellectually gifted, but I think you have
> neglected to unwrap most of your presents.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Instead of selling off the Statue of Liberty, I think we ought to return it
to France. Then we tell them where to get off.on death penalty issues.

3260. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 22:38:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA78FFE.557FA164@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39252

N4IXT wrote:
> Please note Val, that I am not trying to flame or insult you. You have
> posted some interesting stuff in the past. In this case, however, your
> entire post seems based on several gratuitous assertions.

It appears to me that Val and Dick, W0EX, have been involved in a
Vulcan mind meld and can no longer tell each other apart.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3261. Re: No coders and the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 22:39:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA7902F.3A165299@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39253

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20020331081446.07859.00002322@mb-mv.aol.com...
>
> > God your an Idiot
>
> You'll burn for that.

For calling God an idiot?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3262. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 22:40:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA7907A.B4FB1218@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39254

Brian P Burke wrote:
> BTW, what is a "neener?"

It's the verbal equivalent of stroking one index finger
upon the other.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3263. Re: Wanted to be a NoCode

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 22:47:08 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <MIMp8.866$5%2.43279595@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39255

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020331171653.11795.00001337@mb-mq.aol.com...
> >Right, he's a girly boy. Not male at all.
>
> No Sissy Boy Im not like you. At least thats what your Mother says

My mother is right, I'm nothing like you

3264. Re: Wanted to be a NoCode

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 22:48:55 UTC
From: Brian P Burke <bpburke@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <rnMp8.868$iZ2.43203991@newssvr17.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 39256

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20020331171858.11795.00001338@mb-mq.aol.com...
> >My guess is that being so judgemental, Bruce moved to
> >Louisianna to accept an appointment in the State Supreme Court.
>
> Still no facts, are you sure you are not related to Carl? Maybe hes your
Daddy?

Welp, I heard the Louisianna Supreme Court was backlogged and needed someone
who could make snap judgements and not worry about facts. I was sure you
were the "person" for the job.

73, Brian

3265. Re: Wanted to be a NoCode

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 22:50:27 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020331175027.11835.00001979@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 39257

>My mother is right, I'm nothing like you

Yea your right, I tryed to explain that to her.

3266. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 22:53:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA79385.274B7201@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39258

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I recall you swore you'd never get an Extra, too. So much for your
> assertions. Looks like it must have been important to you, after all.

If you recall, I asked the members of this newsgroup to offer a convincing argument for me to change my mind and upgrade to Extra. I forget who offered the argument but it went like this: What if, in the future, the FCC eliminates the Advanced class and busts all the Advanced back to General? That argument changed my mind. I know you never change your mind, Dick, especially when you are proven wrong, but some of us are rational folk who learn from our mistakes. But I still have not used any Extra privileges so you can sleep soundly at night.

> One would think that in all those years
> > of electronics, you could have managed a EE degree.
>
> Nope. Never was located where I could attend engineering school, and ya
> know, it was just not important enough to abandon a good career to move.

Translation: Dick was too lazy to expend the effort to gain knowledge by getting a EE degree. That's appropriate for someone who thinks it's OK to rest on one's laurels. And he has the nerve to rag on Techs, Generals, and Advanced hams who are perfectly satisfied with their licenses.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3267. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 22:56:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA7943A.F22A768@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39259

Valentine Germann wrote:
>
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> >Val, your entire line of thinking here, with all of these
> >backroom conspiracy theories, is false and so absurd
> >that it makes you look foolish to even suggest it. If you
> >had been involved long enough in ham radio policy and
> >politics, you'd know that, but as a "newbie" your mistake
> >is understandable/excusable.
>
> So, when is NCI officially disbanding?

Asked and answered already - when the code requirement is removed
for all amateur exams in all countries.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3268. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 23:05:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA79629.79B1A920@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39260

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> The fat lady has sung ... get on with your life, quit your incessant
> bitching, and don't presume to insult people like Bill Cross who
> are so far above you in intelligence and integrity that "head and
> shoulders" doesn't even come close to describing it adequately.

I've always pictured Dick's head and shoulders as being just
about the level of his buttocks. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3269. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 23:07:26 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020331180726.02316.00001468@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 39261

>When there is no longer a mandatory Morse test for any
>class of Amateur license anywhere in the world.

Talk about saving a segment of society that doesn't appear to want to be saved.

Mark

3270. Its been Fun

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 23:11:34 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20020331181134.11827.00001860@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 39262

Thanks guys for the Fun Weekend you to TIT. I have to get ready to take of this week on Bussiness, and wont have time to play on the Newsgroups. But to keep you all motivated heres some things you can talk about.

1. Will Carl find a Surgeon who can remove the Tattos with out laughing?

2. Will Brian figure out his parents ID

3. And TiT I will be in the Dallas Area part of the week, maybe we can have a QSO on your favorite 2 Meter CB Repeater. The Question for the rest of you is will TIT and I have the QSO?

Have fun guys be back in a Week or Two, and again thanks for the fun, you guys are always good for a Laugh.

3271. Re: What's It All About, Alfie?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 23:13:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA7980B.9EE571A2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39263

Dave Heil wrote:
> It was never the intent of anyone that every citizen of the United
> States should become a radio amateur.

I'm sure from reading the Amateur's Code that there was never any
intent to establish a pecking order within the ARS.

> Is she coherent?

Nope, my point exactly. Everyone cannot become an amateur radio operator.

> > As long as incentive licensing continues to
> > exist, the door will be open for higher class bullies to heap abuse on the
> > lower classes. Why don't you talk to those bullies about "Live and let live"?
>
> Excuse me while I take time to laugh off your latest offering as being
> beyond reality.

Of course, as one of the bullies, you are forced to defend yourself
thusly. One wonders why all the power mongering since it doesn't seem
to accomplish anything productive.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3272. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 23:19:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA79970.21233D0B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39264

Bill Sohl wrote:
> Yea, the great ARRL/NCI conspiracy. Gee, it
> doesn't get any funnier than this.

Remember how screwed up Dr. McCoy got after a mind meld with Spock?
Maybe Val's mind meld with Dick is having the same effect?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3273. Re: Code Test Fiasco: Upon Further Review!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 23:21:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3CA79A0D.82EB2CB9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 39265

Bill Sohl wrote:
> WA8LUX shows his complete ignorance again.
> I won't speak for Carl, but my view of both Bill & Hillary
> is that they are scum. The Clintons are the arch enemy
> of conservative thought and political process to which
> I subscribe. THAT, is obviously beyond the grasp
> of WA8LUX who keep dreaming up this liberal
> bunk and try to tie it to NCI.

Well, he's a lot like the Clintons. He wants a governmental
welfare program for his favorite mode.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3274. My rebuttal to WA6ITF's SLAM of CB RADIO!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-03-31 23:57:56 UTC
From: k8cpa@arrl.net
Message-ID: <3ca7a1cd.16074281@news.mi.comcast.giganews.com>
Source record: 39266

http://mywebpages.comcast.net/K8CPA/rebuttal.html

http://mywebpages.comcast.net/K8CPA/rebuttal.html

http://mywebpages.comcast.net/K8CPA/rebuttal.html

http://mywebpages.comcast.net/K8CPA/rebuttal.html